

**Item 4 - Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts - OPPOSED**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
04/13/2021	15:17	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	I do not support the removal of rezoning applications for social housing. This short-circuits the democratic process.	Peter Kieser		[REDACTED]	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
04/13/2021	16:08	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	I oppose this change to zoning.	Michelle		[REDACTED]	Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.
04/13/2021	21:36	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	If the state of city zoning laws is so bad that you need to make "work arounds" to get things done, then you should probably look at zoning as a whole and write away some of the barriers. Quit applying band-aids to a festering wound and create real policy that promotes real density.	Steve Cook		[REDACTED]	Grandview-Woodland	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	09:45	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Dear Mayor Stewart and Council members: I am in full support of increasing social housing for low income and persons with disabilities in the neighbourhoods mentioned above. However, I do not support the blanket rezoning of the sections of neighbourhoods as laid out in the zoning amendment. Barring public input on a case-by-case basis is undemocratic and unfair to surrounding neighbours. The outcome will be even greater distrust in government. These areas contain some of the most affordable housing in Vancouver. Encouraging their replacement makes little sense. Could renovations solve the problem rather than destruction? We are talking about buildings that are only 30 to 50 years old. Since the City does not require new development in these areas to comply with the green plan, it can't make the argument that the older buildings have to go because expensive retrofits will make them too costly to retain. Finally, when you look at the numbers, increasing social housing by rezoning for 6-storey buildings with larger FSR across the board will result in only a few "affordable" units; most of them will be market-rental. In the end, these new buildings will increase land-lift and make existing affordable units in the area also unaffordable. Is it worth giving away millions of dollars in CLCs and DCLs to developers for such little return? I hope the City has learned from the MIRHPP program that this way of increasing affordable housing has yet to be successful in Vancouver. Thank you.	Evelyn Jacob		[REDACTED]	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	13:17	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	I am strongly opposed to the area-wide rezoning for apartment zones in RM-4 and RM-3A areas of Kitsilano, Mount Pleasant, Fairview, Grandview-Woodland and Marpole. Much affordable rental already exists in these areas. Yet planning staff are proposing to change outright the zoning to 6-storeys and 2.5 FSR for development applications that may include just 30% social housing and 70% market (expensive) rental. While I might find this increase in height acceptable if 100% of the units were social housing, I am totally opposed to this increase and incentivizing redevelopment for such a minimal amount of social housing. What this proposal could well result in is a tsunami of demovictions as perfectly serviceable and affordable buildings are demolished and their sites redeveloped with rentals that in many cases will be far more expensive than the existing rentals. In addition, sending so much perfectly good mature housing stock to the landfill is environmentally destructive and unacceptable for that reason. This increase to 6-storeys is unnecessary. It is possible to build 2.5 FSR in 4-storeys as is done in C-2 zones. Four-storeys result in far less intrusion on neighbouring residents, less shading and other negative impacts. Since apartments on higher floors generally go for higher rents, all this increase in height will do is make for more expensive market rentals when we need less expensive rents. These proposed changes could/would also likely set a new baseline for a slippery slope of even taller rezonings in future. That would be totally horrible. In addition, parts of the City's Grandview-Woodland Community Plan would be overwritten by these proposed changes. Community Plans should be respected and not overwritten. Furthermore, virtually no public went into producing the staff report and the changes recommended. The proposed changes to 6-storeys should apply only to buildings that are 100% social housing at shelter rates. Buildings that include market rental should be constrained to four storeys. In addition, instead of foisting taller and taller, bigger and bigger buildings on us everywhere in the city, there should be more incentives for ground level rentals in newly built houses which is a gentle way to increase rental capacity throughout the city without the need for so many larger taller structures that reduce quality of life here. Why does the City keep blocking such rentals? That just makes no sense given at all! This is a critical question discussed here: <a href="https://cityhallwatch.wordpress.com/2021/04/09/cov-targets-new-basement-suites-evicts/">https://cityhallwatch.wordpress.com/2021/04/09/cov-targets-new-basement-suites-evicts/</a>	Roberta Olenick		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	14:11	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	I am expressing my strong opposition to the area-wide rezoning for apartment zones in RM-4 and RM-3A areas of Kitsilano, Mount Pleasant, Fairview, Grandview-Woodland and Marpole. Where is the evidence that these areas need even more social housing and what facts prove that past efforts to provide such support have actually made Vancouver a more affordable city in which to live? Furthermore, the provisions to grant development permits for more market-based rental units (along with the social housing) is clearly another windfall for the development companies that have already run wild in this city. It is time that the city end its obsession with "social justice" causes and all their destructive and costly unintended consequences and get back to the job of governing a clean, safe and economically-vibrant city.	Ben Cherniavsky		[REDACTED]	West Point Grey	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	14:33	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Please see attached letter. Thanks, Larry A. Bengé, Co-chair Dorothy Barkley, Co-chair Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods	Larry A. Bengé		[REDACTED]	Unknown	APPENDIX A



# COALITION OF VANCOUVER NEIGHBOURHOODS

<http://coalitionvan.org>

April 14, 2021

City of Vancouver Council

Dear Mayor Kennedy Stewart and Councillors,

**Re: Public Hearing Item 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts**

Agenda: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20210415/phea20210415ag1.htm>

Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20210309/documents/rr6.pdf>

The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) is **opposed** to the recommendations in this report to rezone RM3 and RM4 to allow outright 6 storey rental projects without a public hearing.

While it only for social housing projects, the City defines social housing as only requiring 30% of the units to be subsidized, while 70% can be market priced, but all is counted as 100% social housing.

This could lead to these mostly market rental projects putting increased development pressure on older affordable rental buildings, many of which have lower rents than the new "social housing" that would replace it. This will lead to displacement, gentrification and demolition of character buildings.

It also undermines neighbourhood character and liveability by allowing much bigger buildings that block views, overshadow yards and buildings for gardens and potential solar panels.

The rezoning is in conflict with community plans, including the most recent in Grandview Woodland.

Please do not approve this rezoning as proposed.

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

Arbutus Ridge/ Kerrisdale/ Shaughnessy Visions

Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours

Downtown Eastside Neighbourhood Council

Dunbar Residents Association

Fairview/South Granville Action Committee

False Creek Residents Association

Grandview Woodland Area Council

Granville-Burrard Residents & Business Assoc.

Greater Yaletown Community Association

Joyce Area Residents

Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association

Kits Point Residents Association

Marpole Residents Coalition

NW Point Grey Home Owners Association

Oakridge Langara Area Residents

Riley Park/South Cambie Visions

Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.

Strathcona Residents Association

Upper Kitsilano Residents Association

West End Neighbours Society

West Kitsilano Residents Association

West Point Grey Residents Association