

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-06	14:48	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	While adding multiplexes in single family zoned areas may be a good idea in the long run, the parking situation MUST be addressed. If there are 4 units in a 33' lot, there should be at least 4, and more properly 6 on-site parking spaces provided. Most families have 2 vehicles, and there should be provision for those vehicles OFF the street. An underground parking lot with 6 spaces makes sense. The city should be proactive on this and not wait for chaos to happen before reacting. Apartment buildings have to provide off-street parking, these multiplexes should have to do the same. Parking is already tight on our street even before this is being approved.	Margaret Cottle		
2023-09-06	14:49	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Our community is growing too quickly without enough support in service. Traffic congestion is also a serious issue.	Parry Fung	Kerrisdale	
2023-09-06	22:55	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Current infrastructure (ie, hospitals, schools, electricity, water supply etc) won't be sufficient to support proposed densification and the proposed plan is it environmentally friendly.	Tim Reiche	Kitsilano	
2023-09-07	15:44	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I was greatly concerned in recently hearing about your council's plan to reduce building FSR for single family homes in Vancouver down to 0.6 and to increase laneway houses up to 0.25.</p> <p>I have lived in Vancouver for the last 32 years and have a young family. I have plans to stay in Vancouver for the rest of my life. I am hoping to build a new home soon in Vancouver. I have a large family and we value a larger space so that we can all continue to enjoy our dream home in Vancouver. Reducing FSR to 0.6 would greatly impact this plan and staying in Vancouver would be much more difficult for us. I also know that there are many others who are in the same situation.</p> <p>Although I understand the rationale of the council to make this move, I would not agree with forcing this decision upon the residents of Vancouver unilaterally. Instead, I would request and support this as an OPTION and FLEXIBILITY for those that are interested but still allow 0.7 FSR for those that still prefer this. Allowing people to have choices and autonomy over their life plans should be of utmost importance to keep the City of Vancouver a livable city for all.</p>	Sharmistha Das	Mount Pleasant	

2023-08-24	11:25	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I support allowing multiplexes on a single lot. However, I strongly OPPOSE reducing the size of new single detached houses.</p> <p>Reducing the size of single detached houses will penalize families that require new homes to meet the needs of their families. This will push families out of Vancouver into other cities with more favorable building guidelines.</p> <p>Yes, allow multiplex options and provide FSR incentives to meet the needs of single individuals, or couples with one child and a dog. But do not reduce FSR and penalize individuals who require more space, not less, for their families, children and elderly parents who may require care in a single detached home.</p> <p>We already live in one of the most expensive cities in the world. Do not make it more difficult and less attractive for families to live and establish roots in our communities.</p>	Nelson Simoes	Kitsilano	
				<p>September 7, 2023</p> <p>Vancouver City Hall 453 West 12th Avenue Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada , V5Y 1V4</p> <p>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 :</p> <p>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</p> <p>REFERRAL REPORT Report Date: July 7, 2023 Contact: Theresa O’Donnell Contact No.: 604.673.8434 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</p>			

2023-09-08	02:18	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	<p>Oppose</p> <p>SUBJECT: Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Ten Main Amendment request, for Mayor and Council before passing the Missing Middle Plan, are:</p> <p>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%?</p> <p>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 x̣ẉməθḳẉəỵəm (Musqueam Indian Band), Sḳẉx̣ẉú7mesh (Squamish Nation), and səliłwətał (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?</p> <p>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) ?</p> <p>4) Can Mayor and Council pass an amendments that no trees greater than 10 inch in diameter will be removed in the Missing Mi</p>	K van Drager	Fairview
------------	-------	---	--	--------------	----------


