

Public Hearing - July 23, 2020 - Item 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts (OPPOSED)

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/22/2020	18:44	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Please see attached letter which expresses our opposition to this Item. Thanks, Larry A. Benge, Co-chair Dorothy Barkley, Co-chair Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods	Larry Benge	Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	APPENDIX A
07/23/2020	08:46	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor and council members; I continue to be shocked at the speed at which Council is pushing through rezoning and densification plans throughout Vancouver without a thought to the number of people in need of housing, and what it will mean to our city when scant public consultation has gone into your "plan." I question why a complex rezoning plan with far reach implications is being rammed through before council leaves on its summer break? What you are doing is producing a glut of taller buildings along commercial zones that only developers and landlords will profit from. The people who live in these areas are once again the main losers. Our beautiful city, with its distinct neighbourhoods, is starting to look like every other major city. Is this what we really want? Adding densification can be accomplished, but it needs to be done slowly and carefully, with input from each neighbourhood. Blanket rezoning like this is the enemy! Consultation with communities has been sorely lacking in recent years and I ask that Council give this rezoning "plan" and others like it far more thought. Let's preserve what is working for each neighbourhood and implement changes for what isn't. Thank you	Ms EVELYN JACOB		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	08:47	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor and council members; I continue to be shocked at the speed at which Council is pushing through rezoning and densification plans throughout Vancouver without a thought to the number of people in need of housing, and what it will mean to our city when scant public consultation has gone into your "plan." I question why a complex rezoning plan with far reach implications is being rammed through before council leaves on its summer break? What you are doing is producing a glut of taller buildings along commercial zones that only developers and landlords will profit from. The people who live in these areas are once again the main losers. Our beautiful city, with its distinct neighbourhoods, is starting to look like every other major city. Is this what we really want? Adding densification can be accomplished, but it needs to be done slowly and carefully, with input from each neighbourhood. Blanket rezoning like this is the enemy! Consultation with communities has been sorely lacking in recent years and I ask that Council give this rezoning "plan" and others like it far more thought. Let's preserve what is working for each neighbourhood and implement changes for what isn't. Thank you	Ms EVELYN JACOB		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	09:22	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	3 story buildings are sufficient do not turn our neighbourhoods into shade runnels with empty storefronts Tenth Ave, e.g. is rife with empty stores and the street is not fully developed yet	Ms RONNIE TESSLER		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West Point Grey	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	10:46	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Please see attached file	Irma Sewerin	myself	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	APPENDIX B
07/23/2020	10:55	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Councillors, I am opposed to this rezoning. There has been no neighborhood-based planning process. Thank you. Darcy Higgs	Darcy Higgs		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	10:56	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	City staff and council continue to disregard neighbourhood concerns. Neighbourhoods should maintain style and flavour. Strongly oppose blanket rezoning; especially when no city plan has been undertaken. Mayor Stewart says he was elected to make change -- most feel the change needed was to listen to neighbourhoods, and truly engage in meaningful public consultation. He is simply following in Vision's ways; not what we expected or wanted.	Alison Bealy		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

07/23/2020	10:56	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Council, You are destroying the Livable City in order to enrich developers. You are also destroying the bond between the electorate and those elected, as you ignore and ride roughshod over public opinion. All you care about is the enticements of developers and the promptings of City staff, who lure you into compliance with their agenda. Get your hands off Point Grey. Do not rezone all C2 shopping areas city-wide. With best regards, Eric Levy	Eric Levy		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	10:58	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I am opposed to the blanket rezoning of shopping areas to permit six storeys. This increase in allowable heights will have adverse effects on communities and on business taxes. What happened to the idea of public consultation? And why is the city so addicted to growth? It's time to assess the real needs of actual Vancouverites living here now, not the megalopolis dreams of the developers. Sincerely Susan Fisher	Ms SUSAN FISHER		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	10:58	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Council, You are destroying the Livable City in order to enrich developers. You are also destroying the bond between the electorate and those elected, as you ignore and ride roughshod over public opinion. All you care about is the enticements of developers and the promptings of City staff, who lure you into compliance with their agenda. Get your hands off Point Grey. Do not rezone all C2 shopping areas city-wide. With best regards, Eric Levy	Eric Levy		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:00	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I am opposed to this motion. o The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019 as follows: "THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts citywide."; o The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested; o There has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas; o There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context; o The increases to 6 storeys (72') for rental may be acceptable in some areas but not in others; o The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses; o The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that is not in character with some local shopping areas; o The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere; o No consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, impacts on local area context; and o No maximum lot size so allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks. George Roberts	GEORGE ROBERTS		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:03	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Mayor & Councillors: I am strongly OPPOSED to this proposal. Neighbourhood-based planning is key to preserving the character of each neighbourhood and reflecting the development/change sentiments of its residents. Proposed height maximums are too great. Alan Drinkwater, CPA CA C. 604 360-7405 H. 604 224-6346 See Anne's and my adventures at http://www.instagram.com/gapyearish [instagram.com] or www.gapyearish.com	Alan		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

07/23/2020	11:05	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Hello, Please register my opposition to the rezoning of all C2 shopping areas city-wide to be discussed at today's council meeting. I am opposed for the reasons below. Thank you, Vicky o The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019 as follows: "THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts citywide."; o The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested; o There has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas; o There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context; o The increases to 6 storeys (72') for rental may be acceptable in some areas but not in others; o The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses; o The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that is not in character with some local shopping areas; o The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere; o No consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, impacts on local area context; and o No maximum lot size so allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks.	Vicky		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:24	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Opposed to ?moar? building with less control oversight not planning. My name is Vishva Hartt I live at vancouver BC v6r 1w4	????? Visva hartt		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:25	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	ALISON BEALY 3608 DUNBAR STREET	Alison Bealy		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:30	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I am opposed to the subject agenda item for the reasons listed below. My overriding objection is the broad and sweeping power that such a bill gives to applicants without particular scrutiny of each application by the those in the immediate neighbourhood. The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested; - There has been no notification of residents and owners in these areas; - There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context; - The increases to 6 storeys (72') for rental may not be acceptable everywhere; - The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses; - The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that may not be in character; - The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere; - No consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, local area context; and - No maximum lot size so allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks. Sincerely, William Hall 4183 West 12th Avenue, Vancouver, V6R 2P5	Mr WILLIAM HALL		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

