

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
04/19/2021	13:50	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	The City mustn't shirk its duty to study and debate each and every rezoning application in its rush to build market housing under the guise of social housing. We need more low-cost social housing; we don't need to bulldoze en masse under false pretenses.	David Ferman		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/19/2021	17:32	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'm extremely distressed by yet another new assault on my Kitsilano neighbourhood. The City seems determined to destroy Kits by pushing through zoning changes that will encourage future highrise development throughout the area. I don't think it's right to do this without public hearing. Shouldn't taxpayers be informed about major changes that will affect us and shouldn't Council be receptive to our views? My greatest personal concern is loss of scenic views. Six storeys will completely obliterate views of the mountains and water. I am certain that many of the most spectacular views in the city are here but we have no view cones to protect them. I would also like Council to produce figures on the estimated increase in population density for this area, taking into consideration ALL of the proposed and anticipated projects.	Valerie Porter		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/19/2021	18:41	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 petition has been brought on without sufficient notice to the residents in the affected areas. No one in my neighbourhood knows that this is occurring, and I only found out at the last minute through word of mouth. By not providing sufficient notice, the City is denying existing residents of these communities appropriate time to review and provide feedback on the proposed changes. Further, the motion as currently drafted is entirely deficient. The concept of social housing is not defined for the purposes of this bylaw. It is open to numerous interpretations and, thus, open to abuse. Council is abdicating its elected responsibility by failing to bring or require a sufficiently clear motion. It is hiding behind the vagueness of the current motion's language. Council cannot possibly vote to approve such a major change without any understanding on what it is actually voting to do. There is a lack of specificity and in that lack, Council is failing in its mandate as elected officials. This could represent an unprecedented major change, but whether that is actually the case is entirely unclear. I am a resident of Kitsilano and practicing lawyer and I cannot decipher the meaning of this motion. This is my paid profession: to interpret such legislation. I have been specifically trained and have many years experience in doing exactly that. And yet I am left befuddled by this poorly drafted, poorly worded, vague and potentially misleading motion. Is this the intent of council? If so, why would council want to mislead the citizens it is supposed to represent? If council is doing its job properly, this motion must be sent back for re-drafting so that the City can actually understand how Council intends this to operate. Only at that time can it be properly debated and voted upon.	Hollis Bromley		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/19/2021	18:51	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	No consultation was done whatsoever with residents of the affected neighbourhoods. It is the city's job to analyze the impact on the community of buildings that do not fit the current zoning, on a case by case basis. This by-law is an abdication of that responsibility, and allows developers to get around current zoning by including an undefined token social housing component.	Greg Sexton		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/19/2021	19:48	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 the proposed Zoning change to allow for increased social housing in the RM-3A, RM-4, and RN4-N zoning districts because: 1) This proposed amendment is a shot in the dark with no research and information to support the claims that this will help the housing situation in Vancouver in a timely manner. For 40 years, successive City Councils have supported increasing supply as the solution to unaffordable housing. So developers supplied the type of housing that guaranteed them the highest returns 'mostly luxury one-bedroom condos. After allowing this to go on long after it was clear that it was counter-productive, the the previous Council developed the rationale that the problem is not enough supply, but the 'right kind' of supply. 2) But buildings that are 70% market rentals are not the 'right kind' of supply. In repeated surveys Vancouverites have stressed that homelessness is the most important housing issue that must be addressed. Middle income earners will always be able to find housing, while low income earners have increasing difficulties being housed. This must be the priority. 3) The amendment before Council is a weak and ineffective response to the 90% of Vancouverites demanding more social housing. It would allow pre-approved, or blanket rezoning for "social" housing in several areas currently zoned for apartments in the city, including Kitsilano where I live. However, these projects would entail only 30% of units being assigned as social housing. but the developers would qualify for extra height and density and waived fees. In other words, this is a great deal for developers, but it does little to help those who need it most. 4) It is time Council demanded more from developers in exchange for the benefits they receive. If only 30% of buildings are social housing, the needs of low-income renters are not able to be met without widespread, indiscriminate, unplanned rezonings and any opposition to the damage done is characterized as mean-spirited self interest on the part of the local community. 5) In order to protect the livability and character of our communities while providing social housing in a timely manner, Council should demand a much higher percentage of truly affordable housing - at least 50%. This would reduce the amount of land that would need to be rezoned while creating the same amount of affordable rental. 6) As an aside, I understand that the City owns or has bought a number of parcels along Broadway to serve the Broadway subway infrastructure. These City-owned lands would be much better used by building social housing on them with the money saved by putting in surface rail, rather than development-oriented transit.	Marion Jamieson		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/19/2021	19:56	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	Why are we taking out perfectly good buildings to build NEW ones for social housing in Kits in particular? What ever happened to preserving the environment? Are we talking out of both sides of our face here? Clean environment? Restore what is really needed. Most affordable housing is in Kits in older homes anyway. You are taking away our history! Building new for people of low income makes no sense. I have worked hard, saved over many years, to buy and old house, restore it and it keep looking like it did decades before. Why should low income or NO income be rewarded with a NEW building that may not keep out our city values? It is time we stop rewarding BAD behaviour in people, most of who may require mental health homes that are compliments of the tax payer. Perhaps look for tax incentives for older people to house low income city dwellers? Certainly communal living and helping each other out will contribute more in the long run. Stop taking out our old buildings unless they are an environmental health risk. Enough is enough already.	Pauline Tolan		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.

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

04/19/2021	20:35	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	I oppose this amendment for 2 reasons: 1. These neighbourhoods already have a high density of low-medium-storey social housing buildings (there are 21 subsidized housing buildings in my area of the Kitsilano neighbourhood) and the existing infrastructure (playgrounds, community centres, grocery stores, schools, etc) which are already strained to support existing residents. Why increase the building height and density in these neighbourhoods' Why not consider more 4-storey social housing projects in other less-dense areas of Vancouver such as Dunbar, Point Grey, Kerrisdale, Arbutus Ridge and Shaughnessy' 2. The dissolution of the application process on a blanket rezoning amendment erodes our democratic system. Public input on a case-by-case basis is needed to keep developers, homeowners, renters and future City Council accountable to the residents of Vancouver. I am attaching a map of my area of Kitsilano which shows the subsidized housing projects in a 100 block area, for your references. Any mistakes or scale inaccuracies are mine, it is difficult to keep abreast of the changes happening in our city while working full-time and enduring the Covid19 pandemic. Included in this map is the location of BC Housing's proposal for a 12-storey 140 unit supportive housing project which is also ill-planned and uncharacteristic of the surrounding 3 and 4 story buildings.	Doni Gratton		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	APPENDIX A
04/20/2021	08:32	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	April 20, 2021 Mayor and Council: Re: Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-Law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts The Riley Park South Cambie Community Visions Steering Committee (RPSC-CVC) has expressed concerns regarding the aforementioned amendments as they apply to the Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Policy (CCP3). We feel that there is a potential problem with the proposed amendments as it implies a direct contradiction to the CCP3 in the following Sections: ' p. 38, Section 4.1 Cambie Village para. 2 "The existing low-rise rental buildings along Cambie Street between 19th and 24th Avenue will be retained.' ' p. 42, Area B: Oak Street between 21st and 24th are allowed 5-6 storey buildings ' p. 44, Section 4.1.3, Cambie Street 19-24th Avenue 'The existing Rm-3Ak zoning will be retained to preserve this stable rental housing.' RPSC-CVC, since its inception in November 2005 has never taken a Nimby position when it comes to social housing. In fact, we have spoken at numerous Council meetings, over the years, to increase the number of social housing units in projects within our area. Unfortunately, our comments have been, on some occasions, on deaf ears . The CCP3 has witnessed Council decisions that we have felt were never openly discussed with the community. This amendment should not be another of those clauses. In fact, we continue to argue for more social housing within our community, but not at the expense of blatantly changing the CCP3's specific sections as noted above. Your consideration in deciding on this amendment will prove that, as a City Council, you abide by established policies. Regards, Allan Buium, Chair on behalf of the RPSC-CVC cc: Theresa O'Donnell, Acting General Manager, Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability Susan Haid, Deputy Director, Long Range and Strategic Planning Dan Garrison, Assistant Director, Housing Policy and Regulation Sarah Ellis, Planner Kirsten Behler, Planner, Cambie Corridor Mateja Seaton, Planner, Cambie Corridor	Allan Buium		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Riley Park	No web attachments.
04/20/2021	09:53	PH2 - 4. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Social Housing in the RM-4 and RM-3A Zoning Districts	Oppose	re: 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 this motion, as it appears that the claims within are misleading. Created in 2004 under the former Vision Vancouver government, the City's definition of social housing requires that 100% of units in a building must be owned by a non-profit or government agency, with at least 30% of the units geared towards affordable rent based on income. The other 70 per cent of units will be market rentals. Because the entire building would fall under 'social housing,' developers would qualify for extra height and density and waived fees worth thousands of dollars. In other words, this is a great deal for developers, but it does little to help those renters who need the most help. At the initial April 15 public hearing, Coun. Colleen Hardwick asked City planner Dan Garrison to explain the City's definition of social housing. When Hardwick could not get a clear yes or no answer, and suggested this could be misleading the public, the Mayor stepped in and told her to stop asking the same question 'over and over.' The Mayor should be ashamed of this behaviour. The City has long been playing with semantics around the terms "affordable" and "social housing". Social housing is generally recognized as being subsidized housing geared to income. The City often uses the social housing term to refer to all non-market rate housing, which is wrong. The same applies to affordable housing, which has been defined by CMHC as when a household spends less than 30 per cent of its gross (before-tax) income on acceptable shelter. The City has hijacked this term to refer to any non-market rate housing, even if it's not affordable (\$1200 for a 300 sq.ft. studio is by no means affordable). This muddying of terms is being used to provide density and development fee giveaways to developers, which is disingenuous and of dubious morality.	P. Caraher		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
04/20/2021	10:07	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 horrible and will change the look and feel of our beautiful city. Why would you put social housing in the most expensive part of Vancouver"	Brenda Heaney		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.

