

4. PH2 - 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
04/14/2021	14:57	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 bringing homeless and social housing to Kitsilano. Instead of dealing with the problem and helping these people the government just wants to disperse them throughout the city in an attempt to hide the problem. As a woman who lives alone I want to feel like I live in a safe neighbourhood. There are many schools in this area as well as Kits beach where kids play. Having people who are likely drug users and bringing needles to this neighbourhood is unacceptable. Dispersing them throughout the city is not going to make the problem go away. They need help and they need to be away from kids and single women who are paying a lot to live in a good neighbourhood. Why ruin good neighbourhoods? It is sexist and dangerous. Why is women's safety always considered the least important thing to worry about? I want to be safe in my neighbourhood and so do my female neighbours and parents who have kids in this area.	Irena		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	15:14	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 writing to voice my OPPOSITION to the Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts, which is on the April 15th Council Agenda. While I advocate of social housing, I have concerns with this policy as currently proposed, at this time: - A large number of the concerned zones exist in the Broadway Planning scope area. Why are staff proposing significant changes to zones in the Broadway Plan scope area, in parallel with the re-planning process? This is such poor planning. Changes like this should be contemplated as a part of the Broadway Plan and Vancouver Plan. Doing so in tandem with the Plans completely sidesteps the planning process, and make changes without the context of an overall plan. Moreover, I am participating in the Broadway Plan process, and staff are already discussing immense increases to the height and density of the scope area - how does the RM-4 and RM-3A change factor into their housing/population estimates for the area, OR have they considered it at all? - The concerned zones include a large amount of Vancouver's existing rental stock. This policy incentivizes the redevelopment of Vancouver's more affordable, mature housing which would not only have serious environmental impacts, but also result in demolitions. As well, adding insult to injury, parts of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan would be overwritten by these proposed changes without any public consultation. - Currently, Vancouver's social housing guidelines only require that 30% of the units in a social housing development be 'social', leaving the remaining 70% to be market housing. While the proposed policy reads 'where 100% of the residential floor area is developed as social housing', we MUST guarantee that, if this policy proceeds, 100% of the housing in these buildings is social housing, and that it is REAL social housing - it is NOT for people for people/families making \$56,000/\$68,000/\$78,000/\$84,000 per year, as outlined in the HIL, it is for people/families making \$21,000/\$34,000 per year. Thanks for your time and consideration.	Sean Nardi		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Fairview	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	17:47	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 from the Council for Strata BCS 3183	Michael Nadeau		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	APPENDIX A
04/14/2021	19:38	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	See attached letter. Thank you, the Upper Kitsilano Residents Association.	Evelyn Jacob		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	APPENDIX B
04/14/2021	20:58	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 writing to voice my OPPOSITION to the Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts, which is on the April 15th Council Agenda. While I advocate for social housing, I have concerns with this policy as currently proposed, at this time: -A large number of the concerned zones exist in the Broadway Planning scope area. Why are staff proposing significant changes to zones in the Broadway Plan scope area, in parallel with the re-planning process? This is such poor planning. Changes like this should be contemplated as a part of the Broadway Plan and Vancouver Plan. Without planning this potential change within the parameters of the Plans completely sidesteps the planning process, and make changes without the context of an overall plan. -The concerned zones include a large amount of Vancouver's existing rental stock. This policy incentivizes the redevelopment of Vancouver's more affordable, mature housing which would not only have serious environmental impacts, but also result in demo-victions. As well, adding insult to injury, parts of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan would be overwritten by these proposed changes without any public consultation. -Currently, Vancouver's social housing guidelines only require that 30% of the units in a social housing development be 'social', leaving the remaining 70% to be market housing. While the proposed policy reads 'where 100% of the residential floor area is developed as social housing', we MUST guarantee that, if this policy proceeds, 100% of the housing in these buildings is social housing, and that it is REAL social housing - it is NOT for people for people/families making \$55,500/\$67,500/\$78,000/\$83,500 per year, as outlined in the Housing Income Limits. Rather, this social housing should be exclusively for people who are living below Canada's poverty line, currently defined by the 2021 low-income cut-off, for example, of \$26,439 per year for one person and \$40,465 per year for a family unit of 3 people.	Ian Poole		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Fairview	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	22:35	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Under the Vision Municipal Government Social Housing was defined as only requiring 30% of the units to be subsidized while 70% can be market priced but all counted as 100% social housing. This definition has and continues to be very misleading to the public at large. This proposal was formulated in 2018 under the Vision Municipal Government which was decimated in the last election. Why does Dan Garrison continue to push the defunct Vision agenda. The planning department seems intent on taking more decisions out of the hands of councilors, our elected representatives and taking charge themselves. The public already has an enormous distrust of city politics. This proposal appear to be another blatant attempt by city planners to circumvent an individual's right to voice their support or opposition to a rezoning application on a case by case basis. Unless the city has changed it definition social housing this newest proposal is unconscionable and completely undemocratic. There are already many affordable units in the areas the city planners recommend for their proposal. Much of this accommodation is still serviceable and could be retrofitted. Old is considerably cheaper than new as we all know. If the public was involved in ongoing consultation with planners and developers from the beginning of a proposed project rather than the tail end when the planners are presenting their proposals to council a great deal of conflict would be resolved well in advance and many more social housing projects would be supported..	Barbara May		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	22:49	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Am absolutely opposed to this proposal as it completely circumvents the public hearing process which every citizen is entitled to participate in. Cutting out the public voice in order to speed up the development process is anti-democratic and simply not acceptable in a country such as ours. There is also the question as to how the term social housing is defined under the current municipal government. Under Vision a building was considered social housing although 70% of the units were rented at market rate and only 30% were subsidized. This definition appears to have been designed to confuse the public.	Paolo Meret		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.

4. PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts - OPPOSED

04/14/2021	22:50	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 opposed to this amendment to removing rezoning process for Social Housing. Firstly the freedom given to Director of planning in terms of heights and set backs is ambiguous, and subject to misinterpretation and abuse. Also, whilst many in favor are basing their support on the simple argument that "More housing is needed", this proposal does not assure 100% Social Housing, even though it is being called this. The 30%-50% requirement means it will simply be developers stacking high price accommodations on top of existing housing stock, with the high probability of little incremental social housing being created. Also, it is unclear why this is being limited to RM4 and RM3 zones. Only 35% of all current Co-Op and Social housing sits in these zones, which supports the theory that the intent is to stack high price accommodations on top of existing social. If there was a real desire to increase this, why would this not be getting put in place where the current majority (65%) of social housing exists? I would ask council to not allow the removal of the re-zoning process, to ensure that the appropriate amount of community input and opportunity exists, beyond that which is just allowed for in the Development Permit process. By allowing this, you are simply providing a new loophole to allow developers to fasttrack their development opportunities in high cost neighborhoods, and not deliver incremental social housing. This amendment should not be passed as is. If there is a need to fasttrack, then a more appropriate alternative would be to have the rezoning applications for 100% social housing put to the front of the queue, or have a dedicated team to handle rezoning submissions that claim to be 100% social. This would ensure transparency in the public domain and not allow for abuse of the system, that we have seen far too many times in City processes like this. It would be irresponsible for council to approve this as it is being submitted today.	Colin	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/14/2021	23:00	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 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 I am opposed to the recommendations in this report to rezone RM3 and RM4 to allow outright 6 storey rental projects without a public hearing, and ask that you vote against adoption of the proposed by-law amendment. While purportedly 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. The rezoning is in conflict with existing, approved, community plans. The proposed change also comes before the official plans are developed for both the Broadway Corridor and the larger Vancouver Plan; if one didn't know better, one might characterize the proposal as an attempt to by pass those planning processes. Please do not approve this rezoning as proposed. Regards, Ian Crook	Ian Crook	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Fairview	No web attachments.
04/15/2021	09:21	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Letter to City of Vancouver Council re Public Hearing on April 15, 2021 ' Agenda Item 4 I am a long time resident in the Kitsilano neighbourhood and two days ago I discovered the proposal to change the RM4 zoning for social housing in my area to 6 storeys. This is a 50% increase in height with absolutely no public consultation with those in the neighbourhood. Just to be clear, I wholeheartedly support the notion of social housing and indeed, we already have at least 15 social housing buildings in our immediate surrounding area. These buildings work exceptionally well as they match the scale and character of the neighbourhood. Rather than being conspicuous and potentially stigmatized, the buildings blend right in to the streetscape and the residents, some of whom may be disadvantaged, have a greater opportunity to be happy and safe neighbours contributing to the success of the community as a whole. I therefore oppose the proposed change in RM4 zoning for social housing without consultation as a matter of