07/23/2020	11:32	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I oppose this for the following: I continue to emphasise the fact that we are in a Pandemic; residents of this City are suffering undue stress and financial hardship and Council is busy implementing huge rezoning changes that seriously impact the city. More and more people are having to move because of unemployment, uncertainty and economic changes. Please give us all a chance to catch up, breathe and reassess in a measured sane fashion. Once you raise land values by rezoning, these are irreversible decisions and have an enormous ripple effect on costs, particularly when you are voting to subsidise developers. (as you did on Tuesday July 21st.) You have set aside Millions of dollars for a City Plan, which you are busy undermining before it even begins. On November 26, 2019, Council directed needed protection be brought in for existing rentals: "THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts citywide.?. This has not happened. o The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested; o There has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas; o There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context; o The increases to 6 storeys (72') for rental may be acceptable in some areas but not in others; (we need heights not storeys on building proposals) o The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses; o The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that is not in character with some local shopping areas; o The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere; o No consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, impacts on local area context; and o No maximum lot size so allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks. Respectfully Jo Scott Baxendale	Jo Scott Baxendale		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:37	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	As I live on 3rd & Balaclava the changes will have an effect on me and my family. As we have not been asked for or given an opportunity to respond to the changes I strongly feel as a resident of 45 years in the same home we are being ignored. Give us time to be heard.	Randall W. Smith		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:43	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Concerning Item 3: Amendments to the Zoning By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2b, C-2c and C-2C1 Commercial Districts. This focuses on aspects of the Motion for Approval-specifically A (ii) c. This section of the Motion states that It is "to ensure that setback requirements for the new residential rental tenure align with the current regulations for regular residential development. What is being brought forward is very much more significant than what this motion states. Instead, all the setback and height rules are being changed for ALL C developments. If approved, it will allow development 72 feet high with a straight facade set 8 feet back from the front (street) property line over a full block and also higher buildings for all development with only a fifteen foot setback from the lane with no stepbacks to reduce shadowing. This will affect the urban design of our local shopping streets and will affect levels of shadowing and sunlight on both the street itself and properties behind. It is my view that more discussion and careful consideration is needed before changes to the form of development in 'C' zones are approved. P. Caraher Kitsilano	Patrick Caraher		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:46	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Please see attached letter. Thanks, Larry A. Benge, Co-chair Jan Pierce, Co-chair Per Board of Directors West Kitsilano Residents Association	Larry Benge	West Kitsilano Residents Association	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	APPENDIX C
07/23/2020	11:48	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Please see attached letter. Thanks, Larry A. Benge, Co-chair Dorothy Barkley, Co-chair Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods	Coalition of Vancouver Neighborhoods	Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	APPENDIX D

07/23/2020	11:50	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	<p>2535 West 13th Avenue Vancouver, BC V6K 2S9 July 23, 2019 Vancouver City Council 453 West 12th Avenue Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4 Dear Councilors, First, thank you for your service to our city and citizens. Before this week, I?d never written a letter to City Hall in my 2+ decades as a Vancouver resident. For the second time in 3 days I find myself writing to you with concerns about zoning changes being contemplated without adequate input from Vancouver citizens. Tomorrow you will consider changes to zoning for the C-2, C-2b, C-2c and C-2C1 Commercial Districts, allowing 6-story buildings in these areas. Your proposed plan may well be the right one ? a way to increase density and hopefully provide affordable housing. But making these changes without sufficient input is a mistake. Have you adequately considered the need for setbacks to reduce shadowing? Will the new height allowances change the character of historic neighborhoods? The city?s core values include: ?the City is responsive to the needs of citizens?. You?re making these changes in the middle of a pandemic and during the summer months, when people are maximally distracted. You haven?t successfully consulted residents and neighborhoods that will be impacted. Please do the right thing. Engage with your citizenry and gather their opinions. Then make a decision, based on real feedback, that is responsive to the needs of Vancouver citizens. Sincerely, Errol Samuelson</p>	Errol Samuelson		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	11:51	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	<p>We are residents of West Kitsilano and are concerned with the Public hearing on July 23 regarding the changes to the C zoning. Our concerns relate to the changes to: Height from 45 feet to 50 feet and for rental development from 45 to 72 which will significantly reduce the sunlight on West Broadway , Fourth Avenue and West 10th avenue. We are opposed to this height increase. Front Yard Setbacks to allow 8 foot front yard setbacks along 100% commercial frontage which is inconsistent with the established street set back of four storey strata and five storey rental buildings. Consdier allowing setbacks that would allow attractive outdoor seating areas especially with need for outdoor seating during pandemic times. No front frontage stepbacks or chamfering on higher floors. We would suggest a stepback above 4 storeys to allow an expression of a four storey scale. This would permit more light on the commercial street. No Maximum site size which could reduce variety of the streetscape which has long been a character of our neighbourhood. No rearyard stepbacks at higher levels even for 6 storeys. Require a single rear stepback at the third or fourth storey to reduce loss of sunlight on properties across the lane and align with existing buildings in the neighbourhood. Overall the changes are many and complex and have not been considered by many residents affected. We have not been notified as per usual policy. We only knew this was happening through a notification from someone in the know. This is best dealt with a neighbourhood based process which was promised during the election. We hope you consider our request. Warren Yamasaki</p>	Warren Yamasaki		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

07/23/2020	11:53	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Public Hearing July 23 Comments regarding C Commercial Zone changes There are three separate items coming forward as part of the Rental Incentives Policy These are: 1. Introduce incentives for rental housing by allowing 6 storey market rental development as part of the zoning for local shopping streets 2. Create ?rental only? zoning as part of the city?s zoning by-law to allow the 6 storey developments to be for rental only 3 make other changes to the C zoning These comments relate to 3. It is our position that the third part of these zoning changes is being introduced prematurely before proper neighbourhood planning has occurred, to allow for the unique character of each neighbourhood?s local shopping streets and before the pubic is aware of the impacts of these changes However, since these changes have been referred to Public Hearing, we will make the following more detailed comments. The Introduction to the Planner?s report states in A (ii) (C) that 3 will: ?ensure that the setback requirements for new rental residential tenure align with current regulations for regular residential development? This is not exactly what is being proposed. Instead, the terminology is changed part way through the report to state: ?Amendments to C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 to align basic forms of development regulations for all development.? This new wording means that, rather than aligning new residential rental with the rules for existing and other new future development, the proposed amendments are to change regulations for all development. We are opposed to several of the proposed changes to all C-2 zoning schedules. Our opposition is guided by two principles. The effect of the changes on: 1. the vibrancy, attractiveness, human scale and thus success of our walkable local shopping areas, ie conformity to accepted urban design principles 2. the impact of the proposed changes on the livability (primarily over-shadowing and sunlight loss) of adjacent residential development, both other already existing C2 developments and lower density areas nearby. Our goal with this document is to show areas where a better balance between livability of new development and livability of existing development can be achieved. There are several major areas where changes are proposed for all development. The changes we propose are particularly important for east/west arterials such as Broadway, Fourth Avenue and West Tenth and particularly important on the north side of these streets where shadowing and sunlight loss will be most severe. Height: Proposed: Increase in height for all development from 45 feet to 50 feet and for rental development from 45 to 72 feet Change to: Maximum height of 47 feet for regular residential, and 67 feet for rental residential We are opposed to height increases of the proposed amount. This is being proposed to allow a 17 foot floor to floor height in commercial units and 10 foot floor to floor in residential units. This can be achieved with a slightl	Stacy Taylor		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	12:00	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor, Councillors, and City Staff, I am absolutely opposed to the carpet rezoning of this C2 city wide. Why is the city council also rushing through so many projects in such a short amount of time- and during the summer? With C2 I have not heard or seen any notifications of this anywhere far less in the news. Also, what happened to Neighbourhood consultation in what is a major change to EVERY neighbourhood? Small businesses are having a hard enough time right now without the threat of being ousted to make way for 6 story zoning. They will have to pay higher taxes when and if they get back into their block that they used to be in. We all know what that will do- more small businesses will close. Dunbar businesses have been decimated by having so many blocks demolished and new 4-6 story buildings put in. These buildings do not have the same character as what was before and shade the streets. With the time frame from closing up their shops, to the buildings demolition, and to the eventual new building ... it takes years. Business owners cannot wait that time ... they have to find a new location often at increased rental, refitting, and building within their shop to get it ready. It?s not inconceivable that if this goes ahead they might only be in a new location for a few years before they are turfed out to make way for a new building. This rezoning should not go ahead until the neighbourhood consultation process is finished. This proposal Also, please STOP ?zone rezoning? until the neighbourhood consultation process is finished!!!! It may take time for this, but it needs to be done. The rezonings above will have a major impact on Vancouver and it?s small businesses for years to come. Why the rush. Especially when we should have other priorities right now- getting through Covid. Stop unnecessary projects right now and unnecessary spending and keep to the Core services PLEASE! Sincerely, Olivia Edwards	Olivia Edwards		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

