

**OPPOSED****Case Summary**

Case ID	201000843572
Case creation date:	9/8/2023, 2:18:19 AM
Case created by	Service Account
Channel:	WEB

## Location and request details:

Location:	none
Advised Your name and comments will be made available publicly as part of the official record for the hearing Contact information will not be made public	true
Subject (address if applicable):	Missing Middle Plan Sept 14 2023 Meeting
Position:	Oppose
Comments:	September 7, 2023

Vancouver City Hall  
453 West 12th Avenue  
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada , V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor Ken Sim and, Councillor Rebecca Bligh, Councillor Christine Boyle, Councillor Adriane Carr, Councillor Lisa Dominato, Councillor Pete Fry, Councillor Sarah Kirby-Yung, Councillor Mike Klassen, Councillor Peter Meiszner, Councillor Brian Montague, Councillor Lenny Zhou, and Urban Planning Department, City Management Team, relevant Departments, relevant staff + open letter :

Re: The Referral Report July 7, 2023 on Missing Middle Plan, now discussed in CITY MEETING September 14, 2023, to which I greatly disagree with the Missing Middle Plan, because ,1) not having 1 to 1 car parking for each 6 Multiplex unit, 2) removing the Tree Canopy in large amounts, 3) changing the name of Single Detached Homes to “Residential Inclusive Homes” and making all RS- 1 zones into one zone, 4) making the Missing Middle Plan “all over”, 5) not being piloted, and, 6) driving up housing prices to 6 million per SFH lot across city, whereby I respectfully request Mayor and Council, not to pass the Missing Middle Plan

#### REFERRAL REPORT

Report Date: July 7, 2023

Contact: Theresa O'Donnell s22(1) Personal and Confidential

RTS No.: 15854

VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20

Meeting Date: July 25, 2023

TO: Vancouver City Council

FROM: General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability

SUBJECT: Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

This letter is to ask Mayor and Council, 1.) to ask City Staff the following 15 - 20 critical questions of the Missing Middle Plan Referral Report July 7, 2023 , now discussed in Council Meeting

September 14, 2023, 2 ) to make 11 amendments to the Plan, and ideally, for Mayor and Council not pass the Missing Middle Plan, because it is greatly “flawed” - not enough density, “unworkable”- no car parking, “unrealistic” - removes Tree Canopy, and not the best density option, moving forwards.

This Missing Middle Plan does not have enough bang for the buck, as they say in big business: this Plan makes no 'common sense' for cars, for trees, for affordable housing.

Let's get real, EVERY City Plan should put affordable housing FRONT and CENTER. Period.  
K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 1 of 11

Ultimately and realistically, there are far better housing density plans, moving forwards, including densification of, 1.) many more main arterial streets, 2.) Downtown on Robson Street, 3) Downtown heading east along Hastings Street, 3 ) the False Creek Flats ( Main / Terminal ) and, 4 ) along South West Marine Drive heading east from Oak or Granville Street.

Ten Main Amendment request, for Mayor and Council before passing the Missing Middle Plan, are:

- 1) Can Council pass an amendment that the Tree Canopy will not be greatly nor moderately reduced by the Missing Middle – ie because the City needs to not only protect the Tree Canopy but increase it from its current 19% up to 25%?
- 2) Can the CITY directly CONSULT – i.e. LEGAL DUTY TO CONSULT ALL INDIGENOUS BASED ON THE VAN- DRIP, WHICH THE CITY SIGNED ONTO IN 2022, all Indigenous Nations associated with Vancouver – ie the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam Indian Band), Sk̓wx̓wú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) , and ask them if removing “a lot” of trees in the city is acceptable to all the animal and tree spirits and Indigenous Cultural and Indigenous Identity on this sacred land?
- 3) If the Missing Middle is passed, can council pass a motion or amendment, that Missing Middle will exclude AREA - A, ( from report) – i.e. the West Side of Vancouver, because it has more tree

canopy than AREA- B ( middle Vancouver) or AREA -C, ( East Van) ?

4) Can Mayor and Council pass an amendments that no trees greater than 10 inch in diameter will be removed in the Missing Middle Plan?

5) Can Council pass a motion that the Missing Middle will be piloted in AREA – C first?

6) Can Council pass an amendment that the Missing Middle must have 1 to 1 car parking for every unit?

7) Can Council pass an amendment not to change the name of Single Detached Homes to any other name – ie Residential Inclusive homes, etc?

8) Can Council pass an amendment not to remove all RS – 1 zones, including not harmonizing them into one zone?

9) Can Council pass an amendment to ask city Staff do a cost analysis of all the city sewer and infrastructure upgrades before passing the Missing Middle Plan?

10) To prove that not having 1 to 1 car parking in the Missing Middle is correct, can City Staff should interview every car owner in Vancouver, to see if they will give up their cars for bicycles and Public Transit?

11) To make an amendment that if the Missing Middle has no car parking, it should have a price cap of \$200,000 per unit in each Multiplex in perpetuity, for seniors, students, disabled, who mostly use Public Transit and bicycle to own Multiplexes in this plan?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 2 of 11

NINE MAIN CRITIQUES OF THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN ( SEPTEMBER 14, 2023)

My critiques of the Missing Middle Plan, are as follows:

A ) = MISSING MIDDLE PLAN INCORRECTLY REMOVES CAR PARKING, WHICH SHOULD BE 1 TO 1

B ) = MISSING MIDDLE PLAN INCORECTLY REMOVES TOO MANY TRESS VIOLATING VANDRIP/ INDIGENOUS HERITAGE

C ) = WE NEED MISSING MIDDLE TO BE PILOTED

D ) = KEEP SINGLE FAMILY HOME OR SINGLE DETACHED HOME NAME

E ) = DO NOT COMBINE ALL CITY RS- 1 ZONES INTO ONE ZONE

F ) = THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN DOES NOT LOWER PROPERTY TAX,

G ) = MISSING MIDDLE WILL NOT INCREASE RENTAL STOCK MEANINGFULLY OR GREATLY

H ) = MISSING MIDDLE WILL INSTANTLY DRIVE UP HOUSING PRICES

I ) = WHAT ABOUT SEWERS AND ELECTRICITY FOR THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN

J ) = WILL THE MISSING MIDDLE MULTIPLEX UNITS BE GOOD FOR FAMILIES

A = THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN INCORRECTLY REMOVES CAR PARKING, WHICH SHOULD BE 1 TO 1, AS CAR PARKING IS AN ESSENTIAL SERVICE AND HUMAN RIGHT

#### INTRODUCTION

Not having enough car parking, or forcing residents not to own a car by not providing parking, is an immense city transit functionality problem in the making, or greatly illegal government policy or

social transgression caused by “draconian” “biased” anti car government policy, by:

1. creating social and emotional harm – i.e. stress not being able to park easily coming home from work, or not to be able to drive out of the city to visit Nature,
2. reducing economic well- being for society - i.e. inhibiting inner city shopping or dissuading city dwellers shopping in suburbia
3. removing diverse social interactions – i.e. demotivating different ethnic neighbourhoods driving by car to other different ethnic neighbourhoods to socialize

POINT OF ORDER # 1 - CARS ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO A VIBRANT CITY ECONOMY AND SOCIALLY DIVERSE INCLUSIVE EQUITABLE COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

Not having enough car parking in Vancouver is very harmful to socialization and economic strength, because :

1 a ) removes people travelling far out of the city quickly to suburbia to shop and socialize with other communities and ethnicity and cultures, which bicycles and public transit can not provide

.K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 3 of 11

2 a ) removes the important easy quick independent travel out of the city to Nature – ie Whistler, Vancouver Island, BC interior, which bicycles and public transit can not provide.

3 a ) removing cars, including the 15 minute City without car agency, is a type of siloing of social activity, confining people to their neighbourhoods, as most people will not use current Public transit since Public Transit – ie buses/ sky train are:

- 1) ugly designed – grey, blue, boring advertising
- 2) less fun than one's car- no car stereo for tunes
- 3) slow to get to work
- 4) sometimes breaks down
- 5) crowded with people
- 6) not true independence like a car

- 7) not travel directly to destination
- 8) has crime
- 9) unsafe for vulnerable persons
- 10) not good in Covid or Pandemics,
- 11) not good for shopping with groceries
- 12) not good for getting kids to school
- 13) sometimes dirty and unsanitary
- 14) not running 24 hours and built 3 or 4 times too small

4 a ) most people in Vancouver who can rent or own a \$500,000 to \$1 million dollar condo/multiplex unit in this Missing Middle Plan will be high income – ie \$ 60,000 or 70,000 plus per year, whereby most in this income bracket will drive cars, because of points in 4a

.

5 a) most cars in 30 to 50 years will be 100% environmentally made and 100% non polluting, so, in theory, cars should be part of a future city with diverse transit options

.

6 a ) cars help teach youth how to be responsible citizens

7 a ) cars support a huge economic industry

8 a) cars drive the economy, whereas bicycles are for recreation, a city which puts bicycles and public transit, as it stands, first, will economically and socially decline. We are already seeing a huge decline and loss of small businesses because of 1) Covid, 2) anti car policies/ not expanding bridges/.too high car parking fees reducing suburbia visiting Vancouver by car, 3) too high property taxes, 4) too high rents.

9 a) Middle Class suburbia outside of Vancouver will not give up cars for bicycles, e scooters, Public Transit as its primary mode of transit for shopping, kids to school, socializing, when driving into Vancouver in the next 100 years because Metro

Vancouver – ie. suburbia – ie Richmond, Delta, Burnaby, Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, Surrey, etc, are such a large areas needing cars, and their Public Transit – sky train is built too small, not 24 hours, and not enough buses, so Vancouver needs to still facilitate car travel robustly, to promote suburbia shopping in Vancouver with their cars

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7 2023 p 4 of11

10 a ) not having car parking, illegally socially controls who can live in a multiplex unit or condo or apartment, - i.e. the resident must either own a bicycle, be co-dependent on car sharing or use our current “substandard” “too small” Public Transit, all which is a type of political/ economic/ social control of “ types of persons living in an area” akin to how Racism functioned historically in terms of “who lives where and how”. As such, anti- car policies are “car racism” or “lifestyle racism”.

11 a) many vulnerable persons- disabled, mental health consumers, seniors, and families, and non wealthy middle middle class benefit from cars driving them out of the city to Nature for their well being, whereby to deny this opportunity may be illegal emotional abuse and trauma to innocent vulnerable persons, especially since Grey Hound buses stopped service in all of B.C. 4 or 5 years ago.

12 a) It is illegal for the City to discriminate against Disabled, Seniors, who need cars for their enjoyment of Life, or view cars as more freedom than Public Transit, making the delimiting of car parking a huge contravening of Diversity Equity Inclusion policy

13 a) Probably not many low income bicyclist, buss users, will be buying these Missing Middle \$500,000 to \$1 million dollar multiplexes. So not having 1 to 1 car parking is incorrect, as most buyers will be wealthy and interested in cars. To prove this, the City should interview every car owner in Vancouver, to see if they will give up their car for bicycles and Public Transit for the Missing Middle Plan.

PONT OF ORDER # 2 - NOT ENOUGH CAR PARKING IN EVERY NEIGHBOURHOODS  
CREATES MANY ILLEGAL AND INCORECT SOCIAL PROBLEMS, THE FOLLOWING ARE  
FOUR QUESTIONS FOR CITY STAFF

QUESTION ONE for City Staff =What does staff think about the following inconvenience?

If a person buys a car, and already most car spots are taken on a city block, all it takes is one or two extra cars without parking space, to make it so one person, can not easily park on their block, meaning they may have to park on the next block.

First, a car parking experience after shopping or work, may increase from just 2 or 3 minutes to 5 or 10 or 20 minutes to find a parking space, this will cause undue psychological or emotional stress

Second, if a person is disabled and uses a wheelchair and has to park really far from their house, this will cause social and emotional abuse.

Third, if a person has have safety concerns walking too far from their car to home at night, this will cause emotional trauma, including gender based trauma.

QUESTION TWO for City Staff =

If a car has to park more than three blocks away from their home, then they may be late getting to work the next day, which will may lead them to be fired from their job. It is illegal for the City to design such a context?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7  
2023 p 5 of 11

QUESTION THREE for City Staff =

Visitors, including close family may not be able to visit and park easily, making such family avoid

visiting, which illegally reduces necessary socialization, reduces family relationships, reduces well being for home owners on the entire block. Is City Staff and Vancouver City Hall anti- family, anti socialization, anti relationships in its urban planning?

QUESTION FOUR for City Staff =

When people, 20 or 30 on entire block need to compete for just one or two parking spaces could cause social disturbances in the entire community causing people to Hate each other, to verbally and physically fight. This is illegal for the State to create the context for social and psychological violence. Is City Staff and Vancouver City Hall intentionally trying to create the context for hate and violence and social discord among neighbours?.

POINT OF ORDER # 3 - GENERAL QUESTIONS TO CITY STAFF ON CAR PARKING

Question one for City Staff:

What if some Multiplex owners want to buy a car anyways and park on the street? What will the city do if this causes a large parking problem for the entire city block? How will the City address this ? How much will this cost the city?

Question two for City Staff:

Does City Staff think every Vancouverite in 20 years will be riding bicycles, active transport, e scooter, riding ugly and slow public transit,...with no cars? If so, this is not in line with the current reality of high car ownership? Especially post Covid. Is the Missing Middle Plan a biased prejudicial biased anti car plan, designing a city for able bodied 'young people" only city? Is City Staff anti seniors who need cars? Is the City Staff dreaming of a city of only students with cell phones, social media, e scooter paradise? If so, this is an incorrect for Vancouver in any Plan.

Question three for City Staff.

Can City Staff please explain some of their current Urban planning theory which justifies, 1. removing car parking for 1000s of future Vancouver residents in multiplexes?

#### Question Four for City Staff

What if a person moves into a Multiplex, and after 2 or 5 or 10 years, needs a car, say for example they get pregnant and now are a young family and their school is really far, or they are 50 years old when they move into a Multiplex and at 60 for health reasons, they need a car? Where will they park their car? What happens when an entire neighbourhood, has 6 or 8 or 10 Multiplexes, on each block, and then even 2 or 5 % of these really need cars in future years,.but can not buy a car? Can they sue the Government? Can City staff explain how they will mitigate this huge social problem?

#### Question Five for City Staff

Imagine driving around the city block for hours and hours not being able to park? Would this be criminal for the City to create such a emotional and psychological trauma for “hard working people who pay the taxes”?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 6 of11

#### AMMENDMENT TO MISSING MIDDLE PLAN – TO MANDATE 1 TO 1 CAR PARKING

As such, i respectfully ask, can Mayor and Council, make an amendment that the Missing Middle Plan must have 1 to 1 car parking, or not pass the Missing Middle Plan at all

B = VANCOUVER'S TREE CANOPY IS NOT DISPOSABLE, OUR TREE CANOPY IS A GREAT PART OF OUR CITY IDENTITY AND INDIGENOUS HERITAGE

#### INTRODUCTION

I recall in the 5th Estate Media 20 years ago, a wonderful news story about a tourist driving in from the airport along Oak Street and was amazed at our huge street trees – i.e. Tree Canopy.

What an amazing way to greet visitors to Vancouver, with immensely tall beautiful old growth trees.

Our trees are emblematic of the immense beauty of our city. If the Missing Middle Plan abandons the Tree Forrest Plan. I totally oppose the Missing Middle Plan, especially on the West Side of Vancouver- AREA - A, when the density reward is not worth it. The Missing Middle Plan should not move forward with so many trees removed.

1b ) Removing any Tree canopy “aggressively” in such a mass scale of the Missing Middle Plan is immensely incorrect, as it goes against the City Tree Forest Plan and goes against VAN- UNDRIP whereby, “in theory”, today's Indigenous- ie Squamish Nation, Musqueam Indian Band. Tsleil-Waututh Nation “value” Nature and trees.

Question one for City Staff

Can the CITY directly CONSULT – IE LEGAL DUTY TO CONSULT ALL INDIGENOUS BASED ON THE VAN- UNDRIP, WHICH THE CITY SIGNED ONTO IN 2022, Indigenous Nations associated with Vancouver – ie the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam Indian Band), Sk̓wx̓wú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) and ask them if removing “many” trees in the city is acceptable ? If so, why? Can you ask the Indigenous to publicly sign onto the Missing Middle Plan saying its ok to destroy 1000s of beautiful trees?

2 b) The Tree canopy helps reduce Heat Waves and are environmentally sound.

Question two for City Staff

So is Vancouver city hall violating its commitment to Environmentalism with this Missing Middle Plan, because removing trees increases the Heat Dome and may lead to many deaths of seniors and immune compromised persons? Is this morally correct to remove so many trees given all the new data that suggest cities should INCREASE THEIR TREE CANOPY.?.

3 b) In the last 10 to 20 years, generally speaking, Vancouver has lost many trees, with a reduction

from 23% to 19% in its Tree Canopy.

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 7 of 11

Question three for City Staff

Can City Staff give an estimate of exactly how many trees will be destroyed in the Missing Middle Plan? Are we talking 1000 trees? 2000 trees? 5000 trees? 20,000 trees? 100,000 trees?

Question four for City Staff

What sizes of trees will be destroyed? How many 30 to 40 or 50 foot mature trees will be destroyed in the Missing Middle Plan?

**AMMENDMENT TO MISSING MIDDLE PLAN – TO GREATLY PROTECT MOST TREES**

Can Mayor and Council pass a motion or amendment, that all three Indigenous Nations, xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam Indian Band), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) must PUBLICLY agree AND SIGN OFF to the Missing Middle plan to remove so many trees, as part of VANDRIP, and discuss in detail for all Vancouverites, how this “illegal” mass tree destruction will be at the great expense of our tourism, culture, indigenous history, animals, insects, environmental shade, visual therapy, human connection to Nature in the city?

Can Mayor and Council pass an amendments that no trees greater than 10 inch in diameter will be removed in the Missing Middle Plan?

**C = WE NEED MISSING MIDDLE TO BE PILOTED**

1c ) Missing Middle not being a piloted project is incorrect, because all major urban planning....should be “piloted”, for refining the product- i.e. plan, for due diligence, for

reasonable fact finding, to “guarantee” tax dollars will not be wasted. The government by not piloting, is asking the tax payer to accept a 80/20 concept, and urban planning needs to be 99%,... at least. Not piloting this plan, turns it into a huge “social experiment” with the economic and social risks to the entire city, and future Canadians. Is this fair of City Planning? Or is this “slash and burn” development?

