

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	09:40	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Missing Middle Plan that comes before you at 1 pm today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 Character houses with infill only are at 0.85 while multiplexes are proposed at 1.0 FSR. <p>There are many issues with the zoning that negatively affect livability, sustainability, and affordability.</p> <p>Some examples are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No required on-site parking that puts more pressure on street parking and undermines the shift to electric vehicles with no place to park for charging. • Loss of trees and green space, both onsite and for street trees due to reduced front yards that impacts street tree roots. • Lack of infrastructure to serve growth including sewers, water supply, electrical grid, schools, daycare, community centres, recreation facilities, medical services, social services, etc. • Impacts of new requirements for onsite underground water holding tanks and electrical transformers (PMT) required for an onsite 12 ft x 12 ft easement on each lot to mitigate lack of infrastructure. • Loss of affordable secondary suites through demolition, and with no requirement to have a suite with a new single family house. • No design guidelines for development quality and contextual design. • Development pressures on land affordability and lack of affordability of new units not much if any less than the original units demolished. 	Olivia Edwards	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
2023-09-14	10:11	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Hi I have been a builder in Vancouver since 1980. I oppose decreasing the fsr from .7 to .6 for a single family house. I also have some other suggestions. Please take a look at my petition and other suggestions how to improve your amending the zonings. I also have some support from other owners in Vancouver.	MADAN (Noni) DHIR	Renfrew-Collingwood	APPENDIX A <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

2023-09-14	10:13	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Honourable Mayor and City Councillors,</p> <p>It was with a feeling of doom that I read an email sent from a friend re your Sept 14 hearing. NOWHERE in print media was this Cityscape and life-changing Hearing mentioned. So Surreptitiousness is now the norm for running our City ? I am aghast at this blatant disregard of Common Law, and City Charter.</p> <p>When I consider the public input that was allowed for the Fraserlands development and the ongoing public input for the Jericho Lands development, and contrast this with the Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations to be considered by council at the September 14th council meeting I feel being whole-sale disenfranchised .</p> <p>The consequences of the decisions which are going to be made as a result of this meeting are staggering. 60,000 single family lots in neighborhoods across Vancouver will be impacted by rezoning to multiplexes. I learned about these changes from a friend's email today, the day before the September 14 council meeting. Where was the public notice of the proposal? Not in print media. The council changed the City charter so that it is not required any more.</p> <p>English Common Law is the basis of our democratic system. It implies that future decisions will be based on the experiences and past decisions of a community. Neighbourhood plans are developed over time in consultation with residents. Change will reflect what the community values and takes into account che character of the community.</p> <p>The arbitrary nature of the zoning revision which council puts forward is arbitrary and amounts to a cookie cutter approach to city wide housing.</p> <p>Where is a detailed discussion of infrastructure that will keep pace with such a dramatic shift in future development? What protection will there be for trees, parks and other public spaces? Where are the test developments to assess the impact on ourselves and our families? Are neighbourhood plans simply to be torn up and trashed? Who do these dramatic changes represent?</p> <p>I have some many unanswered questions and so few answers? Where is the time for consideration and debate, which characterises Democracy from Dictatorship. This is not a single project under discussion. It is by far a major part of our future as a distinctively beautiful city,</p> <p>Let's slow this runaway express train down before it's too late.</p> <p>Amy Clements <small>s22(1) Personal and Confidential</small> Vancouver.</p>	Amy Clements	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
2023-09-14	10:20	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I oppose the intent to decrease the FSR for single family dwelling to 0.6 for many reasons.</p> <p>The reduction in allowable built area to 0.6 FSR produces a smaller house compared with a multiplex at 1.0 FSR and this size discrepancy will have a negative affect on neighbourhood streetscapes</p> <p>Many households live in multi-generational and other co-living arrangements and larger homes are better equipped to support this.</p> <p>Single family residences with secondary suites would now have less area to use between the 2 dwellings (0.6 FSR for both the primary dwelling and the suite).</p> <p>Reducing maximum allowable area makes the single family housing stock built under these new rules less flexible and adaptable for future living.</p> <p>The reduction in allowable built area will negatively impact the flexibility and desirability of renovating older homes.</p> <p>The City should maintain the current buildable area for single-family homes at 0.7 FSR and allow up to 0.85 total FSR on the site if a lot includes a laneway house, with a maximum laneway FSR of 0.25. This allows for the flexibility to allocate FSR between the principal dwelling and the laneway house to suit individual homeowner's needs. From an urban planning and long term outlook for housing perspective, there is no good reason to reduce buildable area from the current standard.</p>	Bowen Xue	Renfrew-Collingwood	
2023-09-14	10:26	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>You are destroying the very reason what makes Vancouver special, livable, and draws people here. Changing the city will not solve the problem, destroy the city and people will leave and also choose not to come here. Heritage homes. Green space, single family homes is WHY people are loving Vancouver. Our water resources are already at an all time low due to the increased population, it's not all because of climate change. We don't have the infrastructure, resources, schools, roads, and the list goes on to support this change in housing. You think you will solve one problem but will create 100 more without a solution. The solution is better transportation to the vastly open and underdeveloped lands of the tri cities, Maple Ridge, Delta, Chilliwack, Abbotsford, Langley. Work on an accessible transportation platform, a rapid transport system and your problem is solved. If you read only one thing today, read this.</p>	Cassandra Ko	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
2023-09-14	10:31	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	There should be maximin flexibility to vary or exempt specific areas where existing lot sizes are the result of geography or historic factors.	Donald Paterson	Kerrisdale	
2023-09-14	10:55	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	It for sure will push up housing prices further	Apple Dexter		
2023-09-14	10:58	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Will bring air pollution noises to the entire city every day	Alice Chang		
2023-09-14	10:59	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	I have added a list of 17 comments as a file under "Add Files" I also intend to speak today.	Stuart Leslie	Dunbar-Southlands	APPENDIX B
2023-09-14	11:01	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Changing the fsr from 0.7 to 0.6 will actually remove housing for renters. With a 0.6 fsr, it is no longer feasible to have a secondary suite as you still require room for your family or in my neighborhood multigenerational families. So before you could have a single main house, secondary suite and a laneway now you will only be able to build a main house and a laneway. Sure the laneway can be bigger, but it still only houses one family.	Harvey Gill	Killarney	
2023-09-14	11:12	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Mayor Robinson said " Vancouver has to get over it's view", and that was the beginning of the destruction of our city. , All apartment blocks belong on major streets, not in residential areas, with tall buildings limited to core areas, not spread throughout the city.. Duplexes and townhouses, rowhouses with setbacks, that fit the character of the neighbourhood are welcome in lower density areas as they maintain green spaces, bring in new neighbours and maintain a feeling of small community.	Catherine Fletcher	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
2023-09-14	11:25	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I am for increasing density but an opposed to rezoning a blanket of lots for the proposed plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No parking requirement Loss of green space Lack of service improvement Reduction of current affordable secondary suites Discouraging the retention and renovation of heritage homes 	Warren Yamasaki	Kitsilano	
2023-09-14	11:25	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>SUPPORTIVE of Multiplexes but OPPOSING proposal to shrink maximum size of new and existing detached homes.</p> <p>Dear city council, I urge you to consider: Adopt multiplex policy but keep FSR for new and existing detached homes at 70%.</p> <p>Larger homes are better suited for multi-generational households and other co-living arrangements. Adult children are living longer in parents homes and enforcing smaller FSRs would punch such families, especially if existing detached homes with space to expand to max 70% FSR will not be allowed to go over 60% FSR. CoV is facing a housing crises, FSR for new and existing detached homes must remain the same or be increased along with multiplex policy adoption to resolve the crises.</p> <p>Allow two legal secondary suites per detached home instead of one legal suite per detached home. This is the opportunity to increase the housing supply for and drive lower rents in the city.</p> <p>Sincerely, V. Lovric</p>	No Name ReCollect	Hastings-Sunrise	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-14	11:30	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. 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. Here is a brief list of concerns and recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> -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. 2. Efforts should be made to identify, protect, and retain significant heritage streetscapes and landscaping. 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. 3. Some off street parking should be mandated for multiplex units to avoid serious problems with unavailable street parking. 4. There should be some design guidelines for multiplex units so that they blend in well with existing streetscapes and neighbourhood character. <p>Thank you for your attention and serious consideration of these concerns.</p> <p>Sincerely, Hilary Reid Vancouver BC</p>	Hillary Reid	West Point Grey	