rule. There may easily be certain spot locations where 5 or 6 storeys of social housing would work well but the applicants for such buildings should be required to submit their plan through the rezoning process and consult the local community. I acknowledge that rezonings take a bit longer and this is challenging for the proponents but isn't it worth a bit more time to preserve and enhance every community in Vancouver? Why ruin a welcoming neighbourhood such as Kitsilano where social housing is fully integrated and is working so well? On another matter, there is 'Supportive Housing' which is described by BC Housing as a different category of housing than 'Social Housing'. It is not clear to me in the proposal for the waiving of rezoning for RM4 social housing buildings in favour of an automatic 6 storey height whether 'Supportive Housing' is included. Indeed, it appears that Supportive Housing is not part of this proposed change, or perhaps it might be for Seniors Supportive Housing? I would like clarification on this as BC Housing is currently proposing a 12 storey 140 studio unit Supportive Housing project in an RM4 Kitsilano location; a scale and unit mix that is totally out of character with the immediate area of 3 or 4 storey housing. Not to mention a unit mix that directly discriminates against women and young families. Does the new ruling apply to Supportive Housing as well as Social Housing? Does this now mean it can be 6 storeys without rezoning? Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and registering my opposition to this change in rezoning requirements for social housing. Diana McMeekin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential Dated: April 15, 2021	Diana A McMeekin	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	APPENDIX C
04/15/2021	09:22	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 strongly oppose the recommendations to increase social housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning districts. Allowing staff to singularly ascertain rezoning matters in isolation of public input is completely unacceptable. Your publics, the tax payers who live in these neighbourhoods, have the right in our democracy to have their voices heard and your commitment to transparency would be forever compromised. Of course Vancouver needs creative, smart solutions to creating more affordable rentals/property. The non-profits concern is legitimate- public input takes too long. So the challenge is to fix the system through skilled planning solutions and Council policies that create efficiencies and protect the public's right to weigh in. I rent- it is notable to me that the City does not truly recognize the affordable rental stock already in place. I say this because the answer consistently seems to be to tear down, displace, and impose new heights and density in a quest to 'make things better'. This is ineffective because it is creating UNaffordable new structures that are, so far, mostly designed as market-rate rentals. MIRHPP projects are excellent examples of this and there is no evidence that this will be any different. You, the City, and we, the residents, need public input- please oppose this recommendation.	Janis Hamilton	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Fairview	No web attachments.
04/15/2021	10:05	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	We have serious concerns regarding the proposed rezonings, as outlined in our attached letter. We ask that Council not proceed with the rezoning of this item at this time pending further consultation.	Grandview Woodland Area Council	s. 22(1) Personal	Grandview-Woodland	APPENDIX D
04/15/2021	10:57	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 proposed changes to the zoning. I support the attached position of the strata council of BCS3183 (the Canvas Strata Council) and requests that the amendment to RM4 not be passed by the City Council today for the enclosed reasons outlined by the Canvas Strata Council. Alan Kaller s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	alan m kaller	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	APPENDIX E

4. PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts - OPPOSED

04/15/2021	11:10	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	<p>Strata BCS 213 is a residential townhouse complex of 20 units located at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" [the 'Hansdowne Row Strata']. The Hansdowne Row Strata Council is writing in opposition to the proposed amendments to the zoning and development by-law pertaining to RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts, currently listed as Item 4 on the agenda for the Public Hearing scheduled to proceed on April 15, 2021 at 6:00 pm [the 'Proposed Amendments']. The Proposed Amendments have been brought to public hearing with insufficient notice to residents of the neighbourhoods most impacted, including the Kitsilano area and the residents of Hansdowne Row Strata. While it is important for the City to deal with housing affordability in Vancouver, scheduling a public hearing to make significant and impactful by-law amendments without sufficient advance notice to the public, including the residents of Hansdowne Row, demonstrates a lack of transparency and meaningful consultation on the part of the City of Vancouver. This is particularly true where the City is considering Proposed Amendments that will effectively allow for the development of buildings that are double the height of most surrounding buildings if the Proposed Amendments are passed. This would be the case in Kitsilano where many properties are zoned as RM-4. The Proposed Amendments are purportedly being recommended to increase 'social housing' in the RM-4 and RM-3A zoning districts. The City of Vancouver has not made it clear what definition of 'social housing' will be applied under the Proposed Amendments. On May 26, 2020, Councillor Fry brought a motion through which he sought to 'define social housing consistently and transparently in the City of Vancouver'. We understand that this motion passed, but a new, consistent, and transparent definition of 'social housing' has yet to be adopted by City Council. The term 'social housing' must be precisely and consistently defined before the Proposed Amendments can be meaningfully considered by residents and City Council, or become the subject of a public hearing and voted on by City Council. Affected parties like Hansdowne Row Strata Council need to be able to seek relevant information and provide meaningful input on the Proposed Amendments before City Council takes a vote. Without providing sufficient notice and information, including the meaning and scope of 'social housing', any amended by-law will be liable to be set aside by a court. Accordingly, Hansdowne Row Strata Council opposes the Proposed Amendments. Sincerely, Council for Strata BCS 213</p>	Dean Pelkey	s. 22(1) Personal and Confide	Kitsilano	APPENDIX F
04/15/2021	11:59	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to this zoning amendment as proposed because I think it may lead to extensive & needless re-building of existing affordable rentals, to the inevitable detriment of people currently living in those, and overall to a loss of affordability. (Not to mention environmental waste.) Also, I think it is very wrong to count as "social housing" buildings in which only 30% of rental will be within social housing rates. The minimum should be 51% - although counting any suites at all as part of a "Social Housing" deal with developers is problematic. Thank you.</p>	Joan Bunn	s. 22(1) Personal and Confide	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/15/2021	14:30	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	<p>To Mayor Stewart and City councillors West Kitsilano Residents Association is opposed to this zoning change due to serious concerns relating to potential for unintended side effects in areas of the City where there are large numbers of existing older affordable rental housing units. The planning report states that this will only be allowed for "social housing" but the City's definition of "Social housing" means that 70 per cent of the units that will result from redevelopment will be market rentals. Only 30 per cent of the newly created units will be truly affordable. Recent reports indicate that recently built market rental units have a very high vacancy rate since they are very small and very expensive. The new social/market rental housing will not truly replace the larger more affordable older rentals that will be demolished to create it. The city should put more priority on renovation and maintenance of existing older affordable rentals rather than facilitating their demolition and redevelopment. This is also a more sustainable approach that will reduce the city's greenhouse gas emissions. Recent reports of the situation in Chinatown at the Grace Seniors Home are an indication of the displacement that will likely occur in existing affordable housing across the City if this change to the Zoning By-law is approved. There may be situations where the existing rental apartments in these zones are no longer able to be renovated and where redevelopment is the only option. In those situations, a rezoning may well be the best option. In order to create more certainty for non-profit housing providers, council can pass a policy that will clarify the kind of rezoning applications that would be considered. However, rezonings and redevelopment should continue to be considered on a case by case basis. This will ensure that existing tenants are not displaced needlessly and that those tenants have a chance to make their views known to council before they are demovicted. Please vote against this amendment/</p>	Jan Pierce	s. 22(1) Personal and Confident	Kitsilano	No web attachments.

April 14, 2021

Attention: City Council

Strata BCS 3183 is a residential townhouse complex of 18 units located s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [the "Canvas Strata"].

The Canvas Strata Council is writing in opposition to the proposed amendments to the zoning and development by-law pertaining to RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts, currently listed as Item 4 on the agenda for the Public Hearing scheduled to proceed on April 15, 2021 at 6:00 pm [the "Proposed Amendments"].