07/23/2020	12:16	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	As a Vancouver resident I oppose these Amendments. I share with others the following concerns: 1. The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019; 2. The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested; 3. There has been no notification of residents and owners in these areas; 4. There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context; 5. The increases to six storys (72') for rental may not be acceptable everywhere; 6. The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses, many of which are already struggling; 7. The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that may not be in character in some/many neighbourhoods; 8. The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere; 9. There has been no consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, local area context; and 10. No maximum lot size is specified and so this allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks. Given the substantial changes here that would affect vast swaths of the city and given the lack of notification of affected residents and business owners, plus once again holding virtual ?public? hearing on a controversial matter, I find myself once again concerned at the lack of fairness, openness and transparency in this entire process. And once again in these amendments, the City wants to apply the same rules everywhere across the city without acknowledging the individuality of specific neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood context MUST be respected if this city is to remain livable, if residents are to have options as to the sort of neighbourhood they want to inhabit rather than just one massive uniformity of cookie cutter developments. Each neighbouhood developed its own character over time for many reasons. Do not paint them all with the same brush. If you do, Vancouver will be very very BORING. Add to all this the vast number of rezonings, controversial policy changes and public hearings lately, many of which affect the same part of the city (or large parts of the city), and it becomes impossible for a regular citizen like me to thoroughly research and comment on all of the rapid changes even though they may be directly and significantly affected by them. This rapid-fire approach negatively impacts public participation and thus demonstrates a what strikes me as major lack of respect for the residents Mayor and Council were elected to represent. Even the various residents associations are struggling to keep up. Such rushed processes make for poor decisions and bad results.	ROBERTA OLENICK	Ms.	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West Point Grey	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	12:27	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	See attached	ROBERTA OLENICK		rolenick@telus.net s.22(1) Personal and Co	Unknown	APPENDIX E
07/23/2020	12:29	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	As I live on 3rd & Balaclava the changes will have an effect on me and my family. As we have not been asked for or given an opportunity to respond to the changes I strongly feel as a resident of 45 years in the same home we are being ignored. Give us time to be heard.	Randall W. Smith		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	12:33	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	The changes proposed are detailed and confusing. They require more citizen input and time to consider the implications. You might think this is a good thing. I support the recommendations of the WKRA and urge you to defer approval. Stuart Rush Sent from my iPad On Jul 9, 2020, at 10:20 AM, Stuart Rush wrote: Dear Mayor and Councillors - I oppose this application for two reasons and urge you to reject it. First, the developers have overreached on this proposal in the same way they overreached at 1805 Larch Street. The Denny site proposal is simply too high. It is out of all proportion to its context. All sites have limits. This is a singular skyscraper amidst scaled neighbourhood buildings. It will block sunlight and views with no plan for amenities. It comes before there is a comprehensive plan with clear and definite guidelines for the Broadway corridor. Second, process. This recommendation is seriously compromised. Council voted to proceed to a Public Hearing on the basis of inaccurate information. The Policy 1 exception to the Broadway Plan Interim Rezoning Policy is not available to this application. The pre-application for MIRHPP that was rejected by the City on March 19, 2018, was not a Rezoning Enquiry as required under the Interim Rezoning Policy and, in any event, was not received by the City before the June 20, 2018, deadline, as required by the Interim Rezoning Policy. The application under MIRHPP was out of time and is not saved by any exceptions set out in the Broadway Plan policy. Sincerely, Stuart Rush	Stuart Rush		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

07/23/2020	12:43	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I oppose this sweeping rezoning. It disregards all local input. Richard Kerekes	RICHARD KEREKES		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	13:12	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor and council members; I continue to be shocked at the speed at which Council is pushing through rezoning and densification plans throughout Vancouver without a thought to the number of people in need of housing, and what it will mean to our city when scant public consultation has gone into your "plan." I question why a complex rezoning plan with far reach implications is being rammed through before council leaves on its summer break? What you are doing is producing a glut of taller buildings along commercial zones that only developers and landlords are profiting from. The people who live in these areas are once again the main losers. Our beautiful city, with its distinct neighbourhoods, is starting to look like every other major city. Is this what we really want? Adding densification can be accomplished, but it needs to be done slowly and carefully, with input from each neighbourhood. Blanket rezoning like this is the enemy! Consultation with communities has been sorely lacking in recent years and I ask that Council give this rezoning "plan" and others like it far more thought. Let's preserve what is working for each neighbourhood and implement changes for what isn't. Thank you	Ms EVELYN JACOB		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED]	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	13:43	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I oppose this.	Albert amp; Soizick Meister		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED]	West Point Grey	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	13:50	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I oppose to rezone all C2 shopping areas city-wide. We don't need a New York City. We need to keep Vancouver livable and protected from the greedy developers, planners, mayor and many councilors from destroying this once beautiful city.	Soizick Meister		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED]	West Point Grey	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	13:51	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, Please do not support the proposed amendments to C-2. As a Grandview-Woodland resident, the so-called 'minor amendments' that apply to all C-2 zones are actually major. Raising maximum heights from 45 to 50' in order to allow a much taller ground floor in fact is a method to incentivize big-box stores. This would be in contrary to efforts to keep the small scale 'mom and pop' stores in the community, and also not fit with the traditional / historic shopping district (especially if the BoV or DoP grants further relaxations). There was no Open House held in Grandview-Woodland and the public consultation process remains incomplete. The base assumption that the City needs to have an additional 72,000 new dwelling units is completely unfounded. This is about DOUBLE the STATISTICS CANADA measurements over 10 years. The 2006 Census found 273,804 dwelling units in the City of Vancouver. The 2016 Census found 309,418 dwelling units. This is an increase of 35,614 dwelling units. Staff have not given any fact-based rationale or evidence to show why they believe that an increase in 72,000 dwelling units is reasonable projection. As such, this staff number should not be used. The Statistics Canada numbers are the ones that should be used instead. Based on StatsCan figures, the expected increase in dwelling units is more than being met without upzoning C-2. Sincerely, Stephen Bohus, BLA Grandview-Woodland resident (from GWCP: '2. Maintain the pattern of smaller, individual retail frontages to help keep The Drive eclectic and active.' and 'Exude a thriving, independent retail character serving a broad array of community needs as well as being a destination for visitors from across the city and beyond. '). The various changes to the current fine-grain setback requirements and guidelines and regulations for Grandview-Woodland would worsen the zoning.)	Stephen Bohus		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED]	Grandview-Woodland	APPENDIX F
07/23/2020	14:24	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	See attached email.	Albert amp; Soizick Meister		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED]	Unknown	APPENDIX G