2023-09-14	11:40	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>This densification plan across the city will change the character of our neighbourhoods. Trying to create affordable housing in a city where land costs are already high will not work. There are more negatives than positives which will come out of this. There will be a loss of green space and tree canopies, parking will be a huge issue, where most families have 2 vehicles, the streets will not be able to accommodate all the cars, and there's no provision for any on site parking. There will be stress on services and infrastructure (schools, parks, electricity, sewers and water. Secondary Rental Suites and Laneway rental housing will disappear. The reduction in allowable floor space for renovations will encourage more demolition of existing character and heritage houses. There is also no design control, which will significantly impact the streetscapes and neighbourhood character.</p> <p>What I have also see with duplexes, is that these do not serve families with children in the long run. I've witnessed this multiple time with the duplex next door. These have been sold multiple times, because as the families grow, more space is needed , so the owners end up selling and moving to a single family home. With this plan single family homes will start to disappear, which will force families to leave the city, so we end up with childless communities in the end</p>	Danny Scodeller	Kitsilano	
2023-09-14	11:54	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>After widespread reading and from personal experience in my neighbourhood including conversations with other residents, I must state my objections to the proposal to convert residential lots to multiplex lots throughout the city. The issues created in Norquay have yet to be addressed, and now we are voting to make those issues a citywide problem? In addition, where is the infrastructure to support this densification? And the school board is busy selling land where future schools could be built? And no designated parking? That will create neighbourhood animosities. While we need affordable housing, the lots in this city are too pricey to provide that with multiplexes. More work needs to be done by planning to create livable densified spaces. A step in the right direction was the raising of AirB&B licensing fees. Kudos to Alderman Zhou!</p> <p>On another note,</p>	Betty Kosel	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-13	15:43	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>As context for our comments, we have been renting a small 1920s house in Dunbar for over 30 years. It has provided us with affordable housing to raise our family, and as seniors we hope to age in place here. We could not afford to buy a home, including a strata or multiplex dwelling as discussed in the proposal Council is now considering.</p> <p>We strongly support the proposed reduction in the maximum size of new single detached houses, and an increase to the maximum size of new laneway houses. The construction of large, new houses in our Dunbar neighbourhood destroyed smaller, older homes which had provided functional, affordable rental options for students, seniors and families. Our</p>	Jane MacFadgen	Dunbar-Southlands	

observation is that many of the large new homes have remained empty, or house very few people.

We strongly oppose the multiplex proposal before Council. We do not in principle oppose increasing the density of low density neighbourhoods. However, density without affordability will not address the City's acute housing crisis, which is driven by the lack of affordable housing. We are concerned that this proposal could potentially exacerbate the current affordability crisis.

While the addition of multiplexes will substantially increase the density in neighbourhoods, the new housing will not address residents' need for affordable housing. Renting or buying a market multiplex unit will be beyond the means of most households, whose income falls well below BC Housing's Middle-Income Limit of \$182,870 (for units with 2 or more bedrooms).

This proposal will primarily benefit real estate industry developers, as well as the homeowners who will profit by selling their single family home to be destroyed and replaced by a multiplex. The prospect of fueling land speculation and higher land values in exchange for minimal gain in affordable housing stock is not a tradeoff which Council should be contemplating, especially in light of some of the downsides which come with increased density as outlined below:

- reduced building setbacks will have significant environmental impacts by substantially reducing the tree canopy which helps to mitigate the overheating arising from climate change;
- increasing impermeable surface areas which cannot absorb and retain rainwater, exacerbating the strain on our already stressed sewer and water infrastructure;
- tearing down existing functional housing, to be trucked to a landfill;
- the absence of onsite parking with EV charging access, compounding the pressure on street parking.

Instead of a wholesale adoption of the multiplex proposal, we recommend the City launch several "proof of concept" pilot projects which would rigorously test in real life the assumptions which underlie the multiplex proposal, before rolling it out across the board.

As others have noted, any pilot projects should evaluate the cost to buy or rent the new homes; the temperature impact from loss of green canopy; the stress on the sewage, water, and hydro infrastructure; the impact on schools, daycare, transit, parking, EV charging; and intangibles such as the impact on neighbourhood character and quality of life. These pilot projects would provide some important baseline data for reliably projecting the real-life pros, cons and impacts of increasing multiplexes in existing neighbourhoods, prior to the irrevocable destruction of large areas of tree canopy and existing housing stock.

