

## Burke, Teresita

---

**From:** Abundant Housing "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:07 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Mac Hartfiel  
**Subject:** Support for Making Room

The following message was sent through the Abundant Housing Vancouver website  
(<http://www.abundanthousingvancouver.com/>) on behalf of Mac Hartfiel <"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential">

-----  
Dear Mayor Robertson and Councillors,

I am writing to express my support for the Making Room proposals being considered on September 19, and especially the one to allow duplexes in RS zones. Similar duplex homes have been allowed in many Vancouver neighbourhoods for decades, so this is long overdue.

It's great that this will apply to the majority of Vancouver's residential land, as city-wide problems demand city-wide solutions. I also appreciate that this will allow small-scale densification away from busy arterial roads.

This will not solve Vancouver's housing crisis on its own, but it is a step in the right direction. I hope you approve it swiftly as a first step toward more more extensive changes later. This proposal is too little too late, but if his incremental improvement is required to ultimately shake the Single Family home but form, then I support it. An increase in FSR is mandatory if our city wants any chance of survival. What kind of community are we protecting when the suburbs are building higher buildings, more housing, supporting more businesses and creating a healthy environment for more people, not just the exclusive few in Vancouver that have been protecting an incredibly selfish and almost grotesque status quo for many decades.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Burke, Teresita**

---

**From:** Andrew Ferguson <[REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential">  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:25 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** I Strongly Support Making Room for Duplexes

Hey Public Hearing Staff,

Whats up? I'm not gonna waste a lot of your time, I'm gonna get to the point.

I'm thirty-four, a small business owner, a resident of Vancouver for thirteen years, a renter in this town, and I strongly support making room for duplexes in the city of Vancouver. This won't solve all our housing woes, but this is a badly needed step forward to help address the housing crisis in this city.

I'm assuming you're just giving these a quick once-over and putting them in the YEA or NAY column, so by all means please do that. If you need to reach me, I'm available here by email or by phone at [REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Thanks for your time,

--Andrew Ferguson

## Burke, Teresita

---

**From:** Erin Reddekopp <[REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential">  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:42 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Making Room For Duplexes

Hello,

Just a quick email to say I'm so happy to see this idea being considered. As a young couple my husband and I have often felt complete despair at the idea we will never be able to buy a home in the city we so dearly love. We're very excited to see new ideas that may allow us to stay. I'm completely in favour of duplexes.

Thank you,  
Erin Reddekopp Meehan

## Burke, Teresita

---

**From:** Abundant Housing [REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 12:33 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Ellen Grant  
**Subject:** Support for Making Room

The following message was sent through the Abundant Housing Vancouver website  
(<http://www.abundanthousingvancouver.com/>) on behalf of Ellen Grant [REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

-----  
Dear Mayor Robertson and Councillors,

I am writing to express my support for the Making Room proposals being considered on September 18, and especially the one to allow duplexes in RS zones. Similar duplex homes have been allowed in many Vancouver neighbourhoods for decades, so this is long overdue. I lived in one in another city and it's a fantastic way to increase housing options for people who can't afford single family homes.

It's great that this will apply to the majority of Vancouver's residential land, as city-wide problems demand city-wide solutions. I also appreciate that this will allow small-scale densification away from busy arterial roads.

This will not solve Vancouver's housing crisis on its own, but it is a step in the right direction. We need to start taking action - let's start here!

Thank you for your consideration.

**Burke, Teresita**

---

**From:** Andrea Sherrington <[REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 1:13 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Making Room

Hi council,

I understand that you're meeting today to discuss duplexes. I would like to note my support for this proposal.

My husband & I are mid-career professionals who rent in East Van. Approving duplexes could significantly increase the supply of affordable housing and potentially make it possible for us to buy our own home in the future (or at least continue to afford rent here!)

The city where I grew up in Alberta had a lot of duplexes, and it retained a great neighbourhood feel. Triplexes and quadplexes are great too.

Housing affordability should be the top priority for council if we want to retain skilled professionals and support economic and social diversity in Vancouver.