Question one for City Staff

Does not piloting this Missing Middle, put any failed economic and social costs at the risk of the tax payer, unduly? Has any other major City Plan every been not piloted?

Question two for City Staff

If the Missing Middle Plan fails and millions of tax dollars are wasted, can the citizens sue Vancouver CITY HALL and BC Provincial government? Can non-Indigenous Vancouverites also sue the Indigenous who have signed onto the responsibility of Vancouver City with VANDRIP if the Missing Middle fails?

D = KEEP SINGLE FAMILY HOME OR SINGLE DETACHED HOME NAME

1 d ) . I would like the Missing Middle Plan to keep the term Single Detached Home – i.e. Single Family Home for consistency, in that “everyday people” know what Single Family Homes and communities are, whereby keeping this terminology on Housing and K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 8 of 11

Density is straightforward / simple / standard / historically consistent / understandable, language, moving forwards, showing the Government and Developers can be “trusted” and second, will probably create more “support” and collaboration and constructive dialogue for all density moving forwards.

2 d) I think any good Urban Plan does not need to “change terms” to “win” the conversation or consent or community support for more density. The ideas of the plan itself, not

how the plan is “languaged”, should create “buy in” from Vancouverites.

3 d ) In fact, by changing terms- by removing Single Detached Home, may bring a lot more density development “resistance” from the public, because “everyday people” may feel, the City is playing “word games”,- ie Political Correctness, to manipulate the matter towards “forced” agreement, in this case, instant massive density as automatically good. Rather, I suggest, A good density plan, of which the Missing Middle Plan is not, sells itself, not because of the language, but because of the substantive common sense workable achievable ideas work in real space with real everyday people.

E = DO NOT COMBINE ALL CITY ZONES INTO ONE ZONE

1 e ) I do not like the idea of harmonizing all the RS 1 zones, into one zone – ie Residential Inclusive, because, it seems like removing the democratic process of citizen and residents involvement in housing density Public Meetings, or city hall engagement. If so, this may reduce public support for any density plans moving forwards, whereby we need more public support of density, . A good density plan invites more citizenry discussion, not less.

2 e ) Rezoning, consolidating zoning, changing housing terms, will not create the best density Plan. ....creating the best density plan, will create the best density plan.

Questions for City Staff

Will removing all the RS – 1, increase the development of more “aesthetic” designs of Multiplexes or not build more ugly mass produced sterile clinical glass and steel Condo Towers in Vancouver's residential areas? If not, I disagree with removing RS- 1 zones.

Will removing the RS – 1 zones, also remove the important aesthetic of “mixed architecture design and styles” in mixed zoning of RS- 1 areas? If so, I disagree with removing RS- 1 .

## F = A GREAT DENSITY PLAN SHOULD LOWER PROPERTY TAX

Question for Staff and Mayor and City Council

1 f ) Will the Missing Middle promote decreasing all residential property tax to a fair amount of 5 or 6 percent per year? Why not? If not, can the City develop a Housing Density Plan that actually reduces property tax? If the Missing Middle Plan, increases residential property tax, I disagree with the Missing Middle Plan.

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 9 of 11

## G = MISSING MIDDLE WILL NOT INCREASE RENTAL STOCK

1 g ) I disagree with the suggestion that the Missing Middle Plan offers.....”Secured market rental’ – ie the Missing Middle will help the renting crisis, because banning all Air B and B in Vancouver will provide way more rentals – i,e 4000 plus, than this Missing Middle Plan. Further, realistically, with these Multiplexes being Strata, my guess is more people will be owners than renters.

Question for City Staff

How many of these Multiplexes will actually be rentals....100...200...1000? Probably not many. I want way more rentals and affordable rentals in every city plan,moving forwards. Thus, I greatly disagree with this Missing Middle plan, and request it be entirely scrapped.

## H = MISSING MIDDLE WILL INSTANTLY DRIVE UP HOUSING PRICES

If this Multiplex/ Duplex /Town Home on each SFH lot with 6 units, actually makes each unit worth

more than 1 million, then every Single Family Home lot across the city will be instantly worth 6 million or 8 or even 12 million if every unit becomes worth 2 million. This is actually very possible.

#### Question 1 for City Staff

If some single SFH lots are now worth 6 to 12 million dollars because they are rezoned as Multiplexes, how many other SFH lots will then start selling their lots for 6 to 10 to 12 million dollars? If many, then this Missing Middle Plan is incorrect, and must be scrapped entirely.

#### Question 2 for City Staff

If all Single Family Home lots are now worth 6 million at least and up to 12 million per lot, how many middle income persons owning Single Family Home lots will now be able to afford taxes on 6 million to 12 million dollar lot? If not many, then this Missing Middle Plan is incorrect, and must be scrapped entirely.

#### I = WHAT ABOUT SEWERS AND ELECTRICITY FOR THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN

##### Question for City Staff

Who will pay for all the upgrades to sewers and electrical for these new Multiplexes? Can city Staff do a cost analysis of all the city sewer and infrastructure upgrades before passing the Missing Middle Plan? I disagree with a CITY WIDE infrastructure upgrade for just a few 1000 Multiplexes, when we should be upgrading our infrastructure for strategic Condo Tower developments.

#### J = WILL THE MISSING MIDDLE MULTIPLEX UNITS BE GOOD FOR FAMILIES

##### Question for City Staff

There is a large shortage of Multiplexes with three bedrooms for families > Why is this? Is Vancouver City Hall and the CITY STAFF anti- family? Is the Missing Middle being made for rich international students or single or two people only?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7,

2023 p 10 of 11

In SUMMARY

Please make the necessary amendments to the Missing Middle Plan, especially having 1 to 1 car parking and not remove many trees, or scrap the Missing Middle Plan. If piloted, please only try AREA – C, but with 1 to 1 car parking and not remove many trees. For me, we already have the Broadway Plan, Vancouver Plan, Senakw, Jericho Lands, on the table...so adding this clearly flawed plan too, reads as too much, especially since all the aforementioned Plans also have major structural problemaitcs to resolve.

Sincerely,

K van Drager B.F.A., M.F.A

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 11 of 11

Neighbourhood:	Fairview
----------------	----------

Subject classification:	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law
-------------------------	---

Contact information:

Phone number:

Name: K van Drager

s22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Case Summary

Case ID	201000850620
Case creation date:	9/12/2023, 10:10:33 AM
Case created by	Service Account
Channel:	WEB

### Location and request details:

Location:	none
Advised Your name and comments will be made available publicly as part of the official record for the hearing Contact information will not be made public	true
Subject (address if applicable):	1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying R
Position:	Oppose
Comments:	The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) supports increasing missing middle housing, in principle, in every neighbourhood. However, CVN has major concerns about the current proposal,

both in substance and process. We therefore cannot support this proposed rezoning without major modifications and meaningful public involvement and urge you to oppose it as presented. At the very least this should be a more limited trial and properties listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register should be exempt.

Change of approach needed: Last fall's civic election sent a clear message that the public wants a change in direction from how things were done by the previous Council. However, this proposal for multiplexes in RS zones citywide is basically the same as the motion brought forward by former mayor Kennedy Stewart last year, for multiplexes up to 6 units on a lot, which he had used as a central part of his re-election campaign. The public vote was a rejection of this approach. Not for it. While changes to RS zones could be made to simplify zoning and include multiplexes, the City should not be following Kennedy Stewart's plan.

Lack of public consultation or notice: Staff have been consulting with the development industry on this topic for over a year and a half, but only consulting with the public in a limited number of open houses and a flawed survey conducted for just a month, before finalizing the options. The public has not received enough detail, information, or opportunities for meaningful input into the proposals. The public survey was flawed and cannot be reliably viewed by Council as public feedback. Many people refused to fill it out as it was so biased. The tens of thousands of affected properties have not been notified of the public hearing by postcard or other effective means. Very little advertizing the first week of September means most people who might be concerned or impacted are unaware of or unable to attend the afternoon Public Hearing.

Attached is an Appendix with just some of the many comments, concerns and questions that have been raised by our network that have yet to be addressed.

Sincerely,  
Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Arbutus Ridge Community Association  
Arbutus Ridge/ Kerrisdale/ Shaughnessy Visions  
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours  
Dunbar Residents Association  
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee  
Grandview Woodland Area Council  
Greater Yaletown Community Association  
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association  
Kits Point Residents Association  
Marpole Residents Coalition  
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association  
Oakridge Langara Area Residents  
Residents Association Mount Pleasant  
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  
West Southland Residents Association

#### APPENDIX - RS Rezoning and Multiplex Public Hearing (September 11, 2023)

Below are just some of the many unaddressed comments, concerns and questions we have about the proposals:

Lack of planning and resources for amenities and infrastructure for growth: Of particular concern is the lack of neighbourhood-based planning for adequate amenities and infrastructure for approved growth. The accumulative affects of multiplexes will be substantial, so therefore it is critical that

planning includes the resources for schools, health care, daycare, community facilities, amenities and infrastructure in every neighbourhood. As we know CACs and DCLs do not begin to cover these costs for growth and there is no reason to believe that new additional proposed CACs will be any different. Many neighbourhoods are already underserved for amenities and infrastructure.

Basic electrical and sewer infrastructure insufficient: Requiring every RS lot to have its own electrical transformer (PMT) with a 12 ft x 12 ft easement at the lane and a huge underground water holding tank to prevent overflowing the sewer system illustrates how the current proposal is beyond the capacity of city infrastructure. These costs of approximately \$100,000 for a transformer PMT and \$25,000 for a water tank are prohibitive, as well as taking up valuable land area that makes this unfeasible.

Loss of existing affordable rental suites: The RS zones currently have a very large number of rental suites, as well as whole houses that are rented, that would be lost through this initiative.

Why rezone 60,000 RS lots for up to 6 units each when the target is only 10,000 more units?: Rather than completely overloading the city's infrastructure, the city should take a more targeted approach. Look at how each neighbourhood can take their fair share of the 10,000 unit target and ensure that it is done in parallel with the required infrastructure. Note that the 10,000 unit target is for all missing middle units, not just multiplexes, including duplexes, suites, infill and character house retention incentive projects.

A more selective approach could produce more units while putting less pressure on services and land values: At an average of only one added unit per lot that could produce 60,000 units. For example, by making multiplexes a bit more moderate, it could actually be easier to build while not undermining the other opportunities such as for more suites, character house retention incentives, or overloading services.

For example, allowing multiplexes at up to 0.85 FSR for 3 units on standard 33'x120' lots, 4 units on 50'x120' lots and 6 units on corners with 60' or more width would provide for bigger family units, more yard, trees and permeability, and a better fit for services.

Properties listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register should be exempted: To be consistent with Heritage retention policies, increasing development pressure from multiplexes should be avoided. Instead, properties listed on the Heritage register can increase development through retention incentives in a Heritage Retention Agreement (HRA).

Undermining character retention incentives - 0.85 FSR vs 1.0 FSR: The current character house retention incentives of 0.85 FSR would be undermined by allowing 1.0 FSR for multiplexes. This will lead to more demolition and lost rental affordability. The retention incentives need to be more than new construction or they will not work. This is unbalanced as proposed.

Existing character house retention incentives should remain at 0.75 FSR rather than reducing to 0.65 FSR as proposed: The proposed reduced sizes of new houses to 0.6 FSR with increased laneway house is reasonable. While avoiding very big new houses is a good idea, the existing incentives for character house retention of 0.75 FSR should not be lowered to 0.65 FSR which is inadequate.

Undermining climate policy objectives for more trees and less embodied carbon: To meet climate objectives, the need for growth should be balanced with climate objectives to increase the tree canopy. Current proposals of 1.0 FSR will leave little yard space for retaining existing trees or planting new. The higher the new FSR and larger site coverage, the more embodied carbon is produced to build a bigger building and more demolition.

Minimum unit sizes and bedroom sizes should be specified: Multiplexes in other areas have shown that some bedrooms are only 7'x8' and some units too small for families so minimum sizes are required.

Lack of data for planning: City Council and the public continue to lack the much-needed data to determine how many units are actually required for anticipated growth in our communities. Also needed is data on how many units have already been planned or approved broken down by neighbourhood and how much impact that will have on services. This data should also inform how

multiplexes are implemented.

Reduced front yard setbacks: Almost no front yards or permeable surfaces are proposed with little green space provided. Loss of trees, even large street trees where front yard setbacks are so narrow that it isn't enough room for root systems. Instead, front yards should be retained to provide for outside space for the ground floor or front unit, to avoid putting all the outdoor space in the rear yard with little privacy between units. Front yards should continue to be a factor of the depth of the lot, as well as consideration of adjacent properties and streetscapes. Where front yards are reduced, consider stepping back the second floor to avoid cutting off all light to adjacent properties. It is unclear in the presentation materials what the proposed front yard setback would be.

Combining RS Zones: While there may be some rationale for simplifying and combining some RS zones, some zones such as RS3 and RS3A were specifically designed for the existing lot sizes, configurations and building forms of the area. These should be treated differently and retained. There should be some consideration of local area conditions and influences.

Design Guidelines should be retained and improved: The Design Guidelines help to clarify the intent of the zoning and provide important guidance to designers, builders and staff. Having this level of clarity actually helps to speed up approvals rather than leaving it open to misinterpretation that requires many revisions. To remove Design Guidelines is not practical and makes the zoning less transparent.

No required onsite parking or EV charging: No required onsite parking for up to 6 units, will overload street parking and not have electric car charging that is a disincentive to convert to an EV.

Require all new single family houses to have a secondary suite: There is no reason to be building new houses without at least one secondary suite to help offset the many suites that will be lost through demolition.

Allow 2 secondary suites through the Secondary Suite Program: Traditionally, it is common to find houses made up of 3 suites, ground level, main floor and top floor suites. Usually at least one of these suites are unauthorized. Rather than shutting down good suites, they could be legalized and made safe through the Secondary Suite Program. Code staff are reluctant to do so, but now even the province is incentivizing more secondary suites so this should be reconsidered through direction by Council.

Landscape irrigation should be required to ensure trees and shrubs survive: There is very little landscaping so to ensure it survives it is essential that there is irrigation, especially with multiple strata owners.

Subject classification:

PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

File upload:

[CVN Letter to Council RS Rezoning for Multiplexes 2023-09-12 final.pdf](#)

Contact information:

Name:

Steering Committee Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN)

**s22(1) Personal and Confidential**

Back

Save

# Case Summary

Case ID	201000846702
Case creation date:	9/9/2023, 6:02:09 PM
Case created by	Service Account
Channel:	WEB

## Location and request details:

Location:	none
Advised Your name and comments will be made available publicly as part of the official record for the hearing Contact information will not be made public	true
Subject (address if applicable):	Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regu
Position:	Oppose
Comments:	Dear Mayor and Council,

I am strongly opposed to the current proposal to allow multiplexes throughout Vancouver's various RS zones, Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law.

Sixty thousand properties will be directly affected by this proposal but precious little input from the owners and renters of these properties has been sought especially compared to builders and developers who have had significant ongoing opportunities to influence this plan.

Every single family lot (a misnomer) throughout the city is already zoned to allow four units (a duplex, suite and laneway house). Yet this multiplex plan for 4-6 units per lot is being pushed through and fast tracked even though it is seriously flawed and poorly thought out with far too many major concerns that have not been considered and are not even remotely close to being resolved.

The city staff report itself clearly indicates that there are many serious unresolved issues with this plan.

These unresolved issues include (among others):

- Loss of much needed tree canopy essential in the time of climate change and heat domes. Trees are also known to contribute to mental and physical health and well-being. Much needed green space/gardens will also be lost. This goes against the goal of Vancouver increasing its tree canopy.

- Insufficient infrastructure including water, sewage and power supply for all the added density. We are already short of water as drought increases with climate change. Our sewage system is long past due for an upgrade and cannot handle any more input; reducing permeable surfaces and increasing input with multiplexes will result in yet more polluting raw sewage overflow being dumped into our local waters. And each multiplex will require expensive electrical infrastructure including a 12-foot square pad for a transformer! Who will pay for that electrical servicing? Will it

be charged, unfairly, to neighbours?

- Lack of addition of new schools, parks, community centres, health care services and other amenities necessary to service the added density. These are already very strained. For example, far too many existing residents cannot even find a family doctor.
- Lack of building design criteria. I would hate to see buildings resembling the hideous uniformly blocky “monster” houses that led to design guidelines in the first place. Is it true that images and renderings to be shown at the public hearing have not yet been seen by Council and citizens and will probably not be revealed until after the public hearing speakers list has been closed, so cannot be questioned or challenged? How can council support a plan when they and the public have no clear idea of what the proposed multiplexes will look like?
- Loss of many existing and affordable secondary suites with no plan for city staff to quantify and track this loss. The whole point of the multiplex plan is to increase affordability yet it threatens to erode it for many residents.
- Lack of protection for heritage and character homes and in fact, disincentives to retain these and incentives to encourage their demolition. We must not lose Vancouver’s charm and history to this plan. Many character homes can be re-worked to include several dwelling units and this should be hugely encouraged.
- Lack of onsite parking requirements for multiplexes, including for electrical vehicles which require a place to recharge, even though city staff say there will be one new car per multiplex unit (4-6 cars per lot). Parking is already tight in many neighbourhoods. A proposal to require parking permits citywide was previously quashed because it unfairly penalized those who could least afford this.
- Collapse of all nine RS zones into just one, hugely impacting Vancouver’s cherished legacy as a city with distinct neighbourhoods. This loss of neighbourhood character was a frequent concern

noted by city staff in its limited engagement with citizens.