The Proposed Amendments have been brought to public hearing with insufficient notice to residents of the neighbourhoods most impacted, including the Kitsilano area and the residents of Canvas Strata. While it is important for the City to deal with housing affordability in Vancouver, scheduling a public hearing to make significant and impactful by-law amendments without sufficient advance notice to the public, including the residents of Canvas Strata, demonstrates a lack of transparency and meaningful consultation on the part of the City of Vancouver. This is particularly true where the City is considering Proposed Amendments that will effectively allow for the development of buildings that are double the height of most surrounding buildings if the Proposed Amendments are passed. This would be the case in Kitsilano where many properties are zoned as RM-4.

The Proposed Amendments are purportedly being recommended to increase "social housing" in the RM-4 and RM-3A zoning districts. The City of Vancouver has not made it clear what definition of "social housing" will be applied under the Proposed Amendments.

On May 26, 2020, Councillor Fry brought a motion through which he sought to "define social housing consistently and transparently in the City of Vancouver". We understand that this motion passed, but a new, consistent, and transparent definition of "social housing" has yet to be adopted by City Council.

The term "social housing" must be precisely and consistently defined before the Proposed Amendments can be meaningfully considered by residents and City Council, or become the subject of a public hearing and voted on by City Council.

Affected parties like Canvas Strata Council need to be able to seek relevant information and provide meaningful input on the Proposed Amendments before City Council takes a vote. Without providing sufficient notice and information, including the meaning and scope of "social housing", any amended by-law will be liable to be set aside by a court. Accordingly, Canvas Strata Council opposes the Proposed Amendments.

Sincerely,

Council for Strata BCS 3183

April 15, 2021

Dear Mayor Kennedy and City Council Members:

RE: Public Hearing, Apr. 15, 2021, Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts

The Upper Kitsilano Residents Association is adamantly opposed to the blanket rezoning of RM-4 and RM-3A zones in Kitsilano that encourages development of six-storey housing with 2.5 FSR, without individual public hearings.

The motion will, in effect, bar public input on new housing development in many parts of the City. Rushing this amendment through will ultimately harm public trust in government. We ask that Council move away from blanket rezoning and instead provide more, not less, transparency, and move to a zoning process that lets the public, especially the neighbourhoods directly affected, have a real say about the future of their communities.

The irony in this zoning amendment is that the majority of the areas of Vancouver selected already have among the most affordable rental housing in the city. Encouraging demolition of 30 to 50 year-old buildings seems drastic, unnecessary and a massive waste of perfectly serviceable buildings. Have you considered renovating as opposed to tear-down on a case-by-case basis? Even more unfathomable is the City's decision not to comply with its own *Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning*s for the potential new construction along these routes. The willingness to undermine Vancouver's long-term environmental health in order to rush through these developments *en bloc* smacks of desperation. Doing so would further lessen any justification for their construction.

We understand and fully support increasing social housing for low-income residents and those with disabilities. But under the City's unusual definition of "social housing," entire buildings under the plan will reap the developer incentives, even though the majority—about 70%—will be priced at market rates.

Another consequence will be the resulting land-lift, which will force up rents in existing affordable units in the area. So much for long-term affordability. This move is similar to the City's MIRHPP, which has been extensively criticized for giving away too many taxpayer dollars to developers for too little in return. We question why staff did not propose making the changes only to buildings that are 100% social housing at shelter rates?

We urge you to vote against this undemocratic rezoning, and to invest in the housing we already have.

Letter to City of Vancouver Council re Public Hearing on April 15, 2021 – Agenda Item 4

I am a long time resident in the Kitsilano neighbourhood and two days ago I discovered the proposal to change the RM4 zoning for social housing in my area to 6 storeys. This is a 50% increase in height with absolutely no public consultation with those in the neighbourhood. Just to be clear, I wholeheartedly support the notion of social housing and indeed, we already have at least 15 social housing buildings in our immediate surrounding area. These buildings work exceptionally well as they match the scale and character of the neighbourhood. Rather than being conspicuous and potentially stigmatized, the buildings blend right in to the streetscape and the residents, some of whom may be disadvantaged, have a greater opportunity to be happy and safe neighbours contributing to the success of the community as a whole. **I therefore oppose the proposed change in RM4 zoning for social housing without consultation as a matter of rule.** There may easily be certain spot locations where 5 or 6 storeys of social housing would work well but the applicants for such buildings should be required to submit their plan through the rezoning process and consult the local community. I acknowledge that rezonings take a bit longer and this is challenging for the proponents but isn't it worth a bit more time to preserve and enhance **every** community in Vancouver? Why ruin a welcoming neighbourhood such as Kitsilano where social housing is fully integrated and is working so well?