Regards,  
Andrea

Dear Mayor and City Councillors,

I am unable to attend the meeting to speak in support of the proposed rezoning. This brings up my first point related to this issue which is that the medium for public consultation is skewed toward people who have time to participate. These people, in many cases, have more personal time to engage meaning they are retired, wealthy, without young children and/or are highly motivated to either support or oppose change.

In the *Logic of Collective Action*, Mancur Olson describes a phenomenon of democratic processes whereby those most adversely impacted by policy changes have outsized influence because they have the most to lose and are the most politically organized. Often times though, these groups represent a relatively small portion of people. Furthermore, because the winners of policies are often unaware of who they are and what's at stake, they are much less organized and influential. The RS-1 upzoning is following Olson's script in that single family dwelling residents in neighbourhoods that will be upzoned are loudly in opposition whereas younger, less wealthy, renters and less politically engaged citizens often are not as organized or motivated.

In essence, existing current homeowners are attempting to shape the housing options for the city's future's housing owners. This dynamic has reinforced the status quo towards keeping existing economic, social and other power structures that influence the City's policy decisions particularly on housing. It is this dynamic that has brought us to this housing crisis, and it is precisely this dynamic that needs to be changed in order for Council to propel a housing policy framework that aligns with our economic and social goals into the 21st century.

The RS-1 upzoning is the bare minimum first step that council should take to address housing affordability in the city. I live directly next to the rezoned Norquay neighbourhood and have noticed a clear and positive change to the character and livability of that neighbourhood. Furthermore, whereas SFD's in my neighborhood are too expensive for purchase, duplexes in the neighbourhood are 1/3 as expensive per unit while offering similar features and characteristics as an SFD. While the upzone may indeed increase the value of land, the per-unit cost will be reduced and this is the critical leading indicator for affordability. Reducing cost-barriers to this middle market segment alleviates the pressures on housing in all other markets. My story applies well here. The rental unit that my family occupies would become available if we were to move into a duplex should prices continue to decline with greater duplex supply. But, this is why I believe that this is the bare minimum action the City should take. Council and city staff should be bolder in allowing triplexes and quadplexes and in allowing further multi-story density off of arterials and into neighbourhood cores. This would also increase the availability of these units to the rental market and to home buyers further down the price scale. Increasing the supply of attractive affordable units has a direct impact on the availability of rental units.

Maintaining the SFD "character" of neighbourhoods as an urban design priority is akin to preserving Vancouver in a city-wide museum dedicated to a 1960s housing form. While museums are interesting places to visit they are not places to live. Vancouver's economic and social fabric has far outgrown the housing model and pattern of design clung to by many residents, some city staff and other advocates. Pointing back to Norquay, there is no sensible argument that the design, character, feel etc. of that

neighbourhood has been compromised to allow other housing forms. Duplexes offer a building mass with character that is almost exactly the same as SFDs. Done right, this move would likely enhance neighbourhood character by providing incentive to replace homes with negative character (particularly in east Vancouver) with new build.

Finally, this upzone should not be isolated from other City policy objectives such as the Greenest City Action Plan (GCAP). Densification of housing is one of the most important actions a city can take to reduce GHG emissions. Densification reduces GHG emissions along multiple streams. Buildings with less floor area per occupant require less energy and fossil fuel consumption. Density also promotes less carbon-intensive modes of transport requiring less fossil fuel consumption. This cascades across the energy system requiring less upstream energy production and emissions (all things remaining equal). Incentivizing building tear downs for duplexes creates an opportunity to replace inefficient building stock and energy consumption equipment before the end of their useful lives. This expedites GHG emissions reductions compared to business as usual with higher efficiency buildings (though care must be taken to ensure that the embodied carbon of building materials is minimized).

A recent global analysis of the role of the buildings sector to reduce GHG emissions stated that the GHG reduction potential of urban density around the world was on par to the potential of energy efficiency. The City of Vancouver needs to understand the limitations of the CGAP scope on Vancouver-specific emissions. Maintaining exclusionary zoning that perpetuates unaffordable housing types simply moves GHG emissions out of the city to less dense neighboring municipalities leading to greater building and transport emissions. Simply put, the city's buildings policies and plans are the single most important factor on the region's long-term GHG emission trajectory.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Tyler Bryant

## Burke, Teresita

---

**From:** Ian Robertson <[REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 2:16 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Making Room Support

Hello,

We have all heard the phrase 'the greenest car is the Hummer that's still here', and it is fitting to the discussion of housing because a typical house uses almost the exact same amount of energy.

