

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
04/16/2021	12:06	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	The actions related to rezoning and creating more affordable rental housing of this Council during its tenure are misguided, based on the bizarre definition of « social housing » which the Council also directed the Planning department to revise (motion by Fry 2020). All this needs to stop until this mess is sorted out. The only winners here are the developers.	Cynthia Lewis		s. 22(1) Personal and Conf	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/17/2021	19:30	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Rezoning and fast-tracking development in these zones will ensure the destruction of nearly all the remaining truly affordable rental stock in this city. And I use the word affordable in a realistic sense, unlike Vancouver City Hall. If your goal is to eliminate the working class from this town, why not just have the integrity to say so outright' If that isn't your goal, then I urge you NOT to go ahead with this rezoning.	David Webb		s. 22(1) Personal and Conf	Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.
04/17/2021	20:05	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	This is clearly another example of the City and BC Housing further excluding communities from what they want in their neighbourhoods. Where is the transparency, consultation and collaboration with people who live in these areas you are affecting' Now this will fast track any low barrier 'supportive' housing project without being held accountable to the people of Vancouver.	Sarah Toth		s. 22(1) Personal and Confiden	Fairview	No web attachments.
04/18/2021	00:44	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM 4 and RM 3A Zoning	Oppose	Please see my comments in the attachment.	Roberta Olenick		s. 22(1) Personal and C	Unknown	APPENDIX A

At the initial April 15 public hearing, Councillor Colleen Hardwick asked City planner Dan Garrison to explain the City's definition of social housing. When she failed to get a clear response and suggested this could be misleading to the public, the Mayor stepped in and stopped her from getting the information she was trying to bring to light.

As a member of the misled public, I really wanted the clarity Councillor Hardwick was seeking and was appalled at the disrespectful treatment she received.

It is only in the last few days that I have come to understand that the City's definition of social housing is not at all what I and everyone I have discussed this with expected it to be. Indeed, what most people would logically and intuitively expect it to be.

It seems 100% social housing does not really mean 100%. It means 30% social and 70% market.

That really IS misleading.

At the April 15 public hearing, a staff presentation referred to a recent Talk Vancouver survey on housing. According to the City, over 90% of respondents said the city needs more social housing.

I was one of those respondents!

However, I and the other respondents were NOT clearly told about the City's misleading definition of social housing in the information provided as part of the survey.

I and very possibly many others would have responded very differently had we known the true 30%-70% definition.

These surveys are meaningless if they provide unclear information that effectively skews the responses. I doubt I will continue to participate in Talk Vancouver going forward if my input/view is to be misrepresented as a result of biased survey design.

As for the proposal under consideration here, I cannot support it regardless of what I said about the need for social housing in that misleading housing survey.

I strongly oppose the proposal to allow for blanket rezoning for 6-storey 30% social-70% market rental buildings in several areas zoned for apartments because this plan:

1. promotes destruction of some of the most affordable rental buildings in the city, built between 1970-1990;
2. would send these perfectly good buildings to the landfill, incongruent with Vancouver as the supposedly greenest city;
3. would displace the residents of these affordable rentals with no guarantee of any net increase in true social housing units and affordable rentals;
4. exempts the new 6-storey buildings from individual public hearings and from having to gain Council approval even with respect to design, a travesty against democracy and public participation that gives too much power to non-elected city staff;

5. leaves a loophole for even more than 6-storeys since the draft zoning bylaws specify height but not the number of storeys that might be squeezed into that height;
6. gives too much latitude for relaxations of setbacks and other relaxations that will impact neighbouring residents through shading, crowding, reduced privacy and other effects;
7. is based on assumptions for the Housing Vancouver Strategy when these are not at all clear to the public since city staff have failed to release the data that were promised for late July 2020;
8. has proceeded without proper notification of residents in the RM-4/4N and RM-3A zones of the proposed changes to these zones, an unfair lack of transparency to those who will be most directly affected.