On another matter, there is "Supportive Housing" which is described by BC Housing as a different category of housing than "Social Housing". It is not clear to me in the proposal for the waiving of rezoning for RM4 social housing buildings in favour of an automatic 6 storey height whether "Supportive Housing" is included. Indeed, it appears that Supportive Housing is not part of this proposed change, or perhaps it might be for Seniors Supportive Housing? I would like clarification on this as BC Housing is currently proposing a 12 storey 140 studio unit Supportive Housing project in an RM4 Kitsilano location; a scale and unit mix that is totally out of character with the immediate area of 3 or 4 storey housing. Not to mention a unit mix that directly discriminates against women and young families. Does the new ruling apply to Supportive Housing as well as Social Housing? Does this now mean it can be 6 storeys without rezoning?

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and registering my opposition to this change in rezoning requirements for social housing.

Diana McMeekin **s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"**

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Dated: April 15, 2021



GRANDVIEW WOODLAND
- AREA COUNCIL -
gwac.ca

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

April 14th, 2021

City of Vancouver Council

Dear Mayor Kennedy Stewart and Councillors,

Re: Opposition to Proposed Changes to RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts.

GWAC strongly urges City Council NOT to approve the proposed changes to RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts.

The referral report initially appeared on the agenda page for Vancouver City Council without any warning. This work should instead be included in a meaningful public consultation process and be referred to the Vancouver Plan. There also was no notification sent to those affected.

There are several very serious issues with the process and the report contents:

- the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan (GWCP) took many years and the participation of many residents to develop, with the plan implementation just recently completed in 2018. Significant areas of Grandview-Woodland are covered in this report, including Cedar Cove with RM-3A zones and RM-4/4N zones in significant areas on both sides of Commercial Drive
- some of the existing, most affordable rental units are located in the RM-3A and RM-4/4N zones
- the possibility of allowing the rapid redevelopment of mature rental housing buildings, many at 3 and 4-storeys, to allow for 6-storey buildings (or 65 ft.), puts many low and medium income renters at risk of “demoviction”
- the City’s definition of ‘social housing’ is not 100% shelter rate; thus, newly built housing can be a mix of market rental and only 30% of below market rates, to qualify as “affordable housing”



GRANDVIEW WOODLAND
- AREA COUNCIL -
gwac.ca

- the current existing mature rental stock offers affordable rents for long term tenants; the demolition of buildings that include those which are around 35 years old, for replacement with new buildings is both very wasteful and has high environmental impacts, thus would be misaligned with the City's climate emergency mandate
- the approved community plan has a rezoning process in place, which includes a "pace of change" policy, which limits the consideration of redevelopment to (potentially) 6-storeys and 2.4 FSR buildings subject to meeting set criteria
- the GWCP is misaligned with the final report of the Citizens' Assembly that did not support 6-storey buildings in RM-4 zones; instead, only 4-storey buildings were supported
- the density targeted in the report of 2.5 FSR can be achieved in 4-storeys or 45 ft., as illustrated in C-2 districts
- an outright height of 65 ft. and 2.5 FSR could set a new floor to begin negotiations for rezoning to even greater heights and densities
- allowing up-zoning that includes a portion of additional market rental units can drive up property values, increase property taxes and thus reduce resources allocated to improving and maintaining existing mature rental housing stock
- the "demoviction" of residents from mature rental housing stock takes a serious human toll; perhaps it would be more ideal to preserve the existing housing stock and build additional units on underutilized sites instead
- no public Open Houses were held on the proposed changes in this policy report such wide-ranging and profound changes should not be brought forward in the midst of a pandemic

Thus, it is premature to approve this report; we ask Council to not proceed with the rezoning of this item at this time.

