

**Dragnea, Irina**

---

**From:** Jami Koehl s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2018 8:03 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Re: July 18, 2018 Public Hearing item # 2. TEXT AMENDMENTS – Laneway Home Regulations

To Mayor and Council:

**Re: July 18, 2018 Public Hearing item # 2. TEXT AMENDMENTS – Laneway Home Regulations**

As a long time resident of the city of Vancouver and Kitsilano, I am deeply disappointed that residents have not been given sufficient time and input on this matter of laneway home regulations, among other matters relating to the design of our neighbourhoods.

In particular I think a blanket approach to this issue of laneway homes size and the speed at which this is being done prior to our upcoming civic election is unfair. We are seeking an approach that maintains neighbourhood character and offers affordable alternatives to residents, not just those who can afford to purchase homes and one that allows neighbours input to the significant changes being proposed. I ask for you to delay the decision until after the fall election with a full consultation process allowing input from affected neighbourhoods .

Yours truly,

Jami Koehl

Dragnea, Irina

---

**From:** Michael Huggins s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2018 11:04 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Laneway House Bylaw

Hello

I have designed a few Laneway Houses including my own which has never been built. I have reviewed the new bylaw and for the most part it is the same with a few changes; raising of the upper most portion of the roof by approx .6M. The second storey can be slightly bigger in footprint **but** with the **FSR unchanged at .16 FSR**, the house cannot really be any bigger. So the argument that the revised zoning increases the size is **not really true**.

The one issue I do have is the "insulation thickness" exclusion. 1) The exclusion of 3% can only be utilized if the insulation thickness is 175mm (7"). **The 3% of the FSR is only approx a 2" zone around the building given a typical footprint.** The insulation is 7" in thickness. And the setbacks can be reduced by 30cm (12") if the "insulation thickness" exclusion is used. **There is a DISCONNECT here.** These clauses need to be re examined. I suggest a revision from **3% to approx 6%** to be realistic and coordinated with the intent of the bylaw.

Sincerely,

—  
Michael C. Huggins • Architect AIBC  
Burrowes Huggins Architects  
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential