

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
2023-09-12	10:04	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	I do not support the city trying to eliminate and penalized single detached house new built. To increase household that can occupied a single detached house. They can have basement suite and laneway house that are not stratified.	Cecile Yuen		
				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods</p>			

2023-09-12	10:10	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods</p> <p>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</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Basic electrical and sewer infrastructure insufficient: Requiring every RS lot to have its own electrical t</p>	Steering Committee Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN)	APPENDIX A
------------	-------	---	--------	--	---	-------------------

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
2023-09-10	21:40	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>During the past 20 some years , every time a new residential building is built, it contributes to higher housing prices. Developers, Real estate agents and governments are the winners. Home owners are lured to sell single houses for better prices, even though some of the homes are pretty new. It's a huge waste of destroying these houses, also creates pollutions, damages to the environment & noises to the neighbourhood. Every month a house near you gets built, you are always living in polluted air, noises, bad traffic (due to construction vehicles). Once the multiunit homes are built, you have more neighbours moving in, you are surrounded by more noises and more traffics. The streets will be overcrowded with vehicles parked. It also adds pressure to other services such as medical & education etc. Your living stander is going downhill. But governments us expected to improve Residents standard of living. Other cities in greater Vancouver and not as crowded and expensive as Vancouver. Further east housings are even more affordable and less crowded. It should never be that whoever wants to live in Vancouver could live in Vancouver. People should live within their means. Every year Canada admits half a million new immigrants and more than half million temporary residents. Many of this newcomers also want to live in Vancouver. Even COV keeps changing rezoning, COV would never been able to supply enough housing units for the demand. The more housing units are built, the more new people want to move to Vancouver.</p>	Alice Chang	Marpole	
2023-09-12	11:10	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>The development contribution requirement (DCR) will act as a deterrent to redevelopment and drive cost of the end product higher. Making the DCR twice as much on the west side will amplify the above effect and perpetuate the west side as a single family home "desert" with few services requiring residents to drive to access services defeating the 15 minute city goal.</p>	No Name ReCollect	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
2023-09-10	17:17	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed motion on RS Rezoning for Multiplexes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal covers all RS Zones across the city, regardless of their specific requirements and character. For example, West Point Grey, in conjunction with the City, developed a Community Vision in 2010 that was to be valid for thirty years. Each neighbourhood must be consulted individually due to its particular and specific nature. • The large increase in density of population that could result from multiplexes will overwhelm the existing infrastructure, e.g. on-site parking, sewers, water supply, schools, daycare, community and recreation facilities, medical services, social services, etc. • Heritage and character houses must be retained. The blanket zoning proposed does not include provisions or incentives to encourage such retention. <p>I therefore oppose this motion, and recommend that blanket rezoning be abandoned in favour of direct consultation with the citizens in the neighbourhoods involved.</p>	William Hall	West Point Grey	
2023-09-10	13:58	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Ignores City history and Neighborhoods Plans ets. Will not provide affordable housing. Ignores honest planning of design and servicing needs (parking, rec, retail, utilities) The City's 10year plus housing needs are incorrect and over state the needs by 2.5 times. Ignores all the thousands of new approved units. Increases land speculation and decreases affordability. Ignores existing zoned capacity. Would eliminate many affordable housing units. Another political motivated stab at a larger problem mostly beyond the capacity of elected officials to manage.</p>	William O'brien	Oakridge	
2023-09-10	13:48	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I have the following concerns about the proposal before council for citywide RS rezoning. I am the owner of a duplex on 15th Avenue West.</p> <p>This seems to be an overreach without adequate citizen consultation. It has the potential to destroy neighbourhoods that have made Vancouver one of the most livable cities in the world. Specific concerns are listed by the Kitsilano Residents Association.</p>	Desmond Berghofer	Kitsilano	

2023-09-10	05:32	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>This proposal should be thrown out.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Sewer capacity must be addressed BEFORE new zoning is based on it NEVER being improved. Why has it not been? Given our droughts surely, we need to store some of the winter rain. Why not tax ppty without a working cistern? They can be retro-fitted. 2) The city needs long-term rentals that can be called 'home' (for decades). These are NOT supplied by condo owners' temporary commitments envisioned in this proposal. 3) Figure out how to force the development of multi-plex rental buildings, and zone for them. Surely, we have learned from Montreal that FORCE is necessary. What about a tax mill-rate that is lower than for personal property? Increase height limits on higher-traffic streets? Have other cities found a way to force doubling existing lot size? Reduce the required set-back from the street after all ppty sales, or on request? Disallow any rebuilding of existing rental ppty with 'other than purpose-built rental'? 4) Disallow all short-term rentals (Airbnb). These have no social 'good'. They create benefits for very few, at a cost to all the rest of us, as well as to businesses. 5) Forget the idea for a half-priced unit to be rented for a limited # of years. Developers will be salivating to 'sell' this suite to a family member to capture the 100% capital gain. No doubt they have already figured out how to get out of the rental requirement quickly. Stop trying to sell us temporary brandades. 6) Require the 1-of-4 units to be PERMANENTLY long-term rental, with no option for the owner (individual/corp/ condo) or family to occupy. This mortgage-helper would be loved by the other condo owners. 7) No requirement for per-unit parking OR BIKE storage? REALLY ? So everything for everyone is now within walking distance? 	Joan Reekie	West End	APPENDIX B
				<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			

2023-09-09	18:02	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>The city staff report itself clearly indicates that there are many serious unresolved issues with this plan.</p> <p>These unresolved issues include (among others):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	Roberta Olenick	West Point Grey
------------	-------	---	--------	--	-----------------	-----------------

				<p>citywide was previously quashed because it unfairly penalized those who could least afford this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 			
2023-09-09	13:38	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Multiplex rezoning proposal. Like the Broadway plan it will result in the demolition of the least expensive rental housing in the city, and it's replacement with more expensive, up-market new homes. It will also increase the burden on our water, sewer and electrical systems, possibly raising costs for me and my neighbours.</p> <p>Finally, having even larger buildings than the current single family homes and laneway homes will put us in the shade.</p> <p>Consider too the carbon footprint of these upmarket new homes. Can our world afford the emissions that come with production of concrete and other building materials?</p>	Ed Chessor	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-09	13:26	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>*PLEASE READ from a VOTER who supported ABC MAYOR and council!*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -do NOT reduce FSR from 0.70 to 0.60 for the MAIN dwelling on 33" lots! -on the average 33' X 122' lot will shrink my capacity to build a 2,400 sq ft house (too small for a suite) from approx -2800 Sq Ft. - will no longer be able or make sense for me to build a house with a laneway AND a suite. COUNTERPRODUCTIVE - proposed new zoning does NOT support multi generational and extended families - developers and home owners will NOT build 4 tiny dwellings on a 33' lot! - further INCREASE density around public transit hubs/stations and create walkable neighbourhoods. - STOP the attack on single family homes, a house with a suite and laneway provide yards for children/pets & 3 different income/lifestyle occupants! <p>- This is a highly flawed proposal - PLEASE go back to the drawing board...VOTERS REMEMBER!</p> <p>respectfully please stop the attack on the single family</p>	Rudy Mckitka	Marpole	
				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To clarify things for my simple mind and make it easy for readers to zero in</p>			

2023-09-09	12:12	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>Process encompasses the ways that city staff developed the proposals before you today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Infrastructure includes all the stuff needed to support a community, especially as it grows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	Brian Palmquist	Dunbar-Southlands	
------------	-------	---	--------	--	-----------------	-------------------	--

				<p>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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Neighb</p>			
2023-09-09	10:46	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Hello and thank you for this chance to give feedback on such an important issue.</p> <p>I've lived in the Glen Park neighbourhood in Vancouver since 1982, and have worked well with the city in the past on increasing density at the King Edward and Knight site, where we felt zoning needed to change to create a hub and services for the area.</p> <p>I am not against finding the best ways to increase density, but I am quite concerned about this new proposal that would probably put our heritage stock at risk, create parking problems as well as lose our arable land. We need the trees and gardens in the city to make it livable.</p> <p>I live in an area that is mostly single family housing. That being said, most of these houses are now multigenerational, or have suites in them that, in some cases, have affordable rent. These areas are already densifying!</p> <p>Our area approved a zoning change in the past that would allow multiple units on a smaller site, built to the character of the neighbourhood, and those units were selling for more than a million dollars. This is what will happen throughout the city, and it will be harder for people to find places with affordable rent.</p> <p>As much as we need to work on solving the housing crisis, please do not vote for this to happen. I love this city, with all it's character, and I don't want to see developers come in and destroy these vibrant neighbourhoods for profit ahead of livability.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Heather Imrie</p>	Heather Imrie	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
2023-09-08	18:52	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose this plan because the process makes a mockery of well-intentioned Vancouver residents, whatever their viewpoints. Its scope is significant and merits a well-publicized referendum. It does not respect the City’s own “Community Engagement Framework”, which derives from the International Association for Public Participation – see this link: https://vancouver.ca/your-government/how-we-do-community-engagement.aspx Read the 7 Core Values listed there and LAUGH hysterically. None of these have been evident in any public engagement process of the past eight years. In that time, not a single rezoning proposal has been denied; citizens’ input and preferences – and the helpful, creative, professional analyses and suggestions of experts outside the civic bureaucracy have been denigrated to the point where essential democratic processes have been subverted. Example: The Mayor’s cozy deal with the Premier to change laws so that citizens’ appeal of a decision to the Supreme Court was dis-enabled. (Democracy, anyone? Cue the HYSTERIA MACHINE). Councillors, as you endorse this sweeping proposal, why not at the same time tell the truth? As you inevitably endorse this staff report, you could also issue a public statement made aloud in Council chambers as your decision is announced. It might run like this: “This Council will do anything and everything to see that more housing is built, as guided and directed by the City Planning Department. We assert that Planning Staff are the qualified professionals who should design our community structures, and we therefore defer to them in all matters. Regrettably, the Vancouver Charter requires public hearings related to zoning changes, but we hope that will change soon. Meanwhile, we will continue to reduce time allotments for citizen speakers and to confuse all residents with short and inadequate notice of policy changes, with inadequate or inaccurate visuals and reports, and with cheerful ignorance of community needs such as infrastructure, schools, recreation such as this one.”</p>	Kelly Talayco		

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	14:51	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Good day, Mayor and Council [our municipal stewards of the City]</p> <p>I provided input awhile ago, and received notice that the multiplex and linked proposals would be considered by Council next Thursday. I am therefore forwarding these comments and the attachment previously submitted. I hope you do have a chance to read/consider. I'm born and raised in Vancouver, 76 years of age in a single family home in East Vanc.</p> <p>I'm against the proposal for many reasons, as noted in this note and in the attachment.</p> <p>My hope is that you defer a decision on this proposal, monitor carefully in the next 2 or 3 years how Vancouver digests what is already in the pipeline, measure impacts on infrastructure, especially schools, hospitals, traffic, sewer and water processing. One of the options initially considered was to proceed with more development in RS zoned areas on a pilot basis. That apparently was shelved because it would have been an inefficient way to proceed. But please remember that we residents in single family RS areas who don't have a profit motive, would like to see any changes made with care, and made without turning over most of the decision-making to developers. Unfortunately various levels of government allowed speculation in property to play a major role in fueling the huge increases in price over the last 10 years - and there is the real danger that changes aimed at adding missing middle housing will continue speculation on a large scale</p> <p>Just based on the amount of documentation being presented, and the detail contained, it appears that the decision to proceed is already quite far along, but hopefully there are still open minds. While the Vancouver Plan might be providing the impetus for this, cannot densification for neighbourhood 'hubs' be achieved by focusing on arterial routes and transit lines?</p> <p>Again, respectfully submitted - Ken Anderson [please see attachment]</p>	Kenneth Anderson	Renfrew-Collingwood	APPENDIX C
2023-09-11	20:37	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Such sweeping zoning changes is sure to have negative consequences -- different in different parts of the City. The impact on property values is not well understood, not is the impact on infrastructure -- water, sewers, tree cover, traffic, etc.</p> <p>This zoning proposal needs a great deal more thought and should be introduced in a few areas so the impacts can be carefully assessed before it is applied more broadly.</p>	Kathleen Bigsby	Kerrisdale	

2023-09-11	20:58	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	I live in a triplex in an upzoned area of Kitsilano. I strongly oppose implementing the Missing Middle plan because it is being rushed, has serious infrastructure, environmental and livability impacts, and will INCREASE housing costs because all land will be upzoned. Most critically, once land has been upzoned, it cannot be downzoned. We lost a lot of affordable rental basement suites and houses with rental suites when Kitsilano was rezoned. And the original purchase price of my one unit (25 years ago) equalled the land value when the property was sold as a single family dwelling. SLOW DOWN!!! This plan has significant long term infrastructure and environmental impacts that merit careful evaluation and planning.	Katherine Taylor	Kitsilano	
2023-09-11	21:14	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	The proponents claim that this will house more people because there are more units. It's rarely the case. Eg. I own an old rental house with an infill small house on the property. 12 people in total live there. 10 adults and 2 children. If this was knocked down and 6 units constructed, I doubt if there would be 12 people living there. And I can guaranty that they would pay 3 times what my tenants pay in rent.	Kim Read	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2023-09-11	21:15	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>The decision to reduce the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) from 0.70 to 0.60 for new single-family homes carries significant and enduring consequences that require thoughtful consideration. This choice becomes permanent once construction is completed, making it imperative to carefully evaluate the potential impacts. The 0.85 FSR should allow homeowners the autonomy to choose between a 0.70 FSR (with a 0.15 laneway) or a 0.60 FSR (with a 0.25 laneway). The repercussions of lowering the FSR from 0.70 to 0.60 are multifaceted:</p> <p>Impact on Rental Housing: A reduction in FSR may discourage homeowners from building secondary suites, which contribute to the rental housing supply. On a standard lot, this reduction would equate to 4,026 square feet x 0.10 FSR = 400 square feet, a size comparable to some condos. These secondary units cater to the housing needs of students, singles, and young couples working or studying in Vancouver. Limiting this housing stock may force these potential renters to seek housing elsewhere, further exacerbating the demand-supply imbalance in Vancouver's housing market.</p> <p>Family Flexibility: Homeowners' family circumstances vary widely, necessitating the flexibility and space to accommodate their unique needs. A higher FSR of 0.70 provides more room to adapt to changing family dynamics, such as accommodating elderly parents requiring in-home care within the primary residence and not the laneway house.</p> <p>Additionally, there are multi-generational families cohabiting in the same space. The reduction of 400 square feet in the main house may result in the loss of up to four bedrooms, assuming they are each 10 feet x 10 feet. This has a profound impact as it eliminates space for four separate individuals/children or potentially couples if they are sharing a room, such as grandparents.</p>	Danny Loo		APPENDIX D

				<p>Long-Term Livability: Reducing the FSR could compromise the long-term livability of homes, potentially limiting their functionality and adaptability. A more generous FSR preserves the ability to create versatile living spaces that can evolve with homeowners' needs over time. Given that life changes are inevitable, providing adequate housing and adaptable living spaces is essential for residents. Vancouver faces constraints in this regard, and limiting FSR could exacerbate these challenges. We all know that a house may be sold to another family in the future. The larger the space, the more flexibility there is to the incoming family.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is imperative to carefully weigh the consequences of reducing the FSR for new single-family homes. Balancing the need for responsible development with the need for flexibility, housing diversity, and long-term livability is essential for our city's continued growth and prosperity. We must consider the broader impact on rental housing, family dynamics, and residents' quality of life when making decisions of this magnitude.</p>			
2023-09-11	21:15	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I absolutely oppose the revised density proposal thus allowing 6 families to occupy an entire single dwelling residence.</p> <p>The parking situation is already bad enough in this city and allowing such an increase in densification such as would exacerbate an already bad situation.</p> <p>The city has not consulted with the residents of this city to the point where a final conclusion can be made.</p> <p>The residents of this Vancouver must have the final say as to what actually happens NOT DEVELOPERS.</p> <p>JOHN LYNCH</p>	John Lynch	Arbutus Ridge	
				<p>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.</p> <p>With the need for:</p> <p>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).</p> <p>b) a bathtub in the front yard to gather water since the sewer system is seriously under-built for the new density.</p> <p>there will be even less room on the property for any trees or green space.</p>			

2023-09-11	16:36	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Where are the new parks and green spaces for these people to use?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Eliminating parking requirements will not decrease the number of vehicles.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6) why are all levels of government putting the cart before the horse?</p> <p>No planning for required new schools, daycares, community centres, parks,</p>	Oliver Prange	Dunbar-Southlands
------------	-------	---	--------	---	---------------	-------------------

				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 h</p>			
2023-09-11	15:54	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I support some densification in single detached home neighbourhoods such as duplexes, triplexes, and even quadplexes on a single lot as long as there is a requirement for off street parking. People still need a personal vehicle for all kinds of reasons. Also, the hydro-electric needs of new denser homes should be met first. I support a trial of the new proposal somewhere before you make it law.</p>	Bruni Goodson	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-11	21:32	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I strongly urge you to SLOW DOWN and DEFER approving the Missing Middle plan because there are several critical flaws in this plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has profound, irreversible, city wide impacts on community infrastructure, environmental sustainability, and livability - all things that are critically important to Vancouver residents, including the "missing middle" - and which this plan has entirely failed to recognize or address. 2. There is absolutely NOTHING in this plan that will address affordability: I live in a triplex in an upzoned area of Kitsilano. Property values spiked as a result of upzoning - the 1997 purchase price of my one unit equalled the total property value when the entire property was sold a year earlier. In my neighbourhood, we lost a lot of affordable rental basement suites and houses with multiple rental suites when Kitsilano was rezoned. 3. Once property has been upzoned, it cannot be downzoned. This plan is so disturbingly ill-conceived and implemented that it bears comparison with the corrupt developer driven housing scandal in Toronto. <p>In my view, this Council has violated the trust of voters and citizens and is destroying years of work in creating a uniquely livable city.</p>	Katherine Taylor		