Report date range from: 9/13/2023 3:00:00 PM to: 9/14/2023 12:00:00 PM

				Jane MacFadgen and Dale Gamble s22(1) Personal and Confidential			
2023-09-13	15:49	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Please see attached correspondence.	organization Dunbar Residents' Association	Dunbar-Southlands	<hr/> APPENDIX C

2023-09-13	17:20	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council members:</p> <p>I am writing in strong opposition to the Missing Middle Housing Plan (MHP). This plan is extremely short-sighted as it does not take into consideration that our world is changing rapidly and the effects of climate change demand resilient ways of planning cities with future generations in mind.</p> <p>The MHP does the opposite: it takes away our best tools of fighting climate change: it removes green spaces, gardens, trees of all sizes and ages and promotes covering the ground surface in concrete when we all know that green space in cities mitigate the effects of pollution. Adding green space to cities reduces a phenomenon called the urban heat island effect, which occurs when cities replace natural land cover with dense concentrations of pavement, buildings, and other surfaces that absorb and retain heat. Green spaces reduce surface temperature and create ecosystems that enable a variety of bird and insect species to thrive. This, in turn, keeps the trees healthy and increases air-purification potential.</p> <p>The City of Vancouver has a Climate Emergency Action Plan that promotes planting trees, and the well-being of all of our green spaces. We do not have enough parks for children to play or for people to enjoy being in nature. Why on earth would the City go against its own climate plan when research has confirmed that a combination of parks, random green spaces, gardens and trees are the optimal recipe for the health of both urban residents and ecosystems?</p> <p>There are other troubling aspects of the MHP. First, there was little to no public consultation. The survey the City sent out did not mention a word of what was at stake if we went ahead with the plan. It seems like the city is not interested in what the public have to say. We do need more housing, but not at the expense of the environment. We must come up with a better, longer term plan that takes both the need for affordable housing and climate change into account if we hope to build a plan for now, and for future generations.</p> <p>Please send this plan back to city staff/planners to incorporate climate concerns into the proposal. With temperatures rising around the world, we need to act quickly.</p> <p>Evelyn Jacob</p>	evelyn jacob	Kitsilano	
2023-09-13	17:30	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Vancouver has built thousands of housing units in recent years in areas such as the East Fraser lands, Cambie, Marine Drive to address housing needs.</p> <p>However this building has never met demand ("the never ending housing crisis").</p> <p>And there is not a shed of evidence it ever will, given the federal</p>	Henry Wrinch	Dunbar-Southlands	

government's decision to flood the country with 500,000+/year immigrants.

Because of this, no politician will ever say "if Canada builds 'x' number of housing units the housing crisis will end". As that would be a lie.

Instead we see statements like "we will build 'x' number of units because of the house crisis" to fool voters.

The central question then becomes who is going to provide that housing. Well Trudeau says the provinces (the businesses requesting immigrants are exempt).

Then the provinces say the municipalities.

The municipalities say neighbourhoods, but only low density ones, because residents there are all demonized as billionaires (I'm a Dunbar OAS pensioner who has to pay BC's Additional School tax) who generally make up a minority of voters, and thus easy targets for rezoning.

The Feds justify this abuse of democracy by saying Canada needs immigrants to replace retiring baby boomers.

Well there are alternatives to immigration that don't involve selective disfranchising (e.g. BC Gov at 8th & Arbutus), the conversion of 1st class farmland to housing (the Toronto Greenbelt), the killing of urban agriculture (by shading), the forcing of car-free on neighbourhoods, the reduction in water (Metro Vancouver's 2022 60% cut in lawn watering to support [13000?] new residents at Jericho), the overloading of parks like Banff...

The main alternative to immigration is automation. For example the California Public Utilities Commission issued its final approval allowing Google's Waymo and GM's Cruise driverless taxi services to operate 24/7 in the state as of August 2023.

Vancouver businesses will not be able to compete price-wise with countries that implement automation. I expect a many Vancouverites will boycott local stores because high property taxes and traffic congestion [recycling centres too] are forcing high shop prices.

Unfortunately I don't expect Trudeau to reduce immigration. He didn't support the BC Government's 15% foreign buyers tax that has been the only proven measure to reduce housing prices (proof available).

This is largely because developers are controlling elections (e.g. a developer was caught stacking public hearing submissions recently in Kelowna [cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/kelowna-council-rescinds-doyle-permit-1.6939264]).

Without more details and time I can't comment on the impact of multiplex

and arterial apartments. But it's absolutely clear the quality of life in Vancouver will take a nosedive (e.g. become more of heat island). Pre-zoning will also discourage upgrades (heat pumps), as developers will only be interested in paying for land.

Lastly I received no notification from the City of the public hearing for this multiplex rezoning. Given the significant negative impact, the City should have provided affected areas with a letter.

As it is, the participation rate will likely be so low as to severely bias the outcome. The public hearing needs to be re-scheduled after proper notice is given.