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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-08	12:49	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	MY wife and I are completely opposed to this proposal, and the methods that are being used to have it approved.	No Name ReCollect	Marpole	
2023-09-08	13:34	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>There is a missing middle no doubt HOWEVER most homeowners will not want to be the ones to solve the issue for the City, why would they when there is more to loose than gain (capital gains tax financing etc). How does the City make some progress, well if the missing middle units were stratified that would help, reduce risk and financial burden and help keep the exemption for taxes. And also there would be less renters and more home owners. And some would stratify and rent but those would be financially better off owners who could afford to do so, and when they move or pass away then the new owner(s) could sell to allow lower income folks an opportunity.</p> <p>Many ways to help fill the void but just allowing density on SF lots won't work, it has not worked in any other municipality that has tried but it's good election press that never amounts to anything.</p> <p>You want solutions then strata otherwise the only people who are going to do this are developers who will buy older homes build your missing middle and sell to small REITS.</p> <p>That's my 2 cents worth.</p>	Larry Traverence	Downtown	
2023-08-22	01:35	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	This proposed change in regulation is flawed on many levels. There is more value in keeping single family homes at 0.7 FSR as it provides flexibility for quality secondary suites and multi-generational/co-living arrangements within principle dwellings. In addition, homes with larger floor space area are more adaptable for future living. Furthermore, the size discrepancy between the new 1.0 FSR multiplex and smaller 0.6 FSR single family homes will negatively affect neighbourhood streetscapes.	Tillie Kwan	Mount Pleasant	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-01	15:24	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Decrease single family new construction will significant reduce the land use for larger family. in stead, city should allow 1.0 FSR for single family new construction the same as the proposed multi-flex building. Here are the benefits to build a large single house like a 4000 sft house on a 4000sft lot:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow 2-4 rental units constructed in single family construction, creates more rental unit, easier for management then stratified muliti-plex. 2. Multiple units or one big unit in one single family house allow large family leave together and take care of each other. 3. Better usage for smaller lots like lots under 3300 sft, for example allow 2000sft lot to build 2000sft single family house, should learn from city of surrey how to build nice houses on smaller lots. <p>Last word: Please don't cut back the land use, our land is valuable asset for the People live in the city!</p>	Jing Cao	Sunset	
2023-08-24	15:33	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce basement depth from original 5' to 4' - Reduce new single family dwelling FSR from 0.7 to 0.6 	organization Wisen Design Ltd.		
2023-09-02	22:54	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposal to allow multiplexes containing 4-6 strata units and the other changes contained within this proposal. I am a 30 year old millennial born and raised in Vancouver.</p> <p>This city doesn't have the infrastructure, the hospitals, the schools, and the public amenities to accommodate all the people that will be living within the city with this change.</p> <p>I am hopeful that I'll eventually own a SFH myself in Vancouver and don't want to see it razed by activists who would be happy to be packed like sardines in small suites as long as they get to be in the city.</p> <p>Additionally, increasing supply will not bring down prices like proponents of this proposal are hoping for. It didn't happen in London, New York, or Hong Kong and it won't happen here. If you never address demand, then supply won't matter.</p> <p>I implore council to vote down this proposal and maintain the livability of this great city.</p>	Rajan Dhudwal	Sunset	

2023-09-01	14:00	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	I oppose the buildn of 6-unit "multiplexes" in RS1 and other residential zones until the issues of parking and infrastructure (water, sewers, etc.) can be addressed to the satisfaction of all residents.	Cathie Bordon	Grandview-Woodland	
2023-09-04	11:59	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	I have a problem with 4-6 strata units per single lot and 8 rental units per single lot without requiring off street parking for every unit and mandating the use of it. Planners seem to think that parking isn't required. They need to get out of the office and look at the real world. On the block where I live there are currently a duplex, 3 laneway houses and basement suite in a third of the houses on the block. There is insufficient on street parking now without increasing the number of units per single lot. Cars are already being parked illegally, i.e. in corner clearances, etc. This has created safety issues for pedestrians and drivers. Where will those in the new units park? Case in point, the house on the single lot across from mine has 5 cars parked on street. I park off street but object to the safety issues caused by the excessive on street parking.	Bill Myrtle	Hastings-Sunrise	
2023-09-04	17:59	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>RE: Vancouver’s missing, middle housing strategy</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am opposed to the above strategy as presently suggested in the recent staff report.</p> <p>Six units on 33 foot lots in Vancouver will reduce our tree cover significantly. This tree cover is essential for mitigating the effects of heat domes and higher temperatures in the city which are definitely being felt for the past few years and will increase in the future with the effects of climate change.</p> <p>These densely built units with less green space will also reduce groundwater penetration and require a great deal of infrastructure which will also strain the sewer system and hydro systems.</p> <p>Parking is already at a premium in some single-family areas especially for homes near parks, community centres, shopping areas and schools and will lead to further costs and frustration for homeowners who are living in already dense areas.</p> <p>Land prices will rise yet again allowing developers to make a fortune in the single-family areas of the city and impact the impact on the price of units will be significant. A good example of this is a recent development on the southwest corner of Larch and 33rd where units cost just under or just over \$2 million for approximately 1500 ft.²!</p> <p>This is time for a pilot project on this idea not full on acceptance until the strategy has proved itself. A pilot project is something that was suggested by</p>	Brenda Sawada	Kerrisdale	