Regards,

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Craig Ollenberger
President, Grandview Woodland Area Council

April 14, 2021

Attention: City Council

Strata BCS 3183 is a residential townhouse complex of 18 units located at s. 22(1) Personal and Confid

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [the "Canvas Strata"].

The Canvas Strata Council is writing in opposition to the proposed amendments to the zoning and development by-law pertaining to RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts, currently listed as Item 4 on the agenda for the Public Hearing scheduled to proceed on April 15, 2021 at 6:00 pm [the "Proposed Amendments"].

The Proposed Amendments have been brought to public hearing with insufficient notice to residents of the neighbourhoods most impacted, including the Kitsilano area and the residents of Canvas Strata. While it is important for the City to deal with housing affordability in Vancouver, scheduling a public hearing to make significant and impactful by-law amendments without sufficient advance notice to the public, including the residents of Canvas Strata, demonstrates a lack of transparency and meaningful consultation on the part of the City of Vancouver. This is particularly true where the City is considering Proposed Amendments that will effectively allow for the development of buildings that are double the height of most surrounding buildings if the Proposed Amendments are passed. This would be the case in Kitsilano where many properties are zoned as RM-4.

The Proposed Amendments are purportedly being recommended to increase "social housing" in the RM-4 and RM-3A zoning districts. The City of Vancouver has not made it clear what definition of "social housing" will be applied under the Proposed Amendments.

On May 26, 2020, Councillor Fry brought a motion through which he sought to "define social housing consistently and transparently in the City of Vancouver". We understand that this motion passed, but a new, consistent, and transparent definition of "social housing" has yet to be adopted by City Council.

The term "social housing" must be precisely and consistently defined before the Proposed Amendments can be meaningfully considered by residents and City Council, or become the subject of a public hearing and voted on by City Council.

Affected parties like Canvas Strata Council need to be able to seek relevant information and provide meaningful input on the Proposed Amendments before City Council takes a vote. Without providing sufficient notice and information, including the meaning and scope of "social housing", any amended by-law will be liable to be set aside by a court. Accordingly, Canvas Strata Council opposes the Proposed Amendments.

Sincerely,

Council for Strata BCS 3183

Attention: City Council

Strata BCS 213 is a residential townhouse complex of 20 units located at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential [the “Hansdowne Row Strata”].

The Hansdowne Row Strata Council is writing in opposition to the proposed amendments to the zoning and development by-law pertaining to RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts, currently listed as Item 4 on the agenda for the Public Hearing scheduled to proceed on April 15, 2021 at 6:00 pm [the “Proposed Amendments”].

The Proposed Amendments have been brought to public hearing with insufficient notice to residents of the neighbourhoods most impacted, including the Kitsilano area and the residents of Hansdowne Row Strata. While it is important for the City to deal with housing affordability in Vancouver, scheduling a public hearing to make significant and impactful by-law amendments without sufficient advance notice to the public, including the residents of Hansdowne Row, demonstrates a lack of transparency and meaningful consultation on the part of the City of Vancouver. This is particularly true where the City is considering Proposed Amendments that will effectively allow for the development of buildings that are double the height of most surrounding buildings if the Proposed Amendments are passed. This would be the case in Kitsilano where many properties are zoned as RM-4.

The Proposed Amendments are purportedly being recommended to increase “social housing” in the RM-4 and RM-3A zoning districts. The City of Vancouver has not made it clear what definition of “social housing” will be applied under the Proposed Amendments.

On May 26, 2020, Councillor Fry brought a motion through which he sought to “define social housing consistently and transparently in the City of Vancouver”. We understand that this motion passed, but a new, consistent, and transparent definition of “social housing” has yet to be adopted by City Council.

The term “social housing” must be precisely and consistently defined before the Proposed Amendments can be meaningfully considered by residents and City Council, or become the subject of a public hearing and voted on by City Council.

Affected parties like Hansdowne Row Strata Council need to be able to seek relevant information and provide meaningful input on the Proposed Amendments before City Council takes a vote. Without providing sufficient notice and information, including the meaning and scope of “social housing”, any amended by-law will be liable to be set aside by a court. Accordingly, Hansdowne Row Strata Council opposes the Proposed Amendments.

Sincerely,

Council for Strata BCS 213