- Negative impacts on neighbouring houses as bigger, bulkier multiplex buildings with reduced yards and setbacks will create shadows and reduce privacy, concerns listed as a “trade-off” in a January 2023 staff presentation to Council but totally missing from the July 2023 report.
- Lack of any major contribution (if any) to affordability. The staff report indicates that multiplex sites will lead to increased land values. This will, of course, increase development pressures and reduce affordability in comparison to the existing homes that will be demolished. What is the point of subjecting Vancouverites to the above negative impacts when there is so little to be gained? Surely this is NOT what Council wants or intends.
- No pilot program to assess the impacts of this major plan even though a limited pilot program was part of previous work such as Council’s 2022 motion and the Vancouver Plan. It is irresponsible to proceed with this plan across all single family lots when its massive changes and repercussions have not been properly evaluated with a test drive. And a similar plan should not be extended to RM and other zoned areas until all the issues above and others have not been addressed.

I urge Council in the strongest possible terms to say NO to this missing middle plan as it stands and hold off on it until such time as the many issues associated with it have been resolved. These issues simply cannot be properly addressed with a hodgepodge of amendments. Send it back to the drawing board.

Once the plan has been appropriately refined to address the many concerns it raises (and after the revised plan has been subjected to full, fair and transparent public scrutiny and comment), it should then most definitely be implemented first as a limited pilot program through which any unforeseen and unintended consequences can be detected and addressed before the entire city is impacted.

	Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.  Sincerely,  Roberta Olenick Vancouver, BC
Neighbourhood:	West Point Grey
Subject classification:	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

Contact information:

s22(1) Personal and Confidential

Name: Roberta Olenick

s22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Case Summary

Case ID	201000846248
Case creation date:	9/9/2023, 12:12:29 PM
Case created by	Service Account
Channel:	WEB

### Location and request details:

Location:	none
Advised Your name and comments will be made available publicly as part of the official record for the hearing Contact information will not be made public	true
Subject (address if applicable):	Missing Middle Housing
Position:	Oppose
Comments:	I will not be in town for the public hearing[1] to consider Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations on September 14th —my plans predated staff's date selection, coming as

it does hard on the heels of back to school. This is my submission to Council.

The name of this staff initiative is often shortened to multiplexes—stands for up to four strata homes on a 10m (33 foot) lot, six on a 15m (50 foot) lot, up to eight if some of the homes are rental. Multiplex is the name I'll use below.

You may not have heard about the multiplex initiative. City staff neglected to advise any citizens except through a difficult-to-find city website[2]. Yet there are 60,000 properties affected by this initiative.

To clarify things for my simple mind and make it easy for readers to zero in on their areas of interest, I have posed pairs of truth and trust questions that Council, city staff and speakers at the public hearing may wish to consider. They are organized by general topic. Apologies to all of those whose content I have copied.

Process encompasses the ways that city staff developed the proposals before you today:

- Is it true there was, in fact, very little input from the owners and renters of 60,000 RS properties as compared to builders and developers?
- Can we trust that further citizen input will be sought before this single zone is implemented?
  
- Is it true that there will be no pilot program for this major initiative, although that was implied in previous work including Council's 2022 motion and the now-adopted Vancouver Plan?
- Can we trust that citizens will be included in any monitoring around the implementation of this programs?
  
- Is it true that staff have indicated their next steps will be to apply the multiplex concept to all of the city's duplex (RT) zones?
- Can we trust that residents in RT zones will be properly consulted as part of any proposed multiplex changes?
  
- Is it true that the multiplex proposals will lead to the loss of many existing and affordable secondary suites and that city staff are not quantifying or tracking this affordability loss?

- Can we trust this tracking will be done, and heeded?

Infrastructure includes all the stuff needed to support a community, especially as it grows:

- Is it true that this initiative comes with no new schools, parks, community centres or other community amenities?
- Can we trust that needed additions that go with more folks will be identified and completed as quickly as the new housing?
- Is it true that engineering infrastructure such as sewers and water mains is not being enlarged or increased to accommodate growth?
- Can we trust that these will be improved in a timely fashion?
- Is it true that there will be increased rainwater runoff from multiplexes resulting from increased hard surfaces, resulting in the need for \$25,000 rainwater detention tanks on most sites?
- Can we trust that the costs of these tanks will not be passed on to other city residents or businesses?
- Is it true that electrical infrastructure increases will be required for multiplexes, at an estimated cost of \$70,000 to \$150,000 per site, plus a 12 foot (3.6m) square pad for a transformer? Is it true that discussions between BC Hydro and city staff suggest some of these multiplex servicing costs will be charged to neighbours?
- Can we trust that neighbours and local businesses will be involved in decisions that may increase taxes or levies on them?
- Is it true that there will be no onsite parking requirements for multiplexes, including electrical vehicles (EVs), even though staff say there will be, on average, one new car per multiplex unit, which is 4-6 cars depending on lot size?
- Can we trust that there will be many many more public high speed charging stations so that EV owners can actually charge their vehicles?

- Can we trust that all RS zones will not now change to paid resident only parking?

Neighbourhoods were, until now, the building blocks of our city. There were 22; the Vancouver Plan proposes to reduce this to six neighbourhood “types:”

- Is it true that 22 will now become six neighbourhoods, all with the identical zoning?
- Can we trust that city staff know how to lead a real consultations with citizens around this compression in such a way as to preserve neighbourhoods?
  
- Is it true that this proposal involves collapsing nine RS residential zones into just one?
- Can we trust that this will not affect Vancouver’s legacy as a city of distinct neighbourhoods, which was a frequent concern staff noted in the (limited) engagement with citizens?
  
- Is it true that the multiplex plan will reduce incentives for retaining character and heritage homes, and encourage their demolition?
- Can we trust that the well established Character House Network will be meaningfully consulted about this?

Urban Design describes how buildings meet the street, the lane and their neighbours, including shadowing, trees, sidewalks, etc.

- Is it true that city staff’s own report[3] indicates there will be significant loss of street and onsite trees for each multiplex development?
- Can we trust that staff will require and verify that lost trees are replaced with like?
- Can we trust that staff will amend their climate emergency program to find a workable solution or compensation for climate change and heat domes arising from tree loss?
  
- Is it true that the allowable building area for existing heritage and character homes will be decreased in favour of multiplexes?
- Can we trust that Council and staff will not permit the wholesale destruction of Vancouver’s

character and heritage?

- Is it true that bigger, bulkier multiplex buildings will create shadows and reduce privacy, a concern listed as a “trade-off” in a January 2023 staff presentation to Council, but not mentioned in the July report?
- Can we trust that Council cares?

Building Design describes the details of a building design governed by its zoning.

- Is it true that multiplexes will have increased height, massing and floor space (FSR)?
- Can we trust that increased floor space and height will be modelled before this proposal is approved?
- Can we trust that these will actually be verified in the field, whereas now building inspectors trust what documents tell them but do not verify what is actually built?
  
- Is it true that staff do not know what kind of multiplex buildings will emerge under this plan? That they have no design guidelines?
- Can we trust that these new buildings will not just become “a sea of homogenized blocky buildings,” as suggested[4] by some in the housing industry?
  
- Is it true that images and renderings to be shown at the public hearing have not yet been seen by Council and citizens and will probably not be revealed until after the public hearing speakers list has been closed, so cannot be questioned or challenged?
- Can we trust that Council will insist on realistic imagery before making this decision?

Conclusions I am forced to draw:

- Is it true that after all these consultations with developers and builders, but few with ordinary citizens, staff are suggesting that multiplex sites will enjoy further increased land values, resulting in only marginal (if any) affordability improvements?

- Can we trust that this was not the intent all along?
- Is it true that multiplexes will increase development pressures, hence reduce affordability as compared to the existing homes that will be demolished?
- Can we trust that this was not Council's intent and that they will defeat this assault on our city?

[OBJ]

[1] [hxxps://council.vancouver.ca/20230914/phea20230914ag.htm](https://council.vancouver.ca/20230914/phea20230914ag.htm)

[2] [hxxps://www.shapeyourcity.ca/multiplexes](https://www.shapeyourcity.ca/multiplexes)

[3] [hxxps://council.vancouver.ca/20230725/documents/rr2.pdf](https://council.vancouver.ca/20230725/documents/rr2.pdf)

[4] [hxxps://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/vancouver/article-vancouver-ponders-plans-to-expand-multiplex-development/](https://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/vancouver/article-vancouver-ponders-plans-to-expand-multiplex-development/)

Neighbourhood:	Dunbar-Southlands
Subject classification:	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

Contact information:

Name: Brian Palmquist

**s22(1) Personal and Confidential**



## Case Summary

Case ID	201000849776
Case creation date:	9/11/2023, 4:36:41 PM
Case created by	Service Account
Channel:	WEB

### Location and request details:

Location:	none
Advised Your name and comments will be made available publicly as part of the official record for the hearing Contact information will not be made public	true
Subject (address if applicable):	Loss of green space. Still mostly unaffordable.
Position:	Oppose
Comments:	The most critical downside of this proposal is the loss of green space. For example, please have a look at the destruction / complete elimination of the tree canopy coming to a 49th and Yew

proposal in the attachments. Not one tree is proposed for the new development.

With the need for:

a) a 12 ft by 12 ft area on the property to provide the electrical transformer (because the BC Hydro grid needs serious upgrading in the lanes and there are no plans in place in the foreseeable future).

b) a bathtub in the front yard to gather water since the sewer system is seriously under-built for the new density.

there will be even less room on the property for any trees or green space. Where are the new parks and green spaces for these people to use?

I walk on green leafy streets, where there is the benefit of large shade trees and being in nature, with gardens and foliage on properties to add interest and place for animals and birds. I live in RT zoning where 4 units are the norm and building setbacks create liveable, walkable spaces. Why are these not the ideal to be achieved? If we are going to destroy these then I guess I will need to travel to more crowded green spaces as this density is built up.

2) curtailing building setbacks, further reduces the tree canopy as only pencil trees with little root systems will be possible. Will only increase the city's challenges with increased heat domes.

3) requiring no off-street parking spaces will result in fewer people taking up electric vehicles. Where are they supposed to be charged? For those no longer working and using community centres daily, are the 2 stations at a CC enough?

4) Assuming that people are taking public transit is unreasonable. With no new schools being built, parents will require cars to get their kids (up to age 11) to schools / daycares miles away. Parents will not have the time it takes for using public transit.

It takes me 1 hour to go 6 km across Vancouver and that is using Broadway, one of the busiest bus corridors. This will not be improved materially by the subway as there are 2 10 minute walks at either end, plus the wait time for bus connections.

Eliminating parking requirements will not decrease the number of vehicles.

5) the greenest building is the one already built. Why are there no incentives to retain / enhance existing character homes?

This proposed plan will undermine character house and heritage building retention incentives and should be revised to be equal to or greater than new construction to be an incentive.

Properties listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register should be exempt from new multiplexes, and instead have viable incentives for increasing density and multifamily through retention options.

For character house retention, with a renovated addition or suite, density is reduced from the current 0.75 to proposed 0.65. The current 0.75 FSR should be retained.

Character houses with infill only are at 0.85 FSR while multiplexes are proposed at 1.0 FSR. Make character house and heritage incentives equal to or greater than new construction.

6) why are all levels of government putting the cart before the horse?

No planning for required new schools, daycares, community centres, parks, increased sewer, water infrastructure, doctors, nurses, hospitals. Let alone having them under construction while we are adding thousands of people to the city. I have a friend who routinely goes to the ER as she can't get in to see the family doctor - there are never any appointments.

7) We already have the highest density of any city in Canada and only lag behind New York and San Francisco. The entire world can't live here. There is a finite carrying capacity for a constrained region in terms of water and air quality.

With the \$15-20 billion that the Iona treatment project will cost (\$12 billion estimate outdated with

skyrocketing cost increases) plus the \$20 billion or more needed for new water infrastructure) no one will be able to afford to live here when all the bills start arriving.

8) why is there no pilot project of a certain number on properties to be able to evaluate the success and tweak for improvements? It is impossible to remove things that are not working once the zoning has been changed.

Neighbourhood:	Dunbar-Southlands
Subject classification:	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

#### Contact information

Name: Oliver Prange

s22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Case Summary

Case ID:	201000852751
Case creation date:	9/13/2023, 9:17:51 AM
Case created by:	Service Account
Channel:	WEB

### Location and request details:

Location:	none
Advised: Your name and comments will be made available publicly as part of the official record for the hearing. Contact information will not be made public.	true
Subject (address if applicable):	Missing Middle Plan SEPT 14 2023 COUNCIL MEETING
Position:	Oppose
Comments:	

Dear Mayor Ken Sim and, Councillor Rebecca Bligh, Councillor Christine Boyle, Councillor Adriane Carr, Councillor Lisa Dominato, Councillor Pete Fry, Councillor Sarah Kirby-Yung, Councillor Mike Klassen, Councillor Peter Meiszner, Councillor Brian Montague, Councillor Lenny Zhou :

Re: The Referral Report July 7, 2023 on Missing Middle Plan, now discussed in CITY MEETING September 14, 2023, to which I greatly disagree with the Missing Middle Plan, because ,1) not having 1 to 1 car parking for each 6 Multiplex unit, 2) removing the Tree Canopy in large amounts, 3) changing the name of Single Detached Homes to “Residential Inclusive Homes” and making all RS- 1 zones into one zone, 4) making the Missing Middle Plan “all over”, 5) not being piloted, and, 6) driving up housing prices to 6 million per SFH lot across city, whereby I respectfully request Mayor and Council, not to pass the Missing Middle Plan

#### REFERRAL REPORT

Report Date: July 7, 2023

Contact: Theresa O’Donnell s22(1) Personal and Confidential

RTS No.: 15854

VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20

Meeting Date: July 25, 2023

TO: Vancouver City Council

FROM: General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability

SUBJECT: Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

This letter is to ask Mayor and Council, 1.) to ask City Staff the following 15 - 20 critical questions of the Missing Middle Plan Referral Report July 7, 2023 , now discussed in Council Meeting September 14, 2023, 2 ) to make 11 amendments to the Plan, and ideally, for Mayor and Council not pass the Missing Middle Plan, because it is greatly “flawed” - not enough density, “unworkable”- no car parking, “unrealistic” - removes Tree Canopy, and not the best density option, moving forwards.

This Missing Middle Plan does not have enough bang for the buck, as they say in big business: this Plan makes no 'common sense' for cars, for trees, for affordable housing.

Let's get real, EVERY City Plan should put affordable housing FRONT and CENTER. Period.  
K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 1 of 11

Ultimately and realistically, there are far better housing density plans, moving forwards, including densification of, 1.) many more main arterial streets, 2.) Downtown on Robson Street, 3) Downtown heading east along Hastings Street, 3 ) the False Creek Flats ( Main / Terminal ) and, 4 ) along South West Marine Drive heading east from Oak or Granville Street.

Ten Main Amendment request, for Mayor and Council before passing the Missing Middle Plan, are:

- 1) Can Council pass an amendment that the Tree Canopy will not be greatly nor moderately reduced by the Missing Middle – ie because the City needs to not only protect the Tree Canopy but increase it from its current 19% up to 25%?
- 2) Can the CITY directly CONSULT – i.e. LEGAL DUTY TO CONSULT ALL INDIGENOUS BASED ON THE VAN- DRIP, WHICH THE CITY SIGNED ONTO IN 2022, all Indigenous Nations associated with Vancouver – ie the x<sup>w</sup>məθk<sup>w</sup>əy<sup>ə</sup>m (Musqueam Indian Band), Sk<sup>w</sup>x<sup>w</sup>ú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) , and ask them if removing “a lot” of trees in the city is acceptable to all the animal and tree spirits and Indigenous Cultural and Indigenous Identity on this sacred land?
- 3) If the Missing Middle is passed, can council pass a motion or amendment, that Missing Middle will exclude AREA - A, ( from report) – i.e. the West Side of Vancouver, because it has more tree canopy than AREA- B ( middle Vancouver) or AREA -C, ( East Van) ?
- 4) Can Mayor and Council pass an amendments that no trees greater than 10 inch in diameter will be removed in the Missing Middle Plan?

- 5) Can Council pass a motion that the Missing Middle will be piloted in AREA – C first?
- 6) Can Council pass an amendment that the Missing Middle must have 1 to 1 car parking for every unit?
- 7) Can Council pass an amendment not to change the name of Single Detached Homes to any other name – ie Residential Inclusive homes, etc?
- 8) Can Council pass an amendment not to remove all RS – 1 zones, including not harmonizing them into one zone?
- 9) Can Council pass an amendment to ask city Staff do a cost analysis of all the city sewer and infrastructure upgrades before passing the Missing Middle Plan?
- 10) To prove that not having 1 to 1 car parking in the Missing Middle is correct, can City Staff should interview every car owner in Vancouver, to see if they will give up their cars for bicycles and Public Transit?
- 11) To make an amendment that if the Missing Middle has no car parking, it should have a price cap of \$200,000 per unit in each Multiplex in perpetuity, for seniors, students, disabled, who mostly use Public Transit and bicycle to own Multiplexes in this plan?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 2 of 11

NINE MAIN CRITIQUES OF THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN ( SEPTEMBER 14, 2023)

My critiques of the Missing Middle Plan, are as follows:

A ) = MISSING MIDDLE PLAN INCORRECTLY REMOVES CAR PARKING, WHICH SHOULD BE 1 TO 1

B ) = MISSING MIDDLE PLAN INCORECTLY REMOVES TOO MANY TRESS VIOLATING VANDRIP/ INDIGENOUS HERITAGE

C ) = WE NEED MISSING MIDDLE TO BE PILOTED

D ) = KEEP SINGLE FAMILY HOME OR SINGLE DETACHED HOME NAME

E ) = DO NOT COMBINE ALL CITY RS- 1 ZONES INTO ONE ZONE

F ) = THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN DOES NOT LOWER PROPERTY TAX,

G ) = MISSING MIDDLE WILL NOT INCREASE RENTAL STOCK MEANINGFULLY OR GREATLY

H ) = MISSING MIDDLE WILL INSTANTLY DRIVE UP HOUSING PRICES

I ) = WHAT ABOUT SEWERS AND ELECTRICITY FOR THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN

J ) = WILL THE MISSING MIDDLE MULTIPLEX UNITS BE GOOD FOR FAMILIES

A = THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN INCORRECTLY REMOVES CAR PARKING, WHICH SHOULD BE 1 TO 1, AS CAR PARKING IS AN ESSENTIAL SERVICE AND HUMAN RIGHT

#### INTRODUCTION

Not having enough car parking, or forcing residents not to own a car by not providing parking, is an immense city transit functionality problem in the making, or greatly illegal government policy or social transgression caused by “draconian” “biased” anti car government policy, by:

1. creating social and emotional harm – i.e. stress not being able to park easily coming home from work, or not to be able to drive out of the city to visit Nature,
2. reducing economic well- being for society - i.e. inhibiting inner city shopping or dissuading city

dwellers shopping in suburbia

3. removing diverse social interactions – i.e. demotivating different ethnic neighbourhoods driving by car to other different ethnic neighbourhoods to socialize

POINT OF ORDER # 1 - CARS ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO A VIBRANT CITY ECONOMY AND SOCIALLY DIVERSE INCLUSIVE EQUITABLE COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

Not having enough car parking in Vancouver is very harmful to socialization and economic strength, because :

1 a ) removes people travelling far out of the city quickly to suburbia to shop and socialize with other communities and ethnicity and cultures, which bicycles and public transit can not provide

.K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 3 of 11

2 a ) removes the important easy quick independent travel out of the city to Nature – ie Whistler, Vancouver Island, BC interior, which bicycles and public transit can not provide.

3 a ) removing cars, including the 15 minute City without car agency, is a type of siloing of social activity, confining people to their neighbourhoods, as most people will not use current Public transit since Public Transit – ie buses/ sky train are:

- 1) ugly designed – grey, blue, boring advertising
- 2) less fun than one's car- no car stereo for tunes
- 3) slow to get to work
- 4) sometimes breaks down
- 5) crowded with people
- 6) not true independence like a car
- 7) not travel directly to destination
- 8) has crime
- 9) unsafe for vulnerable persons
- 10) not good in Covid or Pandemics,

- 11) not good for shopping with groceries
- 12) not good for getting kids to school
- 13) sometimes dirty and unsanitary
- 14) not running 24 hours and built 3 or 4 times too small

4 a ) most people in Vancouver who can rent or own a \$500,000 to \$1 million dollar condo/multiplex unit in this Missing Middle Plan will be high income – ie \$ 60,000 or 70,000 plus per year, whereby most in this income bracket will drive cars, because of points in 4a

.  
5 a) most cars in 30 to 50 years will be 100% environmentally made and 100% non polluting, so, in theory, cars should be part of a future city with diverse transit options

.  
6 a ) cars help teach youth how to be responsible citizens

7 a ) cars support a huge economic industry

8 a) cars drive the economy, whereas bicycles are for recreation, a city which puts bicycles and public transit, as it stands, first, will economically and socially decline. We are already seeing a huge decline and loss of small businesses because of 1) Covid, 2) anti car policies/ not expanding bridges/.too high car parking fees reducing suburbia visiting Vancouver by car, 3) too high property taxes, 4) too high rents.

9 a) Middle Class suburbia outside of Vancouver will not give up cars for bicycles, e scooters, Public Transit as its primary mode of transit for shopping, kids to school, socializing, when driving into Vancouver in the next 100 years because Metro Vancouver – ie. suburbia – ie Richmond, Delta, Burnaby, Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, Surrey, etc, are such a large areas needing cars, and their Public Transit – sky train is built too small, not 24 hours, and not enough buses, so Vancouver needs to still facilitate car travel robustly, to promote suburbia shopping in Vancouver with their cars

K van Drager " Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking" Sept 7 2023 p 4 of11

10 a ) not having car parking, illegally socially controls who can live in a multiplex unit or condo or apartment, - i.e. the resident must either own a bicycle, be co-dependent on car sharing or use our current "substandard" "too small" Public Transit, all which is a type of political/ economic/ social control of " types of persons living in an area" akin to how Racism functioned historically in terms of "who lives where and how". As such, anti- car policies are "car racism" or "lifestyle racism".

11 a) many vulnerable persons- disabled, mental health consumers, seniors, and families, and non wealthy middle middle class benefit from cars driving them out of the city to Nature for their well being, whereby to deny this opportunity may be illegal emotional abuse and trauma to innocent vulnerable persons, especially since Grey Hound buses stopped service in all of B.C. 4 or 5 years ago.

12 a) It is illegal for the City to discriminate against Disabled, Seniors, who need cars for their enjoyment of Life, or view cars as more freedom than Public Transit, making the delimiting of car parking a huge contravening of Diversity Equity Inclusion policy

13 a) Probably not many low income bicyclist, buss users, will be buying these Missing Middle \$500,000 to \$1 million dollar multiplexes. So not having 1 to 1 car parking is incorrect, as most buyers will be wealthy and interested in cars. To prove this, the City should interview every car owner in Vancouver, to see if they will give up their car for bicycles and Public Transit for the Missing Middle Plan.

PONT OF ORDER # 2 - NOT ENOUGH CAR PARKING IN EVERY NEIGHBOURHOODS  
CREATES MANY ILLEGAL AND INCORECT SOCIAL PROBLEMS, THE FOLLOWING ARE

## FOUR QUESTIONS FOR CITY STAFF

QUESTION ONE for City Staff =What does staff think about the following inconvenience?

If a person buys a car, and already most car spots are taken on a city block, all it takes is one or two extra cars without parking space, to make it so one person, can not easily park on their block, meaning they may have to park on the next block.

First, a car parking experience after shopping or work, may increase from just 2 or 3 minutes to 5 or 10 or 20 minutes to find a parking space, this will cause undue psychological or emotional stress

Second, if a person is disabled and uses a wheelchair and has to park really far from their house, this will cause social and emotional abuse.

Third, if a person has have safety concerns walking too far from their car to home at night, this will cause emotional trauma, including gender based trauma.

QUESTION TWO for City Staff =

If a car has to park more than three blocks away from their home, then they may be late getting to work the next day, which will may lead them to be fired from their job. It is illegal for the City to design such a context?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7 2023 p 5 of 11

QUESTION THREE for City Staff =

Visitors, including close family may not be able to visit and park easily, making such family avoid visiting, which illegally reduces necessary socialization, reduces family relationships, reduces well being for home owners on the entire block. Is City Staff and Vancouver City Hall anti- family, anti socialization, anti relationships in its urban planning?

**QUESTION FOUR for City Staff =**

When people, 20 or 30 on entire block need to compete for just one or two parking spaces could cause social disturbances in the entire community causing people to Hate each other, to verbally and physically fight. This is illegal for the State to create the context for social and psychological violence. Is City Staff and Vancouver City Hall intentionally trying to create the context for hate and violence and social discord among neighbours?.

**POINT OF ORDER # 3 - GENERAL QUESTIONS TO CITY STAFF ON CAR PARKING****Question one for City Staff:**

What if some Multiplex owners want to buy a car anyways and park on the street? What will the city do if this causes a large parking problem for the entire city block? How will the City address this ? How much will this cost the city?

**Question two for City Staff:**

Does City Staff think every Vancouverite in 20 years will be riding bicycles, active transport, e scooter, riding ugly and slow public transit,...with no cars? If so, this is not in line with the current reality of high car ownership? Especially post Covid. Is the Missing Middle Plan a biased prejudicial biased anti car plan, designing a city for able bodied 'young people" only city? Is City Staff anti seniors who need cars? Is the City Staff dreaming of a city of only students with cell phones, social media, e scooter paradise? If so, this is an incorrect for Vancouver in any Plan.

**Question three for City Staff.**

Can City Staff please explain some of their current Urban planning theory which justifies, 1. removing car parking for 1000s of future Vancouver residents in multiplexes?

**Question Four for City Staff**

What if a person moves into a Multiplex, and after 2 or 5 or 10 years, needs a car, say for example they get pregnant and now are a young family and their school is really far, or they are 50 years

old when they move into a Multiplex and at 60 for health reasons, they need a car? Where will they park their car? What happens when an entire neighbourhood, has 6 or 8 or 10 Multiplexes, on each block, and then even 2 or 5 % of these really need cars in future years,.but can not buy a car? Can they sue the Government? Can City staff explain how they will mitigate this huge social problem?

#### Question Five for City Staff

Imagine driving around the city block for hours and hours not being able to park? Would this be criminal for the City to create such a emotional and psychological trauma for “hard working people who pay the taxes”?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 6 of11

#### AMMENDMENT TO MISSING MIDDLE PLAN – TO MANDATE 1 TO 1 CAR PARKING

As such, i respectfully ask, can Mayor and Council, make an amendment that the Missing Middle Plan must have 1 to 1 car parking, or not pass the Missing Middle Plan at all

B = VANCOUVER'S TREE CANOPY IS NOT DISPOSABLE, OUR TREE CANOPY IS A GREAT PART OF OUR CITY IDENTITY AND INDIGENOUS HERITAGE

#### INTRODUCTION

I recall in the 5th Estate Media 20 years ago, a wonderful news story about a tourist driving in from the airport along Oak Street and was amazed at our huge street trees – i.e. Tree Canopy.

What an amazing way to greet visitors to Vancouver, with immensely tall beautiful old growth trees.

Our trees are emblematic of the immense beauty of our city. If the Missing Middle Plan abandons the Tree Forrest Plan. I totally oppose the Missing Middle Plan, especially on the West Side of Vancouver- AREA - A, when the density reward is not worth it. The Missing Middle

Plan should not move forward with so many trees removed.