So, when someone sets out to replace their Hummer, what do they replace it with? Personally, I hope it is with something with something small and light with as little ecological footprint as possible. So too for their house.

The problem is, with housing, you can't replace with something small or light, as zoning dictates nothing else but a 1:1 replacement of one house with another house. If built to passivehouse standard, this new house will pay off its carbon footprint inside its first mortgage, but there is still the issue that few can afford the first house, not to mention its replacement.

So why can't we at least split this new house into multiple units, and extend the idea of small and light living into the 60% plus of the city which is zoned residential? We're the greenest city, after all, shouldn't we be able to live like it?

Lets look at the economics of replacing a house.

Taking a notional East Vancouver lot worth \$1 Million, a typical replacement house will also cost about \$1 Million, so one would hope to sell for very nearly \$2 Million at the end of the day to cover costs. So we turned an old \$1 Million dollar house into a new \$2 million Dollar house. This is what people immediately sneer at as the pointlessness of 'building affordably', and for the 1:1 replacement of a single family house, they're not wrong.

So lets look at the Duplex scenario being considered in 'Making Room' ... the costs of building the duplex are a bit higher because of extra kitchens and bathrooms, but still, you basically turn a \$1 Million dollar old house into two \$1 Million dollar new houses. This of course is also sneered at as being a wonderful example of 'affordability'.

If I stopped here, I'd do well to prove the point of many that new construction hurts affordability, but that's why I'm not stopping.

If you split each of the duplexes into two, you get a stacked townhouse, and while you again add a bit of costs in adding yet more bathrooms and kitchens, you turn that \$1 Million dollar house into 4 Half-Million dollar houses (ok, actually about \$600k). Which certainly starts to look more affordable to me, and all this without really adding much actual density to the site. I live in something similar in Fairview, and this is the time to point out that you don't have to look elsewhere in the world for the kind of density we need, its already here in Vancouver, its just only allowed in a tiny fraction of the alphabet soup of zoning areas.

Finally, if you summon the nerve to add a bit more density to the property and put 6 units on this property, you can bring the cost per unit down to close to \$400k, which incidentally is approximately the theoretical buying



power of the Median Income in Vancouver. Does this qualify as 'Capital A' affordability? No, but by definition it would be affordable to most, which is a huge improvement from where we are now.

So to conclude the Making Room proposal is a good first step, it will mean that there is a way for Hummer Houses to be viably replaced with things which are far more sustainable. However, on behalf of the next generation, I would ask you to go further. We've all seen the graphic comparing the space that 100 commuters take driving cars vs taking the bus vs riding bikes. Please let us do the same for housing, by not just allowing the replacement of the Hummer House with two Prius Houses, but going further yet, and allowing those who want to, to live small and light in something more akin to 'Bicycle Houses' across the city.

I would encourage you to pass this resolution and make more room, but then tomorrow to still consider what else you can do to make even more room yet.

A friend of mine just posed this well on Twitter:

“Last night's "purity" comment in regard to single family was revealing, the more I think about it.

This isn't about buildings. It's about having a veto to ensure your neighbours are the right kind of people.”  
@YVRYIMBY

Please be liberal in your desire to Make Room, for the benefit of all those who would otherwise be excluded by those seeking 'pure' neighbourhoods.

Regards,

-Ian Robertson

Fairview

Vancouver



**Burke, Teresita**

---

**From:** K Cheng "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018 2:43 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** SUPPORT to change from RS zones to Duplexes

we need to have the more affordable single house in Vancouver. I want my child can effort to live in Vancouver nearby me.

Wu J

**Burke, Teresita**

---

**From:** Christa Giles <[REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential">  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2018, 11:38 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** PRO Duplexes

I am FOR changes to zoning that increases density and provides more options for housing in Vancouver.

Our city is well served by transit and bicycle infrastructure, and housing for middle age renters, the millennials, and lower income folk is in short supply.

I support the measures that the city is taking to provide more housing for all.

Signed, a public employee who bikes to work, rents on the west side, and doesn't know where she will be able to live with her family if her landlord decides to move his family in.