

**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
2023-09-14	12:08	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I am very concerned about the following issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Loss of green space and tree canopy: increase in impermeable surface area leading to more runoff: impacts on the urban heat island and air quality.</li> <li>Construction requirements will also lead to loss of street trees. Due to the lack of open space, only 1 tree per lot will be required for replacement.</li> <li>*no requirement for any on-site parking: thus overloading street parking and limiting the ability of multiplex residents to charge EV's and car share (Residents Only parking will not assist since the increase in demand will come from residents on the block)</li> <li>* lack of improvements to services: there is no accompanying plan for improvement to health care, schools, community centres, etc</li> <li>* loss of existing affordable housing, secondary suites and disincentives for rental laneway houses</li> <li>* strain on infrastructure such as electricity, sewers and water: with no plan in place to upgrade or cost estimates. Instead each multiplex will need a large rainwater retention tank in the front yard and a pad mounted electrical transformer costing about \$100,000 to \$150,000</li> <li>* no design control of the new multiplexes and the incentive to create/build monolithic buildings, devoid of character. (read - just creates financial benefits for the developers and while leaving no value for the community or residence)</li> <li>* reduction in allowable floor space for character and heritage house renovation in the RS zones thus discouraging renovation and conversion and encouraging demolition of our character and heritage houses. This is clearly a biased/unbalanced policy with the sole objective to penalise anyone wanting to protect/enhance character/historic homes &amp; buildings.</li> <li>* the implementation of this changes without any pilot testing and the opportunity to determine unintended consequences.</li> </ul>	Rick Harris	Kitsilano	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-14	12:20	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor Sim and Vancouver City Council:</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns over a few aspects of the proposed multiplex rezoning for the city of Vancouver.</p> <p>Obviously there is a need for more densification in the lower mainland if we are to accommodate newcomers, as well as those who already live here but cannot afford the current high rental and purchasing costs of housing. However, I feel that the approach to densification should be more nuanced than the blanket rezoning proposition before you.</p> <p>Here is a brief list of concerns and recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There need to be more incentives to retain heritage buildings and streetscapes to retain Vancouver's neighbourhood character and sense of place. Here are some specific suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-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.</li> <li>-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.</li> <li>-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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Efforts should be made to identify, protect, and retain significant heritage streetscapes and landscaping.</li> <li>3. It is imperative that greenscaping and retention of mature trees and vegetation be prioritized in any rezoning, due to the increasing detrimental effects of global warming on cities. Rising urban temperatures are exacerbated by increased built forms, pavement and hardscaping. Multiplex units should have the same setbacks as existing zoning, and the planting of shade trees and other greenscaping should be mandated as part of the rezoning permit process. Shade street tree planting should also be an imperative for the city going forward. Green verges instead of pavement should be mandated between sidewalks and curbs.</li> <li>3. Some off street parking should be mandated for multiplex units to avoid serious problems with unavailable street parking.</li> <li>4. There should be some design guidelines for multiplex units so that they blend in well with existing streetscapes and neighbourhood character.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your attention and serious consideration of these concerns.</p> <p>Sincerely, Hilary Reid Vancouver BC</p>	Hilary Reid	West Point Grey	

**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
2023-09-14	12:27	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I am very concerned about the following issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Loss of green space and tree canopy: increase in impermeable surface area leading to more runoff: impacts on the urban heat island and air quality. Construction requirements will also lead to loss of street trees. Due to the lack of open space, only 1 tree per lot will be required for replacement.</li> <li>*no requirement for any on-site parking: thus overloading street parking and limiting the ability of multiplex residents to charge EV's and car share (Residents Only parking will not assist since the increase in demand will come from residents on the block)</li> <li>* lack of improvements to services: there is no accompanying plan for improvement to health care, schools, community centers, etc</li> <li>* loss of existing affordable housing, secondary suites, and disincentives for rental laneway houses</li> <li>* strain on infrastructure such as electricity, sewers, and water: with no plan in place to upgrade or cost estimates. Instead, each multiplex will need a large rainwater retention tank in the front yard and a pad-mounted electrical transformer costing about \$100,000 to \$150,000</li> <li>* no design control of the new multiplexes and the incentive to create/build monolithic buildings, devoid of character. (read - just creates financial benefits for the developers and while leaving no value for the community or residence)</li> <li>* reduction in allowable floor space for character and heritage house renovation in the RS zones thus discouraging renovation and conversion and encouraging demolition of our character and heritage houses. This is clearly a biased/unbalanced policy with the sole objective of penalizing anyone wanting to protect/enhance character/historic homes &amp; buildings.</li> <li>* The implementation of these changes without any pilot testing and the opportunity to determine unintended consequences.</li> </ul>	Vicky Harris	Kitsilano	
2023-09-14	12:40	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>More density will make the city unliveable. Crowding, extra traffic, parking issues, pressure on aging infrastructure.</p>	Steve Hale	West Point Grey	