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
2023-09-11	21:38	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I am absolutely opposed to the proposed rezoning and heritage for the city of Vancouver. This city is already overcrowded and we don't need res1 houses being renovated to the point where it can be subdivided to where six families or resident can be accommodated.</p> <p>Also this will cause havoc with parking as it is already bad enough and to increase the densification of residents will severely acerbate an already bad situation which maxed out.</p> <p>The city has not given adequate warning and has only consulted with developers not the residents of Vancouver. Which should not be the case as this decision should be made by them not developers.</p> <p>I call upon the Vancouver City Council return this matter to the residents by plebicite.</p> <p>Yours Truly</p> <p>John Lynch</p>	John Lynch	Arbutus Ridge	
2023-09-11	15:17	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Reducing FSR for single family homes will reduce the number of secondary suites available. We need to increase density instead of decreasing it. Keep the current allowable FSR to 0.7 for single family homes or even better increase it. We need to allow for flexibility and adaptability for the future.</p>	Theresa Shao Xia Tsang		

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
2023-09-11	14:45	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>1. **Overdevelopment in Vancouver:** Vancouver is known for its natural beauty and green spaces. The construction of a large multiplex might contribute to overdevelopment and the loss of these cherished qualities. Preserving the city's unique character should be a priority.</p> <p>2. **Traffic and Infrastructure:** Vancouver already struggles with traffic congestion and strained infrastructure. A multiplex is likely to exacerbate these issues, requiring additional investments in transportation and infrastructure improvements that might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>3. **Environmental Sustainability:** Vancouver prides itself on being a green and environmentally conscious city. The environmental impact of constructing and operating a multiplex, including energy consumption and waste generation, should be thoroughly evaluated, and sustainable alternatives considered.</p> <p>In summary, opposition to the City of Vancouver's multiplex proposal should focus on how the project may negatively impact Vancouver's unique characteristics, exacerbate existing issues, divert resources from more pressing needs like transportation, and potentially harm the environment.</p>	Jakob M	Victoria-Fraserview	
2023-09-12	09:20	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I feel The proposed increased density plan for middle income housing is short sighted and putting the cart before the horse.</p> <p>Without a complete overhaul of vancouver's planning department any additions or new units built on the 60,000 lots as proposed will clog up the already clogged up planning department to the point of no units being built! It already takes upto 2 years plus to receive planning permission and permits to get building!</p> <p>Once vancouver's planning dept has been completely overhauled then city council can begin talks of adding additional unit for middle income housing</p>	Bonnie Spence	Kitsilano	
2023-09-11	14:10	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I am against the rezoning bylaws. I do support increasing density near transit hubs but not a citywide rezoning. The character of neighborhoods will change ie going from a quiet family area to a far more chaotic environment. Basic services such as infrastructure can not handle the increase in density- it is an already strained system with stormwater mixing with waste water. Street parking, especially since no parking is being mandated will become a huge concern. It is already a concern with people using buckets/cones, fake signs, parking to close to curbs and stops signs to the ever increasing parking behind driveways that block residents due to new lanehouses. New bylaw and parking enforcement officers will be needed as they can not attend to the flood of issues that will happen via 311.</p>	Carol Jones	Sunset	

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
2023-09-11	10:32	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	So-called "densification" is not a solution to the deteriorating quality of life, and increasing cost, of living in Vancouver. The solution requires only that politicians have the courage to state the truth. That s, Vancouver is not unaffordable. That is obvious from the fact that sales and prices persist at records levels. Vancouver is expensive, not unaffordable. The next fact is that if people cant afford to live here they simply have to live where they can afford to do so. We do not need more people and certainly not more people who can't afford to live here. While these facts may not be popular with people who want to live here but can't afford to do so, the responsibility of municipal government is to current residents. Remember, non-residents not only don't pay taxes here, they don't vote.	Doug Lahay	Shaughnessy	
2023-09-12	09:49	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	We are opposed for the following reasons: 1. Loss of tree canopy, permeable year surfaces; 2. Lack of infrastructure: sewers, off-street parking, water supply, electrical grid, Schools, Daycares, Community and Recreation facilities, Medical facilities (already overcrowded) 3. This will destroy neighbourhood character	Mary Jane Garvin	Kitsilano	