07/23/2020	14:45	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	This blanket proposal, without consultation of the neighbourhood residents in the various parts of Vancouver, does not take into consideration how it will affect particular shopping areas, in our case West 10th Avenue?s 4500, 4400 & 4300 blocks. What was once a thriving village shopping area in Point Grey has been slowly reduced to a retail rump because of the already high rents. Adding 6 storey high condos would appear to add to a customer base, but at the same time it would further increase the real estate values on the aforementioned blocks with a subsequent increase in the already too-high rents for small storekeepers and restaurants. Before covid-19 we had a steady stream of exits: Starbucks, Kaboodles, Safeway? whose emptied site was a great aggravator. Because of the development prospects the building that housed our doctors? offices on the 4300 block is coming down, and ahead of that happening, our doctors have all moved. Consequently, we can no longer walk to our appointments. The existing neighbourhood businesses and neighbours in the respective areas should be properly consulted before any proposal for rezoning goes ahead. George McWhirter	George McWhirter		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	14:55	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	For the record: I am opposed to the proposal to amend the commercial districts C2, C2B, C2C, and C2C1. Jan Alexander Vancouver resident	Jan Alexander		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/23/2020	10:31	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	To Mayor Stewart and City Councillors Despite our agreement with the need for more rental housing in the commercial C2 zones of the City, we are opposed to Item 3 being considered at the July 23 Public Hearing. Our reasons for our opposition are in the accompanying attachment. Regards Jan Pierce Larry Bengé Per Board of Directors West Kitsilano Residents Association	No Name No Name (ps	West Kitsilano Residents Association	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	nknown	APPENDIX H



COALITION OF VANCOUVER NEIGHBOURHOODS

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

July 22, 2020

City of Vancouver Council

Dear Mayor Kennedy Stewart and Councillors,

Re: Public Hearing - Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts

Agenda: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20200723/phea20200723ag.htm>

Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20200623/documents/rr10.pdf>

While the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) supports adding more rentals, we are **opposed** to the approval of the recommendations as currently proposed for the following reasons:

- The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019 as follows: "*THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts city-wide.*";
- The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses;
- There has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas; and
- There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context.

We therefore request **that Council refer this report back to staff for more work on neighbourhood-based planning and public consultation, and to report back to Council with amendments to address the concerns raised by the public, after the Rental Housing Stock ODP has been amended as previously directed by Council on November 26, 2019, as quoted above.**

Specifically, the proposed rezoning amendments have three components:

1. Introduce incentives for rental housing by allowing 6-storey market rental development as part of the zoning for local shopping streets
2. Create 'rental only' zoning as part of the city's zoning by-law to allow the 6-storey developments to be for rental only
3. Make other changes to the C zoning by-laws and Design Guidelines for both rental and regular residential development

While #1 and #2 raise concerns as identified above, we are particularly concerned about #3. The considered changes are problematic for the proposed amendments for the outright provisions of the by-laws for strata. The main changes are related to increased height and decreased setbacks, which allows a bigger envelope for more density to be built out, and all of this has broader impacts on the surrounding area.

These are some of the concerns raised by member organizations and we are sure that each neighbourhood will have additional concerns based on their specific context.

Thank you,

Larry A. Benge, Co-chair
Dorothy Barkley, Co-chair
Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Member Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Arbutus Ridge Community Association	Kits Point Residents Association
Arbutus Ridge/ Kerrisdale/ Shaughnessy Visions	Marpole Residents Coalition
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours	NW Point Grey Home Owners Association
Downtown Eastside Neighbourhood Council	Oakridge Langara Area Residents
Dunbar Residents Association	Riley Park/South Cambie Visions
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee	Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.
False Creek Residents Association	Strathcona Residents Association
Grandview Woodland Area Council	Upper Kitsilano Residents Association
Granville-Burrard Residents & Business Assoc.	West End Neighbours Society
Greater Yaletown Community Association	West Kitsilano Residents Association
Joyce Area Residents	West Point Grey Residents Association
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association	

July 23,2020 Public Hearing C -zones changes

Considering the lack of community planning or further discussion though open houses,
and respecting the desire to simplify planning, maybe minimize planning staff and save expenses to the city

then

(If we had a chance for further dialogue) I would propose to create off-the-shelf design to high quality, community enhancing, livability and diversity

- **Livability: purposeful design for modern living,**
soundproofing of residential units,
pugs for electric vehicles including bikes and scooters,
large balconies for all units
- set-backs at ground level to accommodate
wider pedestrian walking area,
commercial area tables or displays, for example sandwich
boards,
customer bicycle/scooter parking
- **Impacts on surrounding neighbourhood, design to
enhance the livability of a mixed used zone**

- stepbacks; a wider podium and slim upper stories both front and back to enhance street scale and provide a more seamless rear fit toward other residential neighbours
- Massing, residential upper storeys should be limited to portions of a block with sizeable breaks created by lower storeys throughout the block
- shadowing should not impact neighbours across alley, buildings should be slender to allow light to stream through at many times of the day
- Minimize noise from loading zones, use covered bays for deliveries with enclosed space for recycling containers then utilize roof for added green space , container gardening, or solar panels,
- added street greenery to offset added traffic for example short hedges/bushes around street trees

- **Diversity: building should include at least one unit respecting the diversity of our population:**

either one of:

low income unit,

rent to own unit,

fully accessible unit,

senior oriented large balcony unit with step-in shower



WEST KITS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

WKRA

June 22, 2020

To Mayor Stewart and City Councilors

Re: Public Hearing July 23

Item 3: Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts

West Kits Residents Association (WKRA) is **opposed** to the approval of these Amendments. We agree with the need for rental units in the commercial areas of our neighbourhood, but:

- the City has not yet brought in needed protections for existing rentals by requiring 1 to 1 replacement for rental housing in these areas (Motion passed on November 26, 2019),
- there has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas, and
- there has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to allow new development to relate to neighbourhood context

There are three separate parts to these Amendments. In summary, these:

1. Introduce incentives for rental housing by allowing 6-storey market rental development as part of the zoning for local shopping streets.
2. Create 'rental only' zoning as part of the city's zoning by-law to allow the 6-storey developments to be for rental only.
3. Make other changes to the C zoning by-laws and Design Guidelines for both rental and regular residential development.