			<p>our previous mayor.</p> <p>In my estimation it would be wiser to continue to develop on our arterial streets where larger pieces of land can be assembled to provide many homes in four to six story developments (or even taller). This is already being done around Cambie Street, Broadway and Dunbar and in many other areas of the city.</p> <p>In spite of this construction, however, sadly truly affordable housing for low and middle-class families and individuals is evading our grasp and in the meantime, we are reducing the number of affordable suites in older homes and affordable lanehouses for the elderly to age in place with their families or for rental to young working people.</p> <p>When will we get it right?</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Brenda Sawada </p>			
2023-09-05	10:52	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	<p>Oppose</p> <p>I agree with the position that more housing needs to be built to help alleviate rental and housing prices. I also support the introduction of multiplex zoning to provide options to add density. However I believe the blanket reduction of the size of single family homes goes directly against these goals.</p> <p>Single family homes do not necessarily house a single family. Many homes have suites that can be used for rental or housing multiple generations. By reducing the FSR from 0.7 to 0.6 you are effectively disincentivizing building secondary suites, which are an important aspect of providing housing density. Increasing the laneway FSR does not add housing density, it can still house only 1 family unit. Additionally you are disincentivizing building new houses in general by penalizing those that want to provide more housing but do not necessarily want to build a multiplex. This mean less energy efficient homes, less homes suitable for adapting to our changing climate.</p> <p>I propose that building a secondary suite ought to be considered when allocating FSR between the principal building and the laneway house. If an applicant is building a laneway house and a secondary suite in the principal building, the maximum FSR for the laneway house is 0.25 and the maximum FSR for the principal building is 0.7, but the combined FSR must not exceed 0.85 (or higher), for example. This is a more flexible policy than the one proposed, and takes into consideration the goals of adding more housing in the city.</p>	Sophia Xu		