1b ) Removing any Tree canopy “aggressively” in such a mass scale of the Missing Middle Plan is immensely incorrect, as it goes against the City Tree Forest Plan and goes against VAN- UNDRIP whereby, “in theory”, today's Indigenous- ie Squamish Nation, Musqueam Indian Band. Tsleil-Waututh Nation “value” Nature and trees.

Question one for City Staff

Can the CITY directly CONSULT – IE LEGAL DUTY TO CONSULT ALL INDIGENOUS BASED ON THE VAN- UNDRIP, WHICH THE CITY SIGNED ONTO IN 2022, Indigenous Nations associated with Vancouver – ie the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam Indian Band), Sk̓wx̓wú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) and ask them if removing “many” trees in the city is acceptable ? If so, why? Can you ask the Indigenous to publicly sign onto the Missing Middle Plan saying its ok to destroy 1000s of beautiful trees?

2 b) The Tree canopy helps reduce Heat Waves and are environmentally sound.

Question two for City Staff

So is Vancouver city hall violating its commitment to Environmentalism with this Missing Middle Plan, because removing trees increases the Heat Dome and may lead to many deaths of seniors and immune compromised persons? Is this morally correct to remove so many trees given all the new data that suggest cities should INCREASE THEIR TREE CANOPY.?.

3 b) In the last 10 to 20 years, generally speaking, Vancouver has lost many trees, with a reduction from 23% to 19% in its Tree Canopy.

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 7 of 11

### Question three for City Staff

Can City Staff give an estimate of exactly how many trees will be destroyed in the Missing Middle Plan? Are we talking 1000 trees? 2000 trees? 5000 trees? 20,000 trees? 100,000 trees?

### Question four for City Staff

What sizes of trees will be destroyed? How many 30 to 40 or 50 foot mature trees will be destroyed in the Missing Middle Plan?

### AMMENDMENT TO MISSING MIDDLE PLAN – TO GREATLY PROTECT MOST TREES

Can Mayor and Council pass a motion or amendment, that all three Indigenous Nations, xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam Indian Band), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) must PUBLICLY agree AND SIGN OFF to the Missing Middle plan to remove so many trees, as part of VANDRIP, and discuss in detail for all Vancouverites, how this “illegal” mass tree destruction will be at the great expense of our tourism, culture, indigenous history, animals, insects, environmental shade, visual therapy, human connection to Nature in the city?

Can Mayor and Council pass an amendments that no trees greater than 10 inch in diameter will be removed in the Missing Middle Plan?

### C = WE NEED MISSING MIDDLE TO BE PILOTED

1c ) Missing Middle not being a piloted project is incorrect, because all major urban planning....should be “piloted”, for refining the product- i.e. plan, for due diligence, for reasonable fact finding, to “guarantee” tax dollars will not be wasted. The government by not piloting, is asking the tax payer to accept a 80/20 concept, and urban planning needs to be 99%,... at least. Not piloting this plan, turns it into a huge “social experiment” with the economic and social risks to the entire city, and future Canadians.

Is this fair of City Planning? Or is this “slash and burn” development?

Question one for City Staff

Does not piloting this Missing Middle, put any failed economic and social costs at the risk of the tax payer, unduly? Has any other major City Plan every been not piloted?

Question two for City Staff

If the Missing Middle Plan fails and millions of tax dollars are wasted, can the citizens sue Vancouver CITY HALL and BC Provincial government? Can non-Indigenous Vancouverites also sue the Indigenous who have signed onto the responsibility of Vancouver City with VANDRIP if the Missing Middle fails?

D = KEEP SINGLE FAMILY HOME OR SINGLE DETACHED HOME NAME

1 d ) . I would like the Missing Middle Plan to keep the term Single Detached Home – i.e. Single Family Home for consistency, in that “everyday people” know what Single Family Homes and communities are, whereby keeping this terminology on Housing and K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 8 of 11

Density is straightforward / simple / standard / historically consistent / understandable, language, moving forwards, showing the Government and Developers can be “trusted” and second, will probably create more “support” and collaboration and constructive dialogue for all density moving forwards.

2 d) I think any good Urban Plan does not need to “change terms” to “win” the conversation or consent or community support for more density. The ideas of the plan itself, not how the plan is “languaged”, should create “buy in” from Vancouverites.

3 d ) In fact, by changing terms- by removing Single Detached Home, may bring a lot more density development “resistance” from the public, because “everyday

people” may feel, the City is playing “word games”,- ie Political Correctness, to manipulate the matter towards “forced” agreement, in this case, instant massive density as automatically good. Rather, I suggest, A good density plan, of which the Missing Middle Plan is not, sells itself, not because of the language, but because of the substantive common sense workable achievable ideas work in real space with real everyday people.

#### E = DO NOT COMBINE ALL CITY ZONES INTO ONE ZONE

1 e ) I do not like the idea of harmonizing all the RS 1 zones, into one zone – ie Residential Inclusive, because, it seems like removing the democratic process of citizen and residents involvement in housing density Public Meetings, or city hall engagement. If so, this may reduce public support for any density plans moving forwards, whereby we need more public support of density, . A good density plan invites more citizenry discussion, not less.

2 e ) Rezoning, consolidating zoning, changing housing terms, will not create the best density Plan. ....creating the best density plan, will create the best density plan.

#### Questions for City Staff

Will removing all the RS – 1, increase the development of more “aesthetic” designs of Multiplexes or not build more ugly mass produced sterile clinical glass and steel Condo Towers in Vancouver's residential areas? If not, I disagree with removing RS- 1 zones.

Will removing the RS – 1 zones, also remove the important aesthetic of “mixed architecture design and styles” in mixed zoning of RS- 1 areas? If so, I disagree with removing RS- 1 .

#### F = A GREAT DENSITY PLAN SHOULD LOWER PROPERTY TAX

#### Question for Staff and Mayor and City Council

1 f ) Will the Missing Middle promote decreasing all residential property tax to a fair amount of 5 or 6 percent per year? Why not? If not, can the City develop a Housing Density Plan that actually reduces property tax? If the Missing Middle Plan, increases residential property tax, I disagree with the Missing Middle Plan.

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 9 of 11

G = MISSING MIDDLE WILL NOT INCREASE RENTAL STOCK

1 g ) I disagree with the suggestion that the Missing Middle Plan offers.....”Secured market rental’ – ie the Missing Middle will help the renting crisis, because banning all Air B and B in Vancouver will provide way more rentals – i,e 4000 plus, than this Missing Middle Plan. Further, realistically, with these Multiplexes being Strata, my guess is more people will be owners than renters.

Question for City Staff

How many of these Multiplexes will actually be rentals....100...200...1000? Probably not many. I want way more rentals and affordable rentals in every city plan,moving forwards. Thus, I greatly disagree with this Missing Middle plan, and request it be entirely scrapped.

H = MISSING MIDDLE WILL INSTANTLY DRIVE UP HOUSING PRICES

If this Multiplex/ Duplex /Town Home on each SFH lot with 6 units, actually makes each unit worth more than 1 million, then every Single Family Home lot across the city will be instantly worth 6 million or 8 or even 12 million if every unit becomes worth 2 million. This is actually very possible.

Question 1 for City Staff

If some single SFH lots are now worth 6 to 12 million dollars because they are rezoned as Multiplexes, how many other SFH lots will then start selling their lots for 6 to 10 to 12 million dollars? If many, then this Missing Middle Plan is incorrect, and must be scrapped entirely.

Question 2 for City Staff

If all Single Family Home lots are now worth 6 million at least and up to 12 million per lot, how many middle income persons owning Single Family Home lots will now be able to afford taxes on 6 million to 12 million dollar lot? If not many, then this Missing Middle Plan is incorrect, and must be scrapped entirely.

I = WHAT ABOUT SEWERS AND ELECTRICITY FOR THE MISSING MIDDLE PLAN

Question for City Staff

Who will pay for all the upgrades to sewers and electrical for these new Multiplexes? Can city Staff do a cost analysis of all the city sewer and infrastructure upgrades before passing the Missing Middle Plan? I disagree with a CITY WIDE infrastructure upgrade for just a few 1000 Multiplexes, when we should be upgrading our infrastructure for strategic Condo Tower developments.

J = WILL THE MISSING MIDDLE MULTIPLEX UNITS BE GOOD FOR FAMILIES

Question for City Staff

There is a large shortage of Multiplexes with three bedrooms for families > Why is this? Is Vancouver City Hall and the CITY STAFF anti- family? Is the Missing Middle being made for rich international students or single or two people only?

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 10 of 11

In SUMMARY

Please make the necessary amendments to the Missing Middle Plan, especially having 1 to 1 car parking and not remove many trees, or scrap the Missing Middle Plan. If piloted, please only try AREA – C, but with 1 to 1 car parking and not remove many trees. For me, we already have the Broadway Plan, Vancouver Plan, Senakw, Jericho Lands, on the table...so adding this clearly flawed plan too, reads as too much, especially since all the aforementioned Plans also have major structural problemaitcs to resolve.

Sincerely,

K van Drager

K van Drager “ Missing Middle should not remove trees, not remove 1 to 1 car parking” Sept 7, 2023 p 11 of 11

Neighbourhood:	Kitsilano
Subject classification:	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

### Contact information

Phone number:

Name: K van Drager

s22(1) Personal and Confidential