It is our opinion that these items should be referred back to Staff to be considered separately, with more work on neighbourhood-based planning and public consultation with report back to Council following the amendment of the Rental Housing ODP as directed by Council on November 26, 2019.

While item numbers 1 and 2 are concerning for the reasons addressed by the initial bullet points above, we are particularly **opposed** to number 3. Its main changes, proposed as amendments to the outright provisions of the by-laws for strata, are problematic as they relate to increased height and decreased setbacks, which allows a bigger envelope for more density to be built out, and all of this has broader impacts on the surrounding area.

We (WKRA) believe that through good neighbourhood-based planning processes we can find solutions to these problems. But until those processes are undertaken, and our concerns are addressed, we **oppose** these Amendments.

For further details and explanations of our concerns specific to our area, see below. Other neighbourhoods may have other concerns specific to their conditions.

Thank you.
Jan Pierce
Larry Bengé
Per Board of Directors
West Kitsilano Residents Association

APPENDIX

We will address Section A (ii) of the Amendments which states as follows:

- a. allow for six-storey mixed-use buildings development where the entire residential portion of the building is secured as residential rental tenure, in certain areas of the districts as identified in the draft by-law;
- b. improve local shopping areas by requiring a minimum amount of commercial retail use and by allowing an additional 2.2 m in overall building height for greater floor-to-floor ceiling heights in commercial retail units; and
- c. ensure that the setback requirements for the new residential rental tenure align with the current regulations for regular residential development.

It is our position that these sections of the zoning changes are being introduced prematurely before proper neighbourhood planning has occurred, before the public is aware of the impacts of these changes and without adequate consideration of the unique character of each neighbourhood's local shopping streets.

The proposed changes are many, significant, and complex. These changes have not been fully considered by residents, nor have residents living in or beside these zones been notified as per usual city policy.

Complete shadow diagrams have not been made available far enough in advance of the Public Hearing to allow discussion or consideration.

These broad zoning changes have been amalgamated into the Rental Incentive Policy as just one very minor part of the major changes being proposed throughout the city for lower density areas. This means that few people have fully considered them.

It is our view that the proposed changes in the Motion of Approval (A ii b and c), to all C2 zoning by-laws need a more robust neighbourhood-based process and further consultation before subsequent improvements will make them adequate for adoption.

Since these significant zoning and guideline changes have been referred to Public Hearing, we will make the following more detailed comments on aspects of the proposed changes that are of particular concern.

The Introduction to the Planner's Report states in A.ii.c. that this will:

"ensure that the setback requirements for new rental residential tenure align with current regulations for regular residential development"

We would not be opposed to this approach.

However, this is NOT what is being proposed. Instead, the terminology is changed part way through the report to state:

"Amendments to C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 to align basic forms of development regulations for all development."

This new wording means that, rather than aligning new residential rental with the rules for existing and other new future development, the proposed amendments are to change the regulations for all development.

We are opposed to several of the proposed changes. Our opposition is guided by two principles:

1. The effect of the changes on the vibrancy, attractiveness, and human scale and thus success of our walkable local shopping areas, i.e. the impact on the conformity to accepted urban design principles.
2. The impact of the proposed changes on the livability (primarily over-shadowing and sunlight loss) of adjacent residential development, on both already existing C2 developments and lower density areas nearby.

Our goal with this document is to show areas where a better balance between livability of new development and livability of existing development can be achieved.

There are several major areas where changes are proposed for all development. The changes we suggest are particularly important for east/west arterials such as West Broadway, Fourth Avenue and West Tenth and particularly important on the north side of these streets where shadowing and sunlight loss will be most severe.

Height:

Proposed: Increase in height for all development from 45 feet to 50 feet and for rental development from 45 to 72 feet

Change to: Maximum height of 47 feet for regular residential, and 67 feet for rental residential.

We are opposed to height increases of the proposed amount. This is being proposed to allow a 17-foot floor-to-floor height in commercial units and 10 foot floor to floor in residential units. This can be achieved with a slightly lower maximum height that would reduce impacts on adjacent areas.

Front Yard Setbacks

Proposed change to require 8-foot front yard setbacks along 100% of commercial frontage.

Change: Move the setback requirement to the Design Guidelines or permit partial frontage setbacks rather than across the full frontage. This is a prime example of where neighbourhood-based planning processes can come to the fore: local conditions should and can give appropriate answers to these design problems. A one-size-fits-all solution should be avoided.

Front Yard Step backs

Proposed: No front elevation step backs or chamfering on higher floors

Change: Require a step back above 4 storeys to allow an expression of a four-storey scale.

This will also retain more light on the commercial street and the building form will be more compatible with already built developments. (Note: the building height of existing market rental buildings on West Broadway is 62 feet with part or all of the façade on the 5th floor stepped back.)

Maximum Site Size

Proposed: No maximum site size thus allowing land assemblies for a full block face along with a simplified building form to allow the full six storeys without a significant break along a whole block.

Change: Limit site size to 100 or 150 feet particularly for 6-storey rental residential developments. This will produce more human scaled buildings with a size that fits better into the established scale and form of development and will contribute to more variety and interest in street frontage treatment.

Or: Use Design Guidelines as is currently the practice to require a break in the front façade on larger sites to produce a more human scale of building and more variety on the street face.

Rear Yard Setbacks

Proposed: Increase rear setback to 5 feet to allow landscaping along the lane. We agree with this change.

Proposed: Above 20 feet, rear setback would be 15 feet in areas outside a community plan area and 20 feet inside a community planned area.

This 15-foot setback includes rental residential developments that have a six-storey height proposed of 72 feet. We note that the illustrations used in previous public input opportunities were incorrect showing a larger rear setback than what is being proposed. Thus any input from the public is flawed.

It is not clear whether the rules for extension of balconies into rear yard requirements will also apply. If so, the impact of the reduction of the rear yard will be even greater.

Change: Require 20-foot setback above 20 feet for all C developments whether they are part of a community plan or not.

Rear Yard Step backs

Proposed: No rear yard step backs at higher levels even for 6-storey rental residential. Goal is to reduce costs of construction for complicated setbacks. This change will increase development potential and lead to higher land prices and taxes for our small local businesses. It would also effect shadowing on adjacent properties, particularly on northside developments on east-west streets.

Change: Require a single rear step back at the third or fourth storey to better transition and reduce loss of sunlight on properties (whether lower density or apartment forms) across the lane and also to more closely align with the form of already existing development and reduce impacts on existing regular "C" developments which have step backs. This will create more livable and attractive private outdoor space for units at the rear of the building.