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
2023-09-13	18:15	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor Sim, Councilors,</p> <p>While I am not opposed in principle to these types of multifamily housing in RS zones, I do oppose this one-size-fits-all city-wide approach to land use planning in our Vancouver neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Instead of approving these recommendations, The CoV needs to use this report as a basis for follow-up local area planning initiatives to better determine--with meaningful input from residents--which of these housing types are suitable for specific areas and which types could prove too problematic--at least in the near term--based on a whole range of area-specific factors, issues and concerns.</p> <p>I am especially alarmed by the very costly measures required to circumvent city infrastructure that is inadequate to support these developments, and which would severely undercut any significant affordability benefits that could be gained by more intensive land use. In some blocks and some neighbourhoods infrastructure constraints may be more or less problematic. Availability of street parking is another concern that can vary from place to place. I am also very concerned about the loss of mature trees, loss of existing, often much more affordable secondary suites, as well as accelerated demolition and replacement of heritage and character homes.</p> <p>At the very least, 'pace of change' policies need to be considered in order to reduce potential construction-based disruption and loss of livability from overly intensive redevelopment that could result from this mass rezoning in some areas, and which would also serve to limit or mitigate redevelopment pressure on existing infrastructure, possibly making those costly and problematic building lot-based measures unnecessary in the near term.</p> <p>In short, Vancouver needs to take a more detailed and measured approach to providing additional 'missing-middle' types of multifamily housing in our RS neighbourhoods by utilizing the local knowledge of residents and area stakeholders in collaborative detailed planning processes that are certain to yield better outcomes, with fewer unintended and problematic outcomes, than would result from this proposed mass rezoning.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ned Jacobs</p>	Maryann Code	Riley Park	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-13	18:21	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>The multiplex rezoning proposal is so deeply flawed that it should not be approved at this point in time.</p> <p>* First, the loss of our urban forest, including risks to street trees, is completely unacceptable. We must find solutions of densification that retain our trees due to their essential role in modifying the urban heat island absorbing pollution and rain water. We can not claim to be dealing with climate change if we allow this.</p> <p>* Second, the lack of parking requirements which means that multiplex residents will have to park on the street, possibly quite far from their home without the ability to charge an EV. 'Resident Only' parking will not help since the excess demand will come from a block's own residents.</p> <p>*Third, the reduction in floor space allowed for character and heritage house renovation. Why would we reduce the ability to renovate our existing housing stock and, instead, encourage wasteful demolition?</p> <p>*Fourth, the units being proposed will not be well designed for families. Our young families are desperate for more affordable housing options that are actually livable in the long term. Unfortunately most of these units will be too small with very tiny bedrooms; most will not have usable outdoor yard space; and they will be very inconvenient for young families carrying groceries and children from a car parked some distance from their house. As well, the current proposal is for no requirement for below grade floor space which would reduce the bulk and mass of the new large buildings. This will result in long stairways that are unsuitable and actually quite dangerous for many families. Supposedly this is to allow for wheelchair accessible spaces but there are hundreds of accessible units being built throughout the city in apartment buildings but very few units that actually work for families. Based on my personal experience, having a long stairway (9 to 10 feet either inside or outside) to a second floor unit is very dangerous for young children. A redistribution of floor space and a reduction in number of units could result in larger more livable units. With a stock of over 60,000 lots, we do not need to crush 4 to 8 units on each lot.</p> <p>* Fifth, no design control and no pilot project</p> <p>We need to rethink these proposals to make sure that the units we build are actually what families need and will be happy living in over the long term, not just creating adequate profits for developers.</p> <p>We must not squander this opportunity to introduce the kinds of units the city desperately needs along with meeting our climate change goals and infrastructure requirements. This proposal is not good enough. We need to go back to the drawing table.</p>	Jan Pierce	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
2023-09-13	18:37	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>When I consider public input that was allowed for the Fraserlands development and the ongoing public input for the Jericho Lands development, and contrast this with the Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations to be considered by council at the September 14th council meeting I feel disappointed and disenfranchised.</p> <p>The consequences of the decisions which are going to be made as a result of this meeting are staggering. 60,000 single family lots in neighborhoods across Vancouver will be impacted by rezoning to multiplexes. I learned about these changes from a friend's email today, the day before the September 14 council meeting. Where was the public notice of the proposal.?Not in print media. The council changed the City charter so that is not required any more.</p> <p>English Common Law is the basis of our democratic system. It implies that future decisions will be based on the experiences and past decisions of a community. Neighbourhood plans are developed over time in consultation with residents. Change will reflect what the community values and takes into account the character of the community..</p> <p>The arbitrary nature of the zoning revision which council proposes is arbitrary and amounts to a cookie cutter approach to city wide housing needs..</p> <p>Where is a detailed discussion of infrastructure that will keep pace with such a dramatic shift in future development? What protection will there be for trees, parks and other public spaces? Where are the test developments to assess the impact on ourselves and our families? Are neighbourhood plans simply to be torn up and trashed? Who do these dramatic changes represent?</p> <p>I have some many unanswered questions and so few answers? Where is the time for consideration and debate? This is not a single project under discussion it is a big part of our future as a city, Let's slow this runaway train down before it's too late.</p>	Thomas Atkinson	Kitsilano	

2023-09-13	19:10	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>*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.</p> <p>*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)</p> <p>* lack of improvements to services: there is no accompanying plan for improvement to health care, schools, community centres, etc</p> <p>* loss of existing secondary suites and disincentives for rental laneway houses</p> <p>* 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</p> <p>* no design control of the new multiplexes</p> <p>* 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</p>	Roberta King		
2023-09-13	19:23	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	For Public Hearing Thursday Sept 14th, 2023 1300 hrs	Janet Stuart	Kerrisdale	APPENDIX D
2023-09-13	20:34	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	I oppose the plan because there was VERY LITTLE DIRECT ENGAGEMENT into It's planning. Only 2,425 direct respondents in the plan development! Counting website views as being supportive is not appropriate. They may indicate interest but not support. The plan itself states that the plan was very supported by Vancouver Residents. The population of Vancouver is 662,248 (2021). How can 0.0036% of the population possibly be construed as strong support for the plan. This can only indicate that the representation of Vancouver resident's opinion in the plan is ridiculously low. That makes the plans recommendation to Council very questionable in its content. I also do not support the required tree removal.	John Fenwick	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-13	22:14	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>The proposed RS rezoning will have many impacts on livability, sustainability, and affordability of Vancouver neighbourhoods. Below is a partial list of key facts and concerns.</p> <p>There has been a lack of neighbourhood planning and meaningful stakeholder involvement in policy development. Developers who are interested in building new multiplexes have been most influential in this process.</p> <p>These rezoning changes are just the beginning. City staff are indicating the next steps will be to apply similar changes citywide (including consolidation</p>	Dan W		

of all [duplex] RT zones), and much more.

Almost all 60,000 lots currently zoned “RS” citywide in Vancouver are proposed for up to 4 units on standard lots, 5 units on mid-sized lots, 6 units on large lots (for strata-owned housing), or up to 8 units on large lots (for rental housing).

Many existing and affordable secondary suites (rental units), both official and unofficial, will be lost through demolition and displacement. The numbers are not being adequately quantified and tracked by the City. Plus, there is no requirement to have a suite with a new single family house.

Other than a limited number of conceptual sketches, planners have not shown Council or the public what these developments will actually look like within neighbourhood contexts and street views once built.

The proposed policy does not require on-site parking. That will put more pressure on street parking. It will also undermine the shift to electric vehicles, with no place to park EVs for charging.

There will be significant losses of trees and green space, both onsite (due to smaller yard requirements) and for street/boulevard trees (due to impacts on tree roots).

There will be an increasingly severe lack of infrastructure to serve growth, including sewers, water supply, electrical grid, schools, daycare, community centres, recreation facilities, medical services, social services, etc. None of this has been adequately or systematically considered.

There will be impacts of new requirements for onsite underground water-holding tanks and pad-mounted electrical transformers (PMTs), requiring a 12×12-foot easement onsite on each lot to mitigate the lack of city infrastructure.

The new policies have no design guidelines for development quality and contextual design.