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-05	14:01	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	The multiplex rezoning initiative is being put through at the expense of our supposed commitment to mitigating climate change. Tree canopy will be lost, affecting climate change and our ability to withstand increasing heat. There are better ways to increase density (multi-unit dwellings as per the Kits model). Racing into a massive undertaking like this without even doing pilot studies is not wise.	Peter Green	Kitsilano	
2023-08-24	13:45	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	RE: COV September 14th City Public Hearing on New Bylaws. I am all for supporting the missing middle and the various proposals regarding multiplex regulation. However I believe reducing the FSR for SFH from 0.70 to 0.60 is mutually exclusive topic and penalizes those who want to build a home for themselves and raise a family. They could be existing home owners who want to tear down and build a SFH with a suite and an laneway, which would mean the existing home owner could rent out the laneway and the legal suite thus accommodating the missing middle via providing rental units. I think that keeping the existing 0.70 FSR will further increase rentals as new SFH are built on top of all the other strategies. No need to punish those that have the opportunity to build a SFH in lieu of the missing middle concepts being proposed. In Vancouver when someone builds a SFH, majority of the time a legal suite is built and rented out and on the East side of Vancouver most will also build a laneway which is also rented out so I highly recommend keeping the FSR at 0.70	Vipul Pachhigar	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-06	09:51	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Dear Council Members</p> <p>I was greatly concerned in recently hearing about your council's plan to reduce building FSR for single family homes in Vancouver down to 0.6 and to increase laneway houses up to 0.25.</p> <p>I have lived in Vancouver for my whole 42 year old life thus far and I love my city. I have plans to stay in Vancouver for the rest of my life as well. I am hoping to build a new home soon in Vancouver. I have a large family and we value a larger space so that we can all continue to enjoy our dream home in Vancouver. Reducing FSR to 0.6 would greatly impact this plan and staying in Vancouver would be much more difficult for us. I also know that there are many others who are in the same situation.</p> <p>Although I understand the rationale of the council to make this move, I would not agree with forcing this decision upon the residents of Vancouver unilaterally. Instead, I would request and support this as an OPTION and FLEXIBILITY for those that are interested but still allow 0.7 FSR for those that still prefer this. Allowing people to have choices and autonomy over their life plans should be of utmost importance to keep the City of Vancouver a livable city for all.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Naveen Sandhu	Riley Park	
2023-08-14	14:27	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Changes to zoning should not allow for purpose build rentals to be demolished. The existing rental housing stock in the city needs to be preserved and any zoning changes should consider the tenants at the proposed location. Building multiplexes on these sights hurts affordability for renters</p>	Meghan Fulton	Riley Park	
2023-09-01	04:42	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I support the density increase being proposed. However, Mayor and Council should NOT polarize density advocates with single family home advocates. BOTH can co-exist. Do NOT reduce FSR for single family homes. This shouldn't be a trade-off!</p>	Peter Guo	Kerrisdale	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-28	11:33	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Parking has already become a big problem in the city.</p> <p>If anything look at redesigning the laneway homes, as a two car garage for parking and the living accommodation on top of the garage and not the current model.this is how coach home/laneway are being built in other municipalities .This will help elevate parking issues on residential streets.</p> <p>Marking homes smaller is a silly idea as ours kids can no longer afford to live in this city we need the current home size so they can afford to live and work in the city. Stop chasing the future away.</p>	Vishal Prasad	Sunset	
2023-08-28	10:40	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose to the reduction of single family dwelling from 0.70 to 0.60 FSR.</p> <p>I oppose to the reduction of detached garage size to only 2-car garage</p>	Michael Lu	I do not live in Vancouver	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-02	20:11	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I'm opposed to the back filling of Single Family Home lots to allow 6 units on a 33 x 120ft lot. I live next to a SFH with a basement suite & laneway home on a 33ft lot. The family has 4 vehicles plus have 2 additional cars from their Air B&B clients. We recently had 2 more triplex homes added on our block with additional 6 cars as they all use their garages for storage and park on the street using the lion share of the available parking for all other properties. Neighbour's are fighting with each other as to who owns the parking space belongs too as there is no room for visitors or delivery trucks to drop off packages so they block the road. Then the excess garbage because some home owners refuse to pay for a larger bin so they try to dump their garbage in my bin. The louder noise pollution, metal gates should be banned as the make loud banging noise at all times of the night. Plus with the city already imposing water restrictions for 6 months of the year adding more people will only add to the problem. Having 12 - 15 people live on tiny units will also add to the problem of not having any electric charging stations onsite and who gets to use it first when you have several electric cars all needing power to get to work.</p> <p>With little to no street parking available how will emergency vehicles respond to an emergency, with the shortage of water & electricity will be the wave of the future. Concrete is not GREEN and this plan does not fit into the cities Green Initiative and only adds to Climate Change for the worst. Having 6 units on one property will not make it affordable if they are selling for 400k each and no green space for families to relax and enjoy in. People want their own space and families with kids need backyards. Packing kids up in the car to drive to the park to play is not a great option as parents want convenience and safety which you don't get in park where folk can used their decriminalize drugs. How many community centres will be built? How many hospitals are you building? The hospitals we have are already overrun with people, what happens when the next pandemic comes. Stacking more people into tiny units is not going to solve housing affordability. Putting profit caps on greedy contractors and having rent controls will go a lot further to reduce the high costs of living in our city.</p>	Kristin Jang	South Cambie	

2023-08-30	18:35	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal in its current form. In past, zoning has provided for higher density in certain areas, with a gradual reduction in density and building height going from high density areas to single family areas. It just seems like common sense that no single family homeowner would want to look across the street at, or be overshadowed by, a high rise building. Yet there are many examples of this scenario in Vancouver today. I expect the majority of single family homeowners would prefer to keep the status quo and not have City tinkering with zoning and allowing large development projects next door to them. For the same reason I object to LARGER laneway houses. Better to focus these initiatives closer to high density areas such as around the Oakridge development or nearer to main roads. The Oakridge development, BTW, has been referred to as Vancouver’s Metrotown. This is not a compliment, it is a grotesque eyesore.</p> <p>Having 4 to 8 unit buildings mixed in randomly among single family homes will simply make our neighbourhoods ugly and unappealing. It makes more sense for these types of projects to be clustered together in designated and consistent areas, where the trend would be to replace all single family homes in favour of higher density, and homeowners would know what to expect in future.</p> <p>I also object to the idea of mass rezoning. When Vision Vancouver made sweeping zoning changes, chaos ensued with major projects underway everywhere all at once, putting strain on City resources and making the City seem like one vast construction site. Many homes along Cambie and Oak look deserted and derelict because they are waiting for development. Why is the development at Yukon and 23rd (Bloom) stagnating? Why is the Holborn Properties development on Ontario south of 33rd stagnating? So many people were thrown out of the co-op there, and for what? The lesson to be learned from this is to make changes much more gradually.</p> <p>Finally, the idea of adding “missing middle” housing baffles me. Generally speaking, new housing is more expensive than old housing. Who in the “missing middle” is going to be buying a new condo for one or two million dollars (or more)? When it comes to buying, just as a young person can seldom buy a new car and will buy a used car for financial reasons, buying older construction housing makes more financial sense than a brand-new home. People need cheaper housing, but sadly that no longer exists in Vancouver. More rental developments might help ease the crunch.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Jack Hunter Homeowner in RS-1 zone</p>	Jack Hunter	Riley Park	
------------	-------	---	--------	---	-------------	------------	--

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-14	13:36	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	This is not a good long term solution to the housing crisis. there is more value in keeping single family homes at the current 0.7 to provide those users with the flexibility to provide liveable rental and in-law units within the principle dwelling along with the space for the modern 4 person family.	Khang Nguyen	Hastings-Sunrise	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-31	18:51	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>These proposals are ill-conceived and the scope for problems easily outweighs any minor benefits. This is a scatter gun approach that City hopes might hit the mark somewhere. We already have new condos in abundance due to the last massive rezoning, and apparently the housing problem continues. None of these provide cheaper housing. So why do we need more of the same if that didn't help?</p> <p>A mass rezoning of single family areas is a very bad idea. City should rezone for higher density close to existing high density areas, rather than having random developments popping up like weeds in single family areas. This proposal is an assault on single family homeowners. Also the size of laneway houses should not be further increased anywhere.</p> <p>A recent article by Carol Volkart in the Vancouver Sun itemizes numerous problems that have been brought to light in a July 25 City staff report. These include parking problems, tree loss, infrastructure strain (roads, sewer and electrical), higher land values and speculation. If city staff present such very serious problems, why would the mayor and council proceed with such a flawed process? Is this a fait accompli and we the public are just wasting our breath?</p> <p>The purported benefit is to provide cheaper housing (the missing middle) but staff admit costs will still be out of reach of many, with a new unit estimated to cost 50% of the cost of a new single family home. That means perhaps 1.5 to 2 million, unless a family of 3 or 4 plans to cram themselves into a new one bedroom unit or something slightly bigger at a price pushing one million.</p> <p>Apparently 77% of 1895 people surveyed thought this was a good idea. I suspect that if they were fully informed on all the downsides they would have a different opinion. The survey was taken in the spring, the staff report produced in the summer. I also expect if single family homeowners were polled, City would be met with outrage and hostility on this issue.</p> <p>These are bad proposals and actually not really, it seems, any sort of actual plan. City needs to scrap it and deal with existing and planned developments as well as transportation issues. Come up with something better, please.</p> <p>Regards, D. McClelland</p>	D. McClelland		

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-31	07:06	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Development is important, but these proposal make no sense. Right now we do not have any parking, adding more places and no parking is not correct. Adding more Hydro costs is not correct. Adding more development costs is not correct either, and the time and speculation just make this city less attractive and more expensive. You should reconsider and development more density around skytrain stations and streets leading to those stations and leave the residential lots to themselves. We also need an attractive city, not total mess of ideas which benefit a few at the expense of many others.	Peter Skov	Renfrew-Collingwood	
2023-08-31	17:54	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	The multiplex zoning change reduces the amount of green space required per building lot. Front and back yard sizes are reduced compared to RS-1 zoning. Green space is important for mental health and to help keep temperatures down in urban areas. The buildings allowed in the new zoning are higher than the present zoning, which will shade surrounding properties more than is now allowed in the present zoning. Access to natural light is also a green space and mental health issue. The present council does not appear to be interested in protecting quality of life for the existing citizens of the city or for newcomers. In addition, the use of underground stormwater storage tanks adds cost and complexity to each project, rather than just following the present practice of maintaining a minimum impervious area on each site.	Mary Boulanger	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2023-08-14	18:08	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Reducing the maximum allowable FSR for single family homes makes those homes less flexible and adaptable for future living requirements. It limits and has a negative impact on multi-generational living arrangements. It reduces the size of single family homes with secondary suites. In a climate where we need more housing this proposed reduction in area makes no sense.	organization Studio Balcaen Kwan Architecture and Design	Fairview	