Planners state that requiring numerous step backs adds to building costs. However, they propose the possibility of an interior courtyard. These courtyards on an east west arterial will be in deep permanent shadow. To allow more sunlight, planners propose a new step back inside the interior shared courtyard, thus adding back in the increased costs associated with numerous step backs. We are opposed to this form of development. It pushes the bulk of the building towards the lane

and the street frontage reducing sunlight on both the shopping street and the adjacent residential properties.

It also creates a shared outdoor space. The recent pandemic shows that private outdoor space is essential for residents while shared space is less usable.

One step back at higher levels will simplify construction and reduce building costs over current requirements while creating very attractive private outdoor space and more livable units.

Commercial Use

Proposed: Allow commercial uses on the second floor, require all the ground floor to be commercial use, and require commercial uses to wrap around the corner with 75% of the frontage being commercial on the local side street

Change: Retain current commercial use requirements for the first floor with more flexibility for some residential use on the street in some areas

This will maximize space for much needed rental residential space, which is the reason why these incentives are being created. Allow more flexibility for some residential frontages on some arterials where appropriate such as on C zoned blocks that are not part of an established shopping district or where residential uses on the street frontage already exist.

Keep to current rules for commercial use around the corners on local streets. Having residential uses along the side streets where developments are located on corners allows for ground-oriented townhouse style units with separate entrances that enliven the street. These types of units are off-arterial and add to the variety of housing forms.

Maintain current rules that allow ground floor units on side streets in appropriate locations at the rear of commercial units. This allows for ground oriented townhouse style units and more attractive lanes.

The above are all suggestions based on the needs of our particular neighbourhood. Again, neighbourhood-based planning processes would allow for local conditions, and the residents who know their communities, to formulate the best solutions to take advantage of these opportunities.

Please **oppose** these Amendments.



COALITION OF VANCOUVER NEIGHBOURHOODS

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

July 22, 2020

City of Vancouver Council

Dear Mayor Kennedy Stewart and Councillors,

Re: Public Hearing - Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts

Agenda: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20200723/phea20200723ag.htm>

Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20200623/documents/rr10.pdf>

While the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) supports adding more rentals, we are **opposed** to the approval of the recommendations as currently proposed for the following reasons:

- The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019 as follows: "*THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts city-wide.*";
- The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses;
- There has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas; and
- There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context.

We therefore request **that Council refer this report back to staff for more work on neighbourhood-based planning and public consultation, and to report back to Council with amendments to address the concerns raised by the public, after the Rental Housing Stock ODP has been amended as previously directed by Council on November 26, 2019, as quoted above.**

Specifically, the proposed rezoning amendments have three components:

1. Introduce incentives for rental housing by allowing 6-storey market rental development as part of the zoning for local shopping streets
2. Create 'rental only' zoning as part of the city's zoning by-law to allow the 6-storey developments to be for rental only
3. Make other changes to the C zoning by-laws and Design Guidelines for both rental and regular residential development

While #1 and #2 raise concerns as identified above, we are particularly concerned about #3. The considered changes are problematic for the proposed amendments for the outright provisions of the by-laws for strata. The main changes are related to increased height and decreased setbacks, which allows a bigger envelope for more density to be built out, and all of this has broader impacts on the surrounding area.

These are some of the concerns raised by member organizations and we are sure that each neighbourhood will have additional concerns based on their specific context.

Thank you,

Larry A. Benge, Co-chair
Dorothy Barkley, Co-chair
Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Member Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Arbutus Ridge Community Association	Kits Point Residents Association
Arbutus Ridge/ Kerrisdale/ Shaughnessy Visions	Marpole Residents Coalition
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours	NW Point Grey Home Owners Association
Downtown Eastside Neighbourhood Council	Oakridge Langara Area Residents
Dunbar Residents Association	Riley Park/South Cambie Visions
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee	Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.
False Creek Residents Association	Strathcona Residents Association
Grandview Woodland Area Council	Upper Kitsilano Residents Association
Granville-Burrard Residents & Business Assoc.	West End Neighbours Society
Greater Yaletown Community Association	West Kitsilano Residents Association
Joyce Area Residents	West Point Grey Residents Association
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association	

Wong, Tamarra

From: Roberta Olenick s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 11:59 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; Johnston, Sadhu; Kelley, Gil
Subject: [EXT] Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am resident of Vancouver and I opposed Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-Law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C and C-2C1 Commercial Districts.

While Vancouver does need some increase in rental housing, I share with others, including the West Point Grey Residents Association, the following concerns regarding these amendments:

1. The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019 as follows: *"THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts citywide."*;
2. The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested;
3. There has been no notification of residents and owners in these areas;
4. There has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to consider context;
5. The increases to six storeys (72') for rental may not be acceptable everywhere;
6. The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses, many of which are already struggling;
7. The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that may not be in character in some/many neighbourhoods;
8. The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere;
9. There has been no consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, local area context; and
10. No maximum lot size is specified and so this allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks.

Given the substantial changes here that would affect vast swaths of the city and given the lack of notification of affected residents and business owners, plus once again holding virtual “public” hearing on a controversial matter, I find myself once again concerned at the lack of fairness, openness and transparency in this entire process.

And once again in these amendments, the City wants to apply the same rules everywhere across the city without acknowledging the individuality of specific neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood context MUST be respected if this city is to remain livable, if residents are to have options as to the sort of neighbourhood they want to inhabit rather than just one massive uniformity of cookie cutter developments. Each neighbourhood developed its own character over time for many reasons. Do not paint them all with the same brush. If you do, Vancouver will be very very BORING.

Add to all this the vast number of rezonings, controversial policy changes and public hearings recently (and more coming up shortly), many of which affect the same part of the city (or large parts of the city), and it becomes impossible for a regular citizen like me to have the time to thoroughly research and comment on all of the rapid changes even though they may be directly and significantly affected by them. This rapid-fire approach negatively impacts public participation and thus demonstrates a what strikes me as major lack of respect for the residents Mayor and Council were elected to represent. Even the various residents associations are struggling to keep up. For everyone’s sake, give us a break and SLOW DOWN!

Sincerely,
Roberta Olenick

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Housing Vancouver Strategy Context

On November 28, 2017 City Council adopted the 10-year Housing Vancouver Strategy. A core objective of Housing Vancouver is to shift the supply of new housing toward the “Right Supply” that meets the needs of the diversity of households in the city. The Strategy identified the need for

⁸ Census 2016

⁹ CMHC Rental Market Report

an additional 72,000 housing units over 10 years, of which 20,000 units are new purpose-built rental housing.



Statistics Canada

www.statcan.gc.ca

Français

Home

Contact Us

Help

Search

canada.gc.ca

[Home](#) > [Census](#) > [2006 Community Profiles](#) > [Search results for "Vancouver"](#) >

⚠ [View the most recent version.](#)

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please [contact us](#) to request a format other than those available.