There will likely be increased development pressure on land affordability. There will likely be a lack of affordability in new units. New housing produced will not likely be much more affordably, and possibly less affordable, than the original housing being demolished.

This proposed plan will undermine character house and heritage building retention incentives. (Policies should be revised to have retention incentives be equal to or greater than new construction. Properties listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register should be exempt from 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. Character houses with infill only are at 0.85 while multiplexes are proposed at 1.0 FSR.)

2023-09-13	22:32	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>My opposition is qualified. I have concerns with a blanket rezoning to allow multiplexes to all RS zoning. One appreciates Vancouver needs to densify. One also appreciates that multiplexes permit of more gentle densification. The concern over a blanket, city-wide rezoning relates to supporting infrastructure. This would have to be managed extremely carefully. As one example, I'm not sure that simply adding in-ground tanks to minimize the prospect of overwhelming the sewerage system, for instance, is an appropriate stop gap in the face of city-wide densification on this scale, particularly combined with so many other major massing developments currently underway in the City.</p>	Kathleen Duffield		
2023-09-13	23:01	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Completely against this, we are suppose to be increasing density not reducing. Reducing single family FSR, means families reducing space for multigenerational families living under one roof. Cost of living is up where will these family members go when you start making homes smaller and housing is so expensive? Nowadays, multiple family members have to POOL resources together to afford just ONE home. Do better CoV. The least you can do is to keep single family home FSR the same and bump multiplexes to 1.2 FSR at the BARE minimum if you want people to lean towards building multiplexes over single family homes. Why are you proposing charging owners to build "BONUS" sqft? That added cost is just going to go to the consumers, how is this helping our skyrocketing housing cost? It is not, its just another cash grab from the city- dont you make enough from permits, vacancy and spec tax, PTT, DCLs and all sorts of other fees?</p>	Cassy Chau	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2023-09-13	23:04	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Re: RS Rezoning and Multiplexes Public Hearing</p> <p>Public Hearing Agenda – Sept.14 at 1:00 pm: https://council.vancouver.ca/20230914/phea20230914ag.htm</p> <p>Report: https://council.vancouver.ca/20230725/documents/rr2.pdf</p> <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>	Aleyda Ramirez		

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.

This entry was posted in Posts on September 12, 2023 by Coalition R.

Post navigation

← CVN letter to Council: RS Rezoning and Multiplex Consultation (online survey on 'missing middle' housing ends March 5)

Search for:

CVN Principles & Goals

Learn more about the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhood's Principles and Goals.

Download the official Principles & Goals PDF document (153kb), endorsed by almost all of Vancouver's political parties, and revised January 8, 2016.

Coalition List

Arbutus Ridge Community Association

Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours
Dunbar Residents Association
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee
False Creek Residents Association
Grandview Woodland Area Council
Greater Yaletown Community Association
Kits Point Residents Association
Marpole Residents Coalition
Norquay Residents
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association
Oakridge Langara Area Residents (OLAR)
Residents Association Mount Pleasant
Riley Park/South Cambie Visions
Shaughnessy Heights
Property Owners Association
Strathcona Residents Association
Upper Kitsilano Residents Association
West End Neighbours
West Kitsilano Residents Association
West Point Grey Residents Association
West Southlands Residents Association
Twitter
Tweets by @CoalitionVan
Recent Posts

CVN letter to Council: RS Rezoning and Multiplexes Public Hearing (Sept 14) (Opposed)
CVN letter to Council: RS Rezoning and Multiplex Consultation (online survey on 'missing middle' housing ends March 5)

				<p>CVN letter to Council (for 17-Jan-2023): Rental Rezoning Policies for RR spot rezonings citywide & referrals to public hearing</p> <p>CVN letter to Council (for 6-Dec-2022): Opposed – Clr. Boyle Motion B.2 – ‘Reducing Barriers and Deepening Affordability for Non-Profit, Co-op and Social Housing in Every Neighbourhood’</p> <p>Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) statement on the 2022 Election</p> <p>Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods Copyright 2014 - 2017</p>			
2023-09-13	23:06	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	Please do not reduce single family FSR. Also, 1.0 FSR for multiplex is still too low, you need higher for multiplexes.	Ngoan Chau	Victoria-Fraserview	
2023-09-13	23:20	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>Densification is necessary and I support the overall concept of densification in RS zoning. However, I have several concerns about the Proposed rezoning going before council today, which I find is flawed in many areas as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of green space and tree canopies. Thus the loss for the small animal/bird populations in the city. Plus the reduction in co2 adsorbing trees. 2. The need for 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). Thus more loss of possible green space 3. The fact the sewer system is seriously under-built for the new density. 4. Lack of any detail on where are new parks and green spaces for the inhabitants to use. 5. Curtailing of building setbacks, thus further reducing the tree canopy which will only increase the city's challenges with increased heat domes. 6. Requiring no off-street parking spaces will result in parking mayhem on the streets and fewer people taking up electric vehicles. Where are they supposed to be charged? 7. The assumption that most people will not own cars but people will take 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. Eliminating parking requirements will not decrease the number of vehicles. 8. The greenest building is the one already built. Why are there no incentives to retain / enhance existing character homes? This proposed plan will 	Robert Leader	Dunbar-Southlands	

				<p>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.</p> <p>9. There appears to be no planning for required new schools, daycares, community centres, parks, increased sewer, water infrastructure, hospitals. Let alone having them under construction while we are adding thousands of people to the city.</p> <p>Why is there no pilot project of a certain number on properties to be able to evaluate the success and tweak for improvements. It is impossible to remove things that are not working once the zoning has been changed.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to submit my concerns about this major rezoning proposal.</p>			
2023-09-14	03:55	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I strongly believe that the new lane house and multiplex proposals first require modification and then should be approved as a pilot project (as they were put forward in previous reports).</p> <p>I will not discuss at length the near leaps of faith required to believe: that residents of dispersed mutliplexes will be more likely to walk/ride/take transit than the residents in the old houses they replace, that taller buildings with shallower front yards, more impermeable space, and fewer required replacement trees (and fewer street trees) will improve rather than shade and degrade the public realm that additional residents in the 4 - 8 units in multiplexes and larger lane houses will not put pressure on existing schools, daycares, community centres, and parks since the dispersed nature of new construction makes preplanning where enhancements will be required impossible AND on the east side there will be no amenity contributions to fund the enhancements when the density is increased from .7 to 1.00 that the new units will actually be affordable for more than a miniscule number of Vancouver households given your market analysis that estimates a new multiplex unit will sell for only 50% less than a NEW single-family house or 25% less than a NEW duplex unit requires the multiplex to replace only old and small houses and, in addition, that the rezoning does not increase property values.</p> <p>My major concerns are the minimum depth of a multiplex courtyard (6.1 metres) and the impacts of lane houses or multiplex buildings which are proposed to be 8.5 metres high.</p> <p>Section 3.1.2.11 (c) (page 9 Appendix A) sets a minimum separation of 6.1 metres between "...buildings located on a site frontage and rear buildings". The maximum permitted height of courtyard buildings are 11.5 metres front and the 8.5 metres rear. Appendix J External Design Guidelines seem to say that external stairs could extend 2.4 metres into this yard from both the</p>	Lori Reilander	West Point Grey	