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
2023-09-12	09:55	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor Sim and Council,</p> <p>Everyone recognizes the housing challenges in Canada's largest cities and the impact this has on so many families. From a personal perspective, my two sons have moved to Montreal and Winnipeg where rent and housing is more affordable. They both greatly regret that they will never be able to move "home" and be near their parents.</p> <p>But multiplexes in RS zones are not a solution to anyone except those who gain from selling their single family homes and the developers reaping the profits from them.</p> <p>The City seems to think multiplexes are the solution but there are far too many unknowns, including the "unknown knowns" to quote Rumsfeld (the things you think you know, that it turns out you did not).</p> <p>At the very least, we need to see whether this might work by developing and thoroughly studying several small pilot projects. These projects need to evaluate the price of the new homes, the temperature gradient from loss of green canopy, the stress on the sewage, water, and hydro system, the impact on transit, parking, walkability and other factors such as quality of life. Small pilot projects cannot provide complete data but would give some data for modelling and extrapolation, without irrevocable destruction of large areas of single family homes.</p> <p>My second point is that the greenest solution is the housing that already exists. Why does the city continue to allow well built and maintained older homes to be destroyed in favour of much larger replacements, so many of which (on my street) remain empty? Case in point: The immaculately maintained, up-to-code, 3 bd 1927 house next door to me, with a productive garden and lush animal habitat, once held a family of 4 plus a suite for two more. It was knocked down and replaced by a massive, shoddily built structure which with no garden, no animal habitat, and grass that is now kept green by sprinklers, rather than trees and shrubs. Three people live there. If the city can't stop, or even slow, the destruction of older character homes, we have little confidence that they can manage a change on the scale of multiplexes.</p> <p>Patricia Birch s22(1) Personal and Confidential</p>	Patricia Birch	Dunbar-Southlands	

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
2023-09-11	09:58	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>The "missing middle" is an affordability issue, not an issue of housing type. If multiplexes are permitted to be built, then each unit will be sold at market rate and the middle class can't buy them. When I moved into my rental in SE Vancouver 2 years ago, the assessed value of the property was \$1.75 M; now, it is \$2.5 M. If I was to buy that place, I would have to save 20% of \$750,000 = \$150,000 in two years in addition to saving up for a down payment (impossible). A family unit in an apartment or multiplex is too small for my family and we are considering leaving the City next year to buy property in a city we can afford.</p> <p>If Vancouver doesn't fix this problem, it will end up like LA, with ultra-rich celebrity enclaves, ultra-poor slums. no culture, and no middle class because they all moved away.</p> <p>I propose that these multiplexes be taken off the market and bought by the City or by BC Housing, priced at a reasonable rate, and given priority access to families.</p>	Kevin Preston	Killarney	



September 12, 2023

City of Vancouver

Dear Mayor Ken Sim and Councillors,

Re: RS Rezoning and Multiplexes Public Hearing

Public Hearing Agenda - Sept.14 at 1:00 pm: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20230914/phea20230914ag.htm>

Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20230725/documents/rr2.pdf>

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.

APPENDIX B

Single Family Home FSR Reduction

The decision to reduce the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) from 0.70 to 0.60 for new single-family homes carries significant and enduring consequences that require thoughtful consideration. This choice becomes permanent once construction is completed, making it imperative to carefully evaluate the potential impacts. The 0.85 FSR should allow homeowners the autonomy to choose between a 0.70 FSR (with a 0.15 laneway) or a 0.60 FSR (with a 0.25 laneway). The repercussions of lowering the FSR from 0.70 to 0.60 are multifaceted:

Impact on Rental Housing: A reduction in FSR may discourage homeowners from building secondary suites, which contribute to the rental housing supply. On a standard lot, this reduction would equate to $4,026 \text{ square feet} \times 0.10 \text{ FSR} = 400 \text{ square feet}$, a size comparable to some condos. These secondary units cater to the housing needs of students, singles, and young couples working or studying in Vancouver. Limiting this housing stock may force these potential renters to seek housing elsewhere, further exacerbating the demand-supply imbalance in Vancouver's housing market.

Family Flexibility: Homeowners' family circumstances vary widely, necessitating the flexibility and space to accommodate their unique needs. A higher FSR of 0.70 provides more room to adapt to changing family dynamics, such as accommodating elderly parents requiring in-home care within the primary residence and not the laneway house.

Additionally, there are multi-generational families cohabiting in the same space. The reduction of 400 square feet in the main house may result in the loss of up to four bedrooms, assuming they are each 10 feet x 10 feet. This has a profound impact as it eliminates space for four separate individuals/children or potentially couples if they are sharing a room, such as grandparents.

Long-Term Livability: Reducing the FSR could compromise the long-term livability of homes, potentially limiting their functionality and adaptability. A more generous FSR preserves the ability to create versatile living spaces that can evolve with homeowners' needs over time. Given that life changes are inevitable, providing adequate housing and adaptable living spaces is essential for residents. Vancouver faces constraints in this regard, and limiting FSR could exacerbate these challenges. We all know that a house may be sold to another family in the future. The larger the space, the more flexibility there is to the incoming family.

In conclusion, it is imperative to carefully weigh the consequences of reducing the FSR for new single-family homes. Balancing the need for responsible development with the need for flexibility, housing diversity, and long-term livability is essential for our city's continued growth and prosperity. We must consider the broader impact on rental housing, family dynamics, and residents' quality of life when making decisions of this magnitude.

APPENDIX C

July 15, updated August 3 and Sept 8 2023

To Mayor and Council: Previously to Planning Department: Comments on City of Vancouver Multiplex Proposal:

Respectfully submitted by long time resident of Vancouver, still living in a single family detached home, which is the layer of property that will be most impacted by the proposed changes:

I am in the 7% group of respondents who don't want zoning changes to permit multiplex development in all RS zones – {but perhaps along arterial roads at some time in the future.}

A. First, I don't think the City has the mandate to go forward:

There is nowhere near enough data to report that residents of the City of Vancouver have "strongly endorsed the proposal for multiplex".

- less than 1 % of the adult population provided online survey feedback 1,800 in total.
- significantly, only 644 residents currently living in RS zone detached homes provided input in the online survey. Again, that's only 1 % or less of those that will be impacted negatively by multiplex development
- the results include input from only 13 % of the majority demographic in the City, representing Asian and South Asian residents who make up perhaps 60 – 70 %?? of those living in RS areas in Vancouver.,

B. Why am I personally opposed?

1. I'm of the opinion that **development in the City is exploding and is out of control**. Context to your studies and proposals for multiplex should have been reporting of current development taking place all across the City of Vancouver. Surely in this list, which isn't exhaustive, there is accommodation for low income families, at least in rental property. And this list doesn't include all the possible accommodation for 3 families on one lot, already allowed in RS zones – a main house, suite, and laneway home:

2. Digest what's in the pipeline [see below] before multiplex:

- a) Oakridge Centre - how many total units? I recently counted 8 cranes south of the Queen E Park reservoir
- b) Jericho lands - how many total units?
- c) First nation development on Burrard, at UBC, and other locations - how many total units?
- d) Major development along Cambie corridor, Broadway, King Edward street, 33rd Avenue - # of units?
- e) Development at many strategic corner lots across the city - see Slocan and Kingsway - # of units?
- f) Developments posted along Earls, North of Kingsway, and large project in progress on North West corner
- g) Land Assembly proposals along main streets, again, across the City # of units?
- h) Recent proposal for 2 high rise towers { 35 and 37 stories} on Penticton St, fairly close to 29th Street Skytrain station - how many units? There are other land assemblies happening near transit; consistent with the Vancouver Plan

- i) "Group Home" developments planned, in progress - # of units? [probably many more needed]
- l) River District - more towers currently under construction and proposed - # of units?
- k) Holborn Development at Queen E park - **might get built this Century** - 1,400 units? Can't resist adding editorial comment about low income families who lost their homes 12+ years ago and finally pressures on developer to get stuff done. A terrible deal by a previous provincial government and just now seeing some concessions by the Malaysian company to provide social housing and other housing for low income families.
- l) Point Grey plans, and 10th Avenue development, including the empty Safeway lot - # of units?
- m) Development hopefully coming some day on the growing number of community gardens on former gas station corner sites.
- m) Very large development at Renfrew and Broadway
- n) Permits in process for laneways and suites in RS zoned areas – already increasing density in RS areas!

3. Related to the above, and, most important, how many residents will occupy the units?

I think the concerns **mentioned by respondents, about the ability of the City's infrastructure to accommodate the future pressures of multiplex activity are justified and are being underestimated by the Planning Department and Council.** Will hospitals, schools, water lines, roads, be able to deal with the population growth expected from the number of developments already contemplated – see 2 above! Hopefully there is an ongoing and objective assessment of this by the Planning Department. Again, recommend digesting current growth, before Multiplex.

4. I don't agree with linking the multiplex proposal with standardized rules, minimal reviews, and fast tracking of approvals. Maybe City staff is already overwhelmed with all the reviews already needed for the above projects and other proposals. However, the need for reviews hasn't changed; control over quality, quantity, neighborhood standards shouldn't be placed in developer's hands. **And neighbors, if multiplex becomes a reality in RS, should still be afforded the opportunity to review and see the developers' plans for a multiplex** that casts a shadow on their RS property, creates parking issues, and potentially noise and other issues.

5. Will multiplex housing help address inadequate housing, and high cost of ownership – perhaps to a small degree, but there are questions about whether or not this objective will be achieved:

{ As included in my email, here's the quote taken from a Vancouver Sun article this year commenting on the possible "...death of the single family home" and it maybe underscores the support of some for the multiplex proposal...

- Arny Wise, an urban planner and retired developer, said simply creating more supply will not bring down prices. The laws of supply and demand, he said, simply do not work in a housing market that has been co-opted by speculators, real estate investment trusts and hedge funds. }

C. Linking this proposal with the following *other issues* 'strongly supported:

- a) reducing max size for new houses
- b) increasing max size for laneway houses
- c) removing design guidelines, standard regs, and reducing # of RS zones [high on list for those contemplating development] - still disagree with this one as noted above.

Could these objectives, if they will contribute to supply of affordable homes, not be achieved on their own merit, without multiplex?

D. I'm concerned that the City isn't doing enough to leverage off existing opportunities for housing before making this incursion into largely single family areas -

1. Community garden lots. – Don't provide wealthy developers with a tax exemption as they reap huge holding gains on corner/community garden lots? I've represented before in notes to the City that a *deferral of taxes [due when the property is resold, or developed] puts the cost of holding property on the developers* – forgiveness or zero tax puts that tax burden on ordinary folks - in the millions of dollars?!

2. There may well be significantly more empty homes in the City than are being taxed.

As far as I'm aware, the 'audits' taking place are on representations made by owners. Are there any 'auditors' who travel the City looking for homes which, based on appearance, are likely vacant?

3. If it's accurately reported, allowing house sitters to help circumvent the EHT is a questionable exemption.

4. Does the following exemption you've recently granted incent developers to pre sell, to not overbuild, etc.

"On May 11, 2023, Vancouver City Council created a new exemption under the Empty Homes Tax ("EHT") for unsold inventory within new developments and kept the annual tax rate for the EHT at 3% of the home's assessed value rather than increase it to 5% as had been approved by the previous City Council in 2022.

These changes were brought forward to incentivize housing development and encourage investment within Vancouver. "

Maybe allow a special low rate perhaps, to make the burden less onerous...does the developers' unsold inventory attract full property and school taxes???

Thank you again for giving the opportunity to provide input on the multiplex proposals. I've lived in Vancouver for my whole life, now coming up to 77 years. Offshore buyers and investors have been buying up property for years, sometimes without a real commitment to the City and community. Development and making money on property might rank pretty high for this demographic so opposition to multiplex and how this would change the character of RS areas would rank correspondingly lower as a priority.

I would hope that development in the City would be driven by needs of families, especially those with children. Infrastructure, quality of life, including having green space [backyards] for kids to play in should be protected.

Regards, Ken Anderson – Resident in Renfrew Heights, previously 40+ years in Dunbar.

APPENDIX D

Single Family Home FSR Reduction

The decision to reduce the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) from 0.70 to 0.60 for new single-family homes carries significant and enduring consequences that require thoughtful consideration. This choice becomes permanent once construction is completed, making it imperative to carefully evaluate the potential impacts. The 0.85 FSR should allow homeowners the autonomy to choose between a 0.70 FSR (with a 0.15 laneway) or a 0.60 FSR (with a 0.25 laneway). The repercussions of lowering the FSR from 0.70 to 0.60 are multifaceted:

Impact on Rental Housing: A reduction in FSR may discourage homeowners from building secondary suites, which contribute to the rental housing supply. On a standard lot, this reduction would equate to $4,026 \text{ square feet} \times 0.10 \text{ FSR} = 400 \text{ square feet}$, a size comparable to some condos. These secondary units cater to the housing needs of students, singles, and young couples working or studying in Vancouver. Limiting this housing stock may force these potential renters to seek housing elsewhere, further exacerbating the demand-supply imbalance in Vancouver's housing market.

Family Flexibility: Homeowners' family circumstances vary widely, necessitating the flexibility and space to accommodate their unique needs. A higher FSR of 0.70 provides more room to adapt to changing family dynamics, such as accommodating elderly parents requiring in-home care within the primary residence and not the laneway house.

Additionally, there are multi-generational families cohabiting in the same space. The reduction of 400 square feet in the main house may result in the loss of up to four bedrooms, assuming they are each 10 feet x 10 feet. This has a profound impact as it eliminates space for four separate individuals/children or potentially couples if they are sharing a room, such as grandparents.

Long-Term Livability: Reducing the FSR could compromise the long-term livability of homes, potentially limiting their functionality and adaptability. A more generous FSR preserves the ability to create versatile living spaces that can evolve with homeowners' needs over time. Given that life changes are inevitable, providing adequate housing and adaptable living spaces is essential for residents. Vancouver faces constraints in this regard, and limiting FSR could exacerbate these challenges. We all know that a house may be sold to another family in the future. The larger the space, the more flexibility there is to the incoming family.

In conclusion, it is imperative to carefully weigh the consequences of reducing the FSR for new single-family homes. Balancing the need for responsible development with the need for flexibility, housing diversity, and long-term livability is essential for our city's continued growth and prosperity. We must consider the broader impact on rental housing, family dynamics, and residents' quality of life when making decisions of this magnitude.