2006 Community Profiles

Data table

Download

Map

Hierarchy

Help

All data

Select a view

Vancouver ⚠
British Columbia
(City)

Select another region

British Columbia ⚠
(Province)

Select another region

Population and dwelling counts

	Vancouver, City			British Columbia		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Population in 2006 ¹	578,041			4,113,487 [†]		
Population in 2001 ¹	545,671			3,907,738 [†]		
2001 to 2006 population change (%)	5.9			5.3		
Total private dwellings ²	273,804			1,788,474		
Private dwellings occupied by usual residents ³	253,212			1,642,715		
Population density per square kilometre	5,039.0			4.4		
Land area (square km)	114.71			924,815.43		

Age characteristics

	Vancouver, City			British Columbia		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Total population ⁴	578,040	282,750	295,285	4,113,485	2,013,990	2,099,495
0 to 4 years	24,725	12,825	11,900	201,880	103,295	98,590
5 to 9 years	22,825	12,185	11,635	220,700	113,175	107,525

Census Profile, 2016 Census

Vancouver, City [Census subdivision], British Columbia and British Columbia [Province]

Topic: All data ☒ Counts ☐ Rates



Related data ▾

Characteristic	Vancouver, CY British Columbia [Census subdivision]			British Columbia [Province]		
	<div>Data quality</div> <div>Map</div> <div>Change geography</div>			<div>Data quality</div> <div>Map</div> <div>Change geography</div>		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
	Counts (unless otherwise specified)					
Population and dwellings						
Population, 2016 <div>1</div>	631,486	4,648,055
Population, 2011 <div>1</div>	603,502	4,400,057
Population percentage change, 2011 to 2016	4.6	5.6
Total private dwellings <div>2</div>	309,418	2,063,417
Private dwellings occupied by usual residents <div>3</div>	283,916	1,881,969
Population density per square kilometre	5,492.6	5.0
Land area in square kilometres	114.97	922,503.01

From: Albert Meister
To: [Public Hearing](#); [Stewart, Kennedy](#); [Carr, Adriane](#); [De Genova, Melissa](#); [Dominated, Lisa](#); [Fry, Pete](#); [Hardwick, Colleen](#); [Kirby-Yung, Sarah](#); [Swanson, Jean](#); [Wiebe, Michael](#); [Bligh, Rebecca](#); [Boyle, Christine](#); [Johnston, Sadhu](#); [Kelley, Gil](#)
Subject: [EXT] Rezone all C2 Shopping Areas City-wide
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 1:39:45 PM

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Council:

I **oppose** Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-Law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C and C-2C1 Commercial Districts.

I agree Vancouver does need some increase in rental housing. I share with others, including the West Point Grey Residents Association, the following concerns regarding these amendments:

1. The City has not yet brought in needed protection for existing rentals in C2 zones as directed by Council in November 26, 2019 as follows: *"THAT Council instruct staff to prepare a report for consideration for referral to public hearing to amend the Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan to extend rental replacement requirements to C-2, C-2C, C-2B and C-2B-1 zoning districts citywide."*;
2. The proposal is substantial and not just minor amendments as suggested;
3. There has been no notification of residents and owners in these areas;
4. There has been no neighborhood-based planning process to consider context;
5. The increases to six stories (72') for rental may not be acceptable everywhere;
6. The proposed amendments to the outright provisions for strata properties will inflate land values, which will increase property taxes for small businesses, many of which are already struggling;
7. The increased outright height of commercial level to 17 ft. is too high and also raises the height of the whole building from 45' to 50', including giving the strata residential above more views, and allows for big box stores that may not be in character in some/many neighborhoods;
8. The increased height and reductions in setbacks will make for much bigger buildings outright for strata residential that may not be appropriate everywhere;
9. There has been no consultation on shadowing, overlook, human scale, local area context;

and

10. No maximum lot size is specified and so this allows for assemblies that could include entire blocks.

Given the substantial changes here that would affect vast parts of the city and given the lack of notification of affected residents and business owners, plus once again holding virtual “public” hearing on a controversial matter, once again I am very concerned at the lack of fairness, openness and transparency in this entire process.

And once again in these amendments, the City wants to apply the same rules everywhere across the city without acknowledging the individuality of specific neighborhoods. Neighborhood context MUST be respected if this city is to remain livable and neighborhoods preserved from destruction, if residents are to have options as to the sort of neighborhood they want to inhabit rather than just one massive uniformity of tasteless developments. Each neighborhood developed its own character over time for different reasons and these characters should be retained. If not Vancouver will become a very boring city, no longer livable and the city will be destroyed forever. Unfortunately, the City planners, mayor and council have started this process of destruction – 10 years ago - under the pressure of the greedy developers, and all this happening without respecting the residents opinions.

The vast number of rezonings, controversial policy changes and virtual public hearings, many of which affect the same part of the city (or large parts of the city), and it becomes impossible for many citizens, including me to have sufficient time to thoroughly research and comment on all of the rapid changes even though they may be directly and significantly affected by them. This rapid-fire approach negatively impacts public motivation and interest to participate and express concerns. This to me shows a major lack of respect for the residents Mayor and Council were elected to represent. Even the various residents associations are struggling to keep up. For everyone’s sake, slow down and respect us the residents of Vancouver.

Sincerely,
Albert Meister

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



WEST KITS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

WKRA

June 22, 2020

To Mayor Stewart and City Councilors

Re: Public Hearing July 23

Item 3: Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts

West Kitsilano Residents Association is opposed to this zoning change even though we approve of creating additional rental units in the commercial areas of our neighbourhood, because

- the City has not yet brought in needed protections for existing rentals by requiring 1 to 1 replacement for rental housing in these areas (Motion passed on November 26, 2019),
- there has been no notification of residents and owners living in these areas, and
- there has been no neighbourhood-based planning process to allow new development to relate to neighbourhood context

There are three separate parts to these zoning by-law amendments. In summary, these:

1. Introduce incentives for rental housing by allowing 6-storey market rental development as part of the zoning for local shopping streets.
2. Create 'rental only' zoning as part of the city's zoning by-law to allow the 6-storey developments to be for rental only.
3. Make other changes to the C zoning by-laws and Design Guidelines for both rental and regular residential development.

It is our opinion that these items should be referred back to Staff to be considered separately, with more work on neighbourhood based planning and public consultation with report back to Council following the amendment of the Rental housing ODP as directed by council on November 26, 2019.

We are particularly **opposed** to the third part of the Motion for Approval (i.e. A.ii., b and c):

b. improve local shopping areas by requiring a minimum amount of commercial retail use and by allowing an additional 2.2 m in overall building height for greater floor-to-floor ceiling heights in commercial retail units; and

c. ensure that the setback requirements for the new residential rental tenure align with the current regulations for regular residential development.

The following comments relate to parts b and c .