front and rear buildings. Given the allowable heights of the front and rear buildings and the lack of any guidelines on roof forms and massing these courtyards will be dark and dank for most of the year. Even in the summer the courtyard would not see much sun. To be useful for children or other ground oriented uses the courtyards must be made deeper, heights of rear buildings reduced, or guidelines added.

Section 11 increases the allowable FSR of lane houses to .25. The height of lane houses has been increased to 8.5 metres and all guidelines related to form and roofs has been removed. The same height and lack of guidelines apply to rear buildings in courtyard style multiplexes. These provisions will create significant shading and overlook impacts on adjacent properties. These are significant concerns. It should be possible to develop fairly simple guidelines that accommodate an increase the size of lane houses and permit livable rear courtyard units without significantly depreciating the attractiveness of adjacent properties.

Creating the missing middle is an appealing concept. However, it seems difficult to implement in a manner that achieves the 'elevator pitch' benefits. The courtyard depth and the height/massing of larger lane homes and rear buildings in court yard multiplexes must be given more thought to avoid massive backlash from adjacent properties. I believe a 50 - 100 property pilot program with monitoring of prices, designs, and post occupancy surveys of new residents and neighbours is a prudent and necessary step before a city-wide rezoning.

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	07:39	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Oppose	<p>I would like to express my opposition to the proposal now before council to change RS zoning in the City to the proposed R1-1 zoning. This massive change to the City’s character will do little to address the issues identified in the staff report. It will clearly not make housing in our city more affordable, nor will it make neighbouroods more “complete, equitable and inclusive”. What it will do is reduce open space, greenspace and natural lighting, exacerbate on street congestion, and further erode the character of our neighbouroods. It will likely result in fewer secondary suites, one of the few forms of relatively affordable housing in the city. While it is true the city needs more housing choice, it does not have to come at the expense of our neighbouroods. This proposal seems custom built for the development industry.</p> <p>The city is already a leader in effectively allowing three units on our small residential lots. What Council should be doing is developing more incentives and reducing barriers to the introduction of secondary suites and coach houses under the existing zoning.</p> <p>This proposal has not been subjected to the deep and meaningful public consultation it requires, which was once a hallmark of community planning in Vancouver. The Vancouver Plan it derives from itself was developed and “consulted” on during a pandemic – few people in the city have any awareness of the implications of that plan, and fewer still are aware of or grasp what this rezoning portends. I ask Council to instead develop tools to incent gentle infill in our RS areas, and perhaps consider a pilot of the proposed zoning, in a neighbourhood that supports it. A pilot program is dismissed in the staff report without evidence that it has been thoroughly explored or discussed in the community. Such disregard for the principles of community planning and engagement is becoming all too commonplace, but can be changed by Council.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Susan Yeomans	Kitsilano	

APPENDIX A

To

Dated Sep 12, 2023

The Mayor & City Council of Vancouver BC
Regarding the proposed changes to the RSI zoning by law.

We fully support Council 's objective to increase housing choices, production, affordability with a focus on much needed and affordable rental housing. There is no debating that we have a complex housing crisis. The current proposal is welcomed however it eliminates a historically important unit type; and with some tweaking on fsrs and design criteria for rental units we can expand types and potential for even more units thru a wider variety of choices.

The current proposal to reduce the fsr for single family dwellings with or without a secondary suite from .70 to .60 fsr will return the highly charged illegal suite issues of 70's and the early 80's .Some of you may recall that .60 was the fsr for single family dwellings during those years . The new builds and renos of the time netted thousands of illegal suites. The estimated number varied between 20 and 40,000 illegal units. The issue exceeded city enforcement capacity. Livability and safety concerns and meeting the housing challenges dominated. We need a plethora of solutions; eliminating an existing housing option no matter what its size just strains or offsets new solutions. Reducing the fsr to .60 for a single-family dwelling with or without a secondary suite is a recipe for a repeat of the illegal suite circumstances of the past commensurate with life safety/livability concerns. Please do not lose existing secondary suite circumstances in the single-family dwelling or cause it to go underground – instead lets resolve the issues of those and increase the number of housing solutions and not risk a return of the past. If the secondary unit design, size, and livability is the issue then legislate design criteria into the zoning. But please do not lose an existing housing type that is in demand ; make it better and not risk an illegal suite pitfall.

The single-family dwelling with a secondary suite plus a laneway house together may net an fsr of .85. Highly doable. On the principle of equitable treatment and more housing choices we support the retention of the duplex with secondary suites at the same .85 fsr. The .85 being available upon suite design criteria being met. Currently duplex developments net 4 units at the .7 fsr on larger sites. As site area decreases so does the secondary suite count. Allowing the duplex with secondary suites the same .85 fsr will net more rental units and better units. We are suggesting that duplexes with secondary suites be allowed an increase to .85 fsr. Again, we would suggest that suite size, livability, safety, and other design concerns be addressed thru design criteria within the zoning.

Going back to the single-family dwelling circumstance, we suggest that a .70 fsr be considered in the case of single-family dwelling with a secondary suite provided the suite meets new family housing design criteria. These units may be of the "family "housing typology.

One other very complicated issue that arises is the disposition of crawl spaces. Historically this has been a very challenging circumstance. The existing provisions for addressing this

circumstance are to be eliminated. This is a complex situation that warrants further review for replacement legislation or strategies.

In summary we would encourage Council to consider the following changes:

1)retain a single- family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at the .70 fsr but with size/design criteria for the secondary suite plus a laneway at 0.15 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

2)allow a smaller single family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at .60 fsr plus a larger laneway at .25 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

3)allow the duplex with secondary suite at a .85 fsr subject to size/design criteria for the secondary suites so that there are no crawl spaces

4)undertake a review of the complex issue of crawl spaces and floor area considering the intent the existing provisions and how best to address in future.

Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature
Raymond Lan	s22(1) Personal and Confidential			
Winnie Chiang				
Woody Chiang				

To

Dated Sep 12, 2023

The Mayor & City Council of Vancouver BC
Regarding the proposed changes to the RSI zoning by law.

We fully support Council 's objective to increase housing choices, production, affordability with a focus on much needed and affordable rental housing. There is no debating that we have a complex housing crisis. The current proposal is welcomed however it eliminates a historically important unit type; and with some tweaking on fsrs and design criteria for rental units we can expand types and potential for even more units thru a wider variety of choices.

The current proposal to reduce the fsr for single family dwellings with or without a secondary suite from .70 to .60 fsr will return the highly charged illegal suite issues of 70's and the early 80's .Some of you may recall that .60 was the fsr for single family dwellings during those years . The new builds and renos of the time netted thousands of illegal suites. The estimated number varied between 20 and 40,000 illegal units. The issue exceeded city enforcement capacity. Livability and safety concerns and meeting the housing challenges dominated. We need a plethora of solutions; eliminating an existing housing option no matter what its size just strains or offsets new solutions. Reducing the fsr to .60 for a single-family dwelling with or without a secondary suite is a recipe for a repeat of the illegal suite circumstances of the past commensurate with life safety/livability concerns. Please do not lose existing secondary suite circumstances in the single-family dwelling or cause it to go underground – instead lets resolve the issues of those and increase the number of housing solutions and not risk a return of the past. If the secondary unit design, size, and livability is the issue then legislate design criteria into the zoning. But please do not lose an existing housing type that is in demand ; make it better and not risk an illegal suite pitfall.

The single-family dwelling with a secondary suite plus a laneway house together may net an fsr of .85. Highly doable. On the principle of equitable treatment and more housing choices we support the retention of the duplex with secondary suites at the same .85 fsr. The .85 being available upon suite design criteria being met. Currently duplex developments net 4 units at the .7 fsr on larger sites. As site area decreases so does the secondary suite count. Allowing the duplex with secondary suites the same .85 fsr will net more rental units and better units. We are suggesting that duplexes with secondary suites be allowed an increase to .85 fsr. Again, we would suggest that suite size, livability, safety, and other design concerns be addressed thru design criteria within the zoning.

Going back to the single-family dwelling circumstance, we suggest that a .70 fsr be considered in the case of single-family dwelling with a secondary suite provided the suite meets new family housing design criteria. These units may be of the "family "housing typology.

One other very complicated issue that arises is the disposition of crawl spaces. Historically this has been a very challenging circumstance. The existing provisions for addressing this

circumstance are to be eliminated. This is a complex situation that warrants further review for replacement legislation or strategies.

In summary we would encourage Council to consider the following changes:

1)retain a single- family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at the .70 fsr but with size/design criteria for the secondary suite plus a laneway at 0.15 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

2)allow a smaller single family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at .60 fsr plus a larger laneway at .25 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

3)allow the duplex with secondary suite at a .85 fsr subject to size/design criteria for the secondary suites so that there are no crawl spaces

4)undertake a review of the complex issue of crawl spaces and floor area considering the intent the existing provisions and how best to address in future.

Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature
Raymond Lan	s22(1) Personal and Confidential			
Winnie Chiang				
Woody Chiang				

To

Dated Sep 12, 2023

The Mayor & City Council of Vancouver BC
Regarding the proposed changes to the RSI zoning by law.

We fully support Council 's objective to increase housing choices, production, affordability with a focus on much needed and affordable rental housing. There is no debating that we have a complex housing crisis. The current proposal is welcomed however it eliminates a historically important unit type; and with some tweaking on fsrs and design criteria for rental units we can expand types and potential for even more units thru a wider variety of choices.

The current proposal to reduce the fsr for single family dwellings with or without a secondary suite from .70 to .60 fsr will return the highly charged illegal suite issues of 70's and the early 80's .Some of you may recall that .60 was the fsr for single family dwellings during those years . The new builds and renos of the time netted thousands of illegal suites. The estimated number varied between 20 and 40,000 illegal units. The issue exceeded city enforcement capacity. Livability and safety concerns and meeting the housing challenges dominated. We need a plethora of solutions; eliminating an existing housing option no matter what its size just strains or offsets new solutions. Reducing the fsr to .60 for a single-family dwelling with or without a secondary suite is a recipe for a repeat of the illegal suite circumstances of the past commensurate with life safety/livability concerns. Please do not lose existing secondary suite circumstances in the single-family dwelling or cause it to go underground – instead lets resolve the issues of those and increase the number of housing solutions and not risk a return of the past. If the secondary unit design, size, and livability is the issue then legislate design criteria into the zoning. But please do not lose an existing housing type that is in demand ; make it better and not risk an illegal suite pitfall.

The single-family dwelling with a secondary suite plus a laneway house together may net an fsr of .85. Highly doable. On the principle of equitable treatment and more housing choices we support the retention of the duplex with secondary suites at the same .85 fsr. The .85 being available upon suite design criteria being met. Currently duplex developments net 4 units at the .7 fsr on larger sites. As site area decreases so does the secondary suite count. Allowing the duplex with secondary suites the same .85 fsr will net more rental units and better units. We are suggesting that duplexes with secondary suites be allowed an increase to .85 fsr. Again, we would suggest that suite size, livability, safety, and other design concerns be addressed thru design criteria within the zoning.

Going back to the single-family dwelling circumstance, we suggest that a .70 fsr be considered in the case of single-family dwelling with a secondary suite provided the suite meets new family housing design criteria. These units may be of the "family "housing typology.

One other very complicated issue that arises is the disposition of crawl spaces. Historically this has been a very challenging circumstance. The existing provisions for addressing this

To

Dated Sep 12, 2023

The Mayor & City Council of Vancouver BC
Regarding the proposed changes to the RSI zoning by law.

We fully support Council 's objective to increase housing choices, production, affordability with a focus on much needed and affordable rental housing. There is no debating that we have a complex housing crisis. The current proposal is welcomed however it eliminates a historically important unit type; and with some tweaking on fsrs and design criteria for rental units we can expand types and potential for even more units thru a wider variety of choices.

