

Swanston, Denise

From: Darcy Higgs <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 4:37 PM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Proposal to amend RS, RT and RM zones

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am **opposed** to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

The proposed changes are problematic, including the impacts on above grade FSR, increased building envelope bulk, increased building depth, decreased rear yard setbacks, and lack of design guidelines to meet neighbourhood-based context and streetscape.

This undermines character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support as proposed and refer back to staff for planning through meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Thank you.

Darcy Higgs

Swanston, Denise

From: Jennifer Mitchell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 5:07 PM
To: Boyle, Christine; Bligh, Rebecca; Wiebe, Michael; Swanson, Jean; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Hardwick, Colleen; Fry, Pete; Dominato, Lisa; De Genova, Melissa; Carr, Adriane; Stewart, Kennedy; Public Hearing
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

I am **opposed** to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

This council has claimed to be improving the consultation process yet the Making Room Program continues to implement major changes to multiple zones at the same time, and calling this "a minor text amendment" when it actually makes major changes to the zones without any public consultation.

I have concerns that the revisions create a new type of outright duplex Vancouver Special with a maximized above grade scale. Duplexes should be conditional, not outright, to ensure design compatibility with neighbourhood context and streetscapes and conditional retention of character houses when applicable.

The proposed changes are problematic, including the impacts on above grade FSR, increased building envelope bulk, increased building depth, decreased rear yard setbacks, and lack of design guidelines to meet neighbourhood-based context and streetscape.

This undermines character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support as proposed and refer back to staff for planning through meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Thank you,

Jennifer Mitchell

Swanston, Denise

From: PAT CARAHER <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 10:09 PM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM.- April 2, 2019

I am **opposed** to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

This council has claimed to be improving the consultation process yet the Making Room Program continues to implement major changes to multiple zones at the same time, and calling this "a minor text amendment" when it actually makes major changes to the zones without any public consultation.

I have concerns that the revisions create a new type of outright duplex Vancouver Special with a maximized above grade scale. Duplexes should be conditional, not outright, to ensure design compatibility with neighbourhood context and streetscapes and conditional retention of character houses when applicable.

The proposed changes are problematic, including the impacts on above grade FSR, increased building envelope bulk, increased building depth, decreased rear yard setbacks, and lack of design guidelines to meet neighbourhood-based context and streetscape.

This undermines character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support as proposed and refer back to staff for planning through meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Pat Caraher, Kitsilano

Swanston, Denise

From: Nancy Stern [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 11:14 PM
To: Speaker Request; Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; adrian.carr@vancouver.ca; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca
Subject: April 2, 2019 - Zoning Amendments to RS, RT RM

Dear Council,

I'm writing to request a delay to Tuesday's vote in council. It would be effective to first ensure a meaningful community consultation on the proposed zoning amendments to RS, RT and RM.

There are issues related to above grade FSR, neighborhood compatibility and the impact of duplexes that should have more consultation to ensure all options are considered. There are concerns regarding the loss of character homes, Heritage Action Plan, conversions, multiple units, the retention of character houses through bonuses to renovate and expand rather than outright demolition. Affordability and growth are important and can be accomplished through effective consultation.

Regards,
Nancy

Nancy Stern
[REDACTED]

Swanston, Denise

From: Public Hearing
Subject: RE: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

Attention City Council:

Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

I am opposed to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

This council has claimed to be improving the consultation process yet the Making Room Program continues to implement major changes to multiple zones at the same time, and calling this "a minor text amendment" when it actually makes major changes to the zones without any public consultation.

I have concerns that the revisions create a new type of outright duplex Vancouver Special with a maximized above grade scale. Duplexes should be conditional, not outright, to ensure design compatibility with neighbourhood context and streetscapes and conditional retention of character houses when applicable.

The proposed changes are problematic, including the impacts on above grade FSR, increased building envelope bulk, increased building depth, decreased rear yard setbacks, and lack of design guidelines to meet neighbourhood-based context and streetscape.

This undermines character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support as proposed and refer back to staff for planning through meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Thank you.

Georgia Scott

Swanston, Denise

From: Kameyo Melina [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 3:06 AM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

I am **opposed** to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

This council has claimed to be improving the consultation process, yet the Making Room Program continues to implement major changes to multiple zones at the same time, and calling this "a minor text amendment" when it actually makes *major* changes to the zones without any public consultation.

I have concerns that the revisions create a new type of outright duplex Vancouver Special with a maximized above grade scale. Duplexes should be conditional, not outright, to ensure design compatibility with neighbourhood context and streetscapes and conditional retention of character houses when applicable.

The proposed changes are problematic, including the impacts on above grade FSR, increased building envelope bulk, increased building depth, decreased rear yard setbacks, and lack of design guidelines to meet neighbourhood-based context and streetscape.

This undermines character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support as proposed and refer back to staff for planning through meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Kameyo Melina

Swanston, Denise

From: Joan Bunn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 8:36 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

I am opposed to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

I am opposed to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

I was shocked to hear that council is considering, on short notice, a zoning change to allow some larger duplexes and smaller yard spaces. This seems utterly at odds with council's declarations of a climate emergency in Vancouver and an affordable housing crisis. I know that you as councillors do care deeply about these issues, so I cannot understand why councillors should consider proposals that seem to fly in the face of concern for these issues.

On my walks around my Kitsilano neighbourhood, I often notice with sadness yet another very large house going up that is clearly intended to house just one family though the house may have double the floor space of the older home it replaces. The height and square footage now allowed in this neighbourhood is quite adequate to allow two well-designed separate residences within it. In fact, there are already numerous de facto duplexes in this area, and they have been tenanted for many years. An attractive duplex with two front doors (not a problem with good design) or side doors could fit in the space now available for a single-family home, and this should improve affordability if land prices remain stable.

Bigger buildings mean more trees and shrubs lost, when Vancouver's tree canopy has already shrunk.

More energy goes into the construction and maintenance of a larger house, and it will permanently be more expensive to buy or rent than one with smaller but adequate floor space. (As you know, many homes that have housed generations of Vancouverites happily, have quite modest floor space even though families were typically larger.)

Land values may rise with this zoning change, further aggravating affordability.

I was initially opposed to the change in our area which allowed duplexes. However, I soon changed my mind when land values did not immediately rise and indication of demolitions did not suddenly increase. It seems to me that Kitsilano can adapt to duplexes without losing its charm, if design guidelines — which I understand are also threatened — are in place.

I also believe that older de facto duplexes should be grandfathered in and legalized — why not?

Please send these rezoning proposals back for further discussion/change.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joan Bunn



Swanston, Denise

From: Craig Gay - [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 8:56 AM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Re: Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a resident of West Point Grey and I am strongly opposed to moving ahead with the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

This council has claimed to be improving the consultation process yet the "Making Room Program" proposes to implement major changes to multiple zones at the same time - calling these changes "minor text amendments" -which would actually make major changes to the zones *without* any public consultation.

The proposed revisions will create a new type of *outright* duplex Vancouver Special with a maximized above grade scale. I believe such duplexes should be *conditional*, not outright, to ensure design compatibility with neighbourhood context and streetscapes and conditional retention of character houses when applicable.

The proposed changes will undermine character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support these amendments as proposed. Refer them back to staff for revision and insist on meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Craig Gay, [REDACTED]

Swanston, Denise

From: Kevin Harney <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 10:21 AM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

I am **opposed** to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input.

This council has claimed to be improving the consultation process yet the Making Room Program continues to implement major changes to multiple zones at the same time, and calling this "a minor text amendment" when it actually makes major changes to the zones without any public consultation.

I have concerns that the revisions create a new type of outright duplex Vancouver Special with a maximized above grade scale. Duplexes should be conditional, not outright, to ensure design compatibility with neighbourhood context and streetscapes and conditional retention of character houses when applicable.

The proposed changes are problematic, including the impacts on above grade FSR, increased building envelope bulk, increased building depth, decreased rear yard setbacks, and lack of design guidelines to meet neighbourhood-based context and streetscape.

This undermines character house retention incentives, the Heritage Action Plan, and the ability to create more affordable rentals through conversion to multiple secondary suites and infill.

Please do not support as proposed and refer back to staff for planning through meaningful consultation in the city-wide planning process.

Kevin Harney
[REDACTED]

Swanston, Denise

From: Doug Johnstone [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 11:32 AM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendments to RS, RT, RM - April 2, 2019

Dear Counsellors,

It appears you are to vote on a massive zoning change this evening without public input. This is wrong and I am opposed to how this motion has been brought forward.

A report was issued today saying that Canada is warming twice as quickly as the rest of the world. Vancouver is no where near being a green city unless all city policies are integrated with policies that are green and that reduce GHG. Please tell me how a policy that would continue to allow demolition of existing building, with larger replacements and multi car garages can be remotely considered green. Covering more of the lot by maximizing envelope bulk is not green. Carting tonnes of demolished building to the land fill is not green. Allowing multiple covered parking spaces is not green.

Send this back to staff for revision. We need to renovate, and energy retrofit, not demolish and rebuild. We need a through review of the so called green initiatives in this city, such as implementing the dark sky by law that has been in process for years, banning artificial grass from city and private property, preventing continued land paving over to allow rain water re-circulation, minimizing the use of concrete in the city, and many other others. Ask for citizen input- you will be amazed at what great ideas you will receive.

The city seems so obtuse. The world is burning up and what do you do? Nothing.

Please start to think outside the proverbial box.

Regards,

Doug

Doug Johnstone CPA.CA
[REDACTED]

Swanston, Denise

From: Brad <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 12:09 PM
To: Public Hearing; Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; Dè Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine
Subject: Public Hearing April 2 @ 6:00 pm to consider rezonings

Come on! I moved to Victoria because Vancouver has so little history left! I am **opposed** to the proposed rezoning of RS, RT and RM areas without meaningful community consultation or input. Travel around the world and see what lengths other communities are going to in order to protect architectural heritage! b. Zembic

--

B. Zembic
Proud champion of a
cheese-, shoe-,
and clink-free environment