It is our position that these parts of these zoning changes are being introduced prematurely before proper neighbourhood planning has occurred, before the public is

aware of the impacts of these changes and without adequate consideration of the unique character of each neighbourhood's local shopping streets.

The proposed changes are many, significant, and complex. These changes have not been fully considered by residents, **nor have residents living in or beside these zones been notified** as per usual city policy.

Complete shadow diagrams have not been made available far enough in advance of the Public Hearing to allow discussion or consideration.

It is our view that the proposed changes in the Motion of Approval (A ii b and c), to all C2 zoning by-laws need a more robust neighbourhood based process and further consultation before subsequent improvements will make them adequate for adoption.

Regards

Jan Pierce

Larry Bengé

Co chairs

West Kitsilano Residents Association

Detailed Comments

Since these significant zoning and guideline changes have been referred to Public Hearing, we will make the following more detailed comments on aspects of the proposed changes that are of particular concern.

The Introduction to the Planner's Report states in A (ii) (C) that this will:

"ensure that the setback requirements for new rental residential tenure align with current regulations for regular residential development"

We would not be opposed to this approach.

However, this is NOT what is being proposed. Instead, the terminology is changed part way through the report to state:

"Amendments to C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 to align basic forms of development regulations for all development."

This new wording means that, rather than aligning new residential rental with the rules for existing and other new future development, the proposed amendments are to **change regulations for all development.**

We are opposed to several of the proposed changes.

Our opposition is guided by two principles.

The effect of the changes on:

1. the vibrancy, attractiveness, human scale and thus success of our walkable local shopping areas, ie impact on the conformity to accepted urban design principles
2. the impact of the proposed changes on the livability (primarily over-shadowing and sunlight loss) of adjacent residential development, both other already existing C2 developments and lower density areas nearby.

Our goal with this document is to show areas where a better balance between livability of new development and livability of existing development can be achieved.

There are several major areas where changes are proposed for all development. The changes we suggest are particularly important for east/west arterials such as West Broadway, Fourth Avenue and West Tenth and particularly important on the north side of these streets where shadowing and sunlight loss will be most severe.

Height:

Proposed: Increase in height for all development from 45 feet to 50 feet and for rental development from 45 to 72 feet

Change to: Maximum height of 47 feet for regular residential, and 67 feet for rental residential

We are opposed to height increases of the proposed amount. This is being proposed to allow a 17 foot floor to floor height in commercial units and 10 foot floor to floor in residential units. This can be achieved with a slightly lower maximum height that would reduce impacts on adjacent areas.

Front Yard Setbacks

Proposed change to require 8 foot front yard setbacks along 100% of commercial frontage.

Change: Move the setback requirement to the Design Guidelines or permit partial frontage setbacks rather than across the full frontage.

Moving this change to the Design guidelines will allow a response that fits into the existing street face. In Kitsilano, the considerable amount of existing four storey strata and five storey rental buildings has established a consistent street setback. Some areas such as West Fourth west of Trafalgar are less suited to such a wide sidewalk (5 or 6 feet setback would be more appropriate) than others such as West Broadway.

If not moving this to the Design guidelines, consider reducing the amount of frontage with an 8 foot setback to allow attractive outdoor seating areas where there is a café or restaurant. This will shelter these areas from traffic noise.

Front Yard Stepbacks

Proposed: No front frontage stepbacks or chamfering on higher floors

Change: Require a stepback above 4 storeys to allow an expression of a four storey scale.

This will also retain more light on the commercial street and the building form will be more compatible with already built developments. (Note: the building height of existing market rental buildings on West Broadway is 62 feet with part or all of the façade on the 5th floor stepped back.)

Maximum Site Size

Proposed: No maximum site size thus allowing land assemblies for a full block face along with a simplified building form to allow the full six storeys without a significant break along a whole block..

Change: Limit site size to 100 or 150 feet particularly for 6 storey rental residential developments. This will produce more human scaled buildings with a scale that fits better into the established scale and form of development and will contribute to more variety and interest in street frontage treatment.

Or: Use Design Guidelines as is currently the practice to require a break in the front façade on larger sites to produce a more human scale of building and more variety on the street face.

Rear Yard Setbacks

Proposed: Increase rear setback to 5 feet to allow landscaping along the lane. **We agree with this change.**

Proposed: Above 20 feet, rear setback would be 15 feet in areas outside a community plan area and 20 feet inside a community planned area.

This 15 foot setback includes rental residential developments that have a six storey height proposed of 72 feet. We note that **the illustrations used in previous public input opportunities were incorrect** showing a larger rear setback than what is being proposed. Thus any input from the public is flawed.

It is not clear whether the rules for extension of balconies into rear yard requirements will also apply. If so, the impact of the reduction of the rear yard will be even greater.

Change: Require 20 foot setback above 20 feet for all C developments whether they are part of a community plan or not.

Rear Yard Stepbacks

Proposed: No rear yard stepbacks at higher levels even for 6 storey rental residential. Goal is to reduce costs of construction for complicated setbacks. This change will increase development potential and lead to higher land prices and taxes for our small local businesses.

Change: Require a single rear stepback at the third or fourth storey to better transition and reduce loss of sunlight on properties (whether lower density or apartment forms) across the lane and also to more closely align with the form of already existing development and reduce impacts on existing regular “C” developments which have stepbacks. This will create very livable and attractive private outdoor space for units at the rear of the building.

Planners state that requiring numerous stepbacks adds to building costs. However, they propose the possibility of an **interior courtyard**. These courtyards on an east west arterial will be in deep permanent shadow. To allow more sunlight, planners propose a new stepback inside the interior shared courtyard thus adding back in the increased costs associated with numerous stepbacks. We are opposed to this form of development. It pushes the bulk of the building towards the lane and the street frontage reducing sunlight on both the shopping street and the adjacent residential properties.

It also creates a shared outdoor space. **The recent pandemic shows that private outdoor space is essential for residents while shared space is unusable.**

One stepback at higher levels will simplify construction and reduce building costs over current requirements while creating very attractive private outdoor space and more livable units.

Commercial Use

Proposed: Allow commercial uses on the second floor, require all the ground floor to be commercial use, and require commercial uses to wrap around the corner with 75% of the frontage being commercial on the local side street

Change: Retain current commercial use requirements for the first floor with more flexibility for some residential use on the street in some areas

This will maximize space for much needed rental residential space which is the reason why these incentives are being created. Allow more flexibility for some residential frontages on some arterials where appropriate such as on C zoned blocks that are not part of an established shopping district or where residential uses on the street frontage already exist.

Keep to current rules for commercial use around the corners on local streets. Having residential uses along the side streets where developments are located on corners allows for ground oriented townhouse style units with separate entrances that enliven the street. These types of units are off-arterial and add to the variety of housing forms.

Maintain current rules that allow ground floor units on side streets in appropriate locations at the rear of commercial units. This allows for ground oriented townhouse style units and more attractive lanes.

Please oppose A ii b and c.