The current proposal to reduce the fsr for single family dwellings with or without a secondary suite from .70 to .60 fsr will return the highly charged illegal suite issues of 70's and the early 80's .Some of you may recall that .60 was the fsr for single family dwellings during those years . The new builds and renos of the time netted thousands of illegal suites. The estimated number varied between 20 and 40,000 illegal units. The issue exceeded city enforcement capacity. Livability and safety concerns and meeting the housing challenges dominated. We need a plethora of solutions; eliminating an existing housing option no matter what its size just strains or offsets new solutions. Reducing the fsr to .60 for a single-family dwelling with or without a secondary suite is a recipe for a repeat of the illegal suite circumstances of the past commensurate with life safety/livability concerns. Please do not lose existing secondary suite circumstances in the single-family dwelling or cause it to go underground – instead lets resolve the issues of those and increase the number of housing solutions and not risk a return of the past. If the secondary unit design, size, and livability is the issue then legislate design criteria into the zoning. But please do not lose an existing housing type that is in demand ; make it better and not risk an illegal suite pitfall.

The single-family dwelling with a secondary suite plus a laneway house together may net an fsr of .85. Highly doable. On the principle of equitable treatment and more housing choices we support the retention of the duplex with secondary suites at the same .85 fsr. The .85 being available upon suite design criteria being met. Currently duplex developments net 4 units at the .7 fsr on larger sites. As site area decreases so does the secondary suite count. Allowing the duplex with secondary suites the same .85 fsr will net more rental units and better units. We are suggesting that duplexes with secondary suites be allowed an increase to .85 fsr. Again, we would suggest that suite size, livability, safety, and other design concerns be addressed thru design criteria within the zoning.

Going back to the single-family dwelling circumstance, we suggest that a .70 fsr be considered in the case of single-family dwelling with a secondary suite provided the suite meets new family housing design criteria. These units may be of the "family "housing typology.

One other very complicated issue that arises is the disposition of crawl spaces. Historically this has been a very challenging circumstance. The existing provisions for addressing this

circumstance are to be eliminated. This is a complex situation that warrants further review for replacement legislation or strategies.

In summary we would encourage Council to consider the following changes:

1)retain a single- family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at the .70 fsr but with size/design criteria for the secondary suite plus a laneway at 0.15 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

2)allow a smaller single family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at .60 fsr plus a larger laneway at .25 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

3)allow the duplex with secondary suite at a .85 fsr subject to size/design criteria for the secondary suites so that there are no crawl spaces

4)undertake a review of the complex issue of crawl spaces and floor area considering the intent the existing provisions and how best to address in future.

Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature
Craig Yee	s22(1) Personal and Confidential			

To

Dated Sep 12, 2023

The Mayor & City Council of Vancouver BC
Regarding the proposed changes to the RSI zoning by law.

We fully support Council 's objective to increase housing choices, production, affordability with a focus on much needed and affordable rental housing. There is no debating that we have a complex housing crisis. The current proposal is welcomed however it eliminates a historically important unit type; and with some tweaking on fsrs and design criteria for rental units we can expand types and potential for even more units thru a wider variety of choices.

The current proposal to reduce the fsr for single family dwellings with or without a secondary suite from .70 to .60 fsr will return the highly charged illegal suite issues of 70's and the early 80's .Some of you may recall that .60 was the fsr for single family dwellings during those years . The new builds and renos of the time netted thousands of illegal suites. The estimated number varied between 20 and 40,000 illegal units. The issue exceeded city enforcement capacity. Livability and safety concerns and meeting the housing challenges dominated. We need a plethora of solutions; eliminating an existing housing option no matter what its size just strains or offsets new solutions. Reducing the fsr to .60 for a single-family dwelling with or without a secondary suite is a recipe for a repeat of the illegal suite circumstances of the past commensurate with life safety/livability concerns. Please do not lose existing secondary suite circumstances in the single-family dwelling or cause it to go underground – instead lets resolve the issues of those and increase the number of housing solutions and not risk a return of the past. If the secondary unit design, size, and livability is the issue then legislate design criteria into the zoning. But please do not lose an existing housing type that is in demand ; make it better and not risk an illegal suite pitfall.

The single-family dwelling with a secondary suite plus a laneway house together may net an fsr of .85. Highly doable. On the principle of equitable treatment and more housing choices we support the retention of the duplex with secondary suites at the same .85 fsr. The .85 being available upon suite design criteria being met. Currently duplex developments net 4 units at the .7 fsr on larger sites. As site area decreases so does the secondary suite count. Allowing the duplex with secondary suites the same .85 fsr will net more rental units and better units. We are suggesting that duplexes with secondary suites be allowed an increase to .85 fsr. Again, we would suggest that suite size, livability, safety, and other design concerns be addressed thru design criteria within the zoning.

Going back to the single-family dwelling circumstance, we suggest that a .70 fsr be considered in the case of single-family dwelling with a secondary suite provided the suite meets new family housing design criteria. These units may be of the "family "housing typology.

One other very complicated issue that arises is the disposition of crawl spaces. Historically this has been a very challenging circumstance. The existing provisions for addressing this

circumstance are to be eliminated. This is a complex situation that warrants further review for replacement legislation or strategies.

In summary we would encourage Council to consider the following changes:

1)retain a single- family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at the .70 fsr but with size/design criteria for the secondary suite plus a laneway at 0.15 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

2)allow a smaller single family dwelling with or without a secondary suite at .60 fsr plus a larger laneway at .25 fsr to be a total fsr of .85 for both

3)allow the duplex with secondary suite at a .85 fsr subject to size/design criteria for the secondary suites so that there are no crawl spaces

4)undertake a review of the complex issue of crawl spaces and floor area considering the intent the existing provisions and how best to address in future.

Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature
Eddie Au	s22(1) Personal and Confidential			
Harwinder Bal				
Jasmine Sethi				
komal dhir				
Sonia Dhir				

Missing Muddle

Councilors and Your Worship.

My name is Stuart Leslie and I am opposed to this motion for the following reasons.

1. This is a radical change. There is no need for a radical change at the present time. There are 60,000 properties affected.
2. This change will change the current streetscape of Vancouver to disorganized hodge podge. It will become Gulag Vancouver.
3. This proposal is not sustainable. It is not Green. It will send 60,000 plus houses and other buildings to the landfill. This is the consumer throw away society at its worst.
4. This proposal will have a very negative affect on climate change given that the number of trees that will be demolished. Trees are the lungs of Vancouver.
5. This council will become known as the council that initiated the destruction of a pleasant streetscape that has evolved gradually during a period of over 100 years.
6. The proposed measure will not reduce the cost of accommodation in Vancouver but will do the opposite. It will result in land value increasing.
7. This measure only benefits developers, not current residents or future ones.
8. This measure will not benefit renters but will make life more expensive for them.
9. A measure such as this requires a pilot program. It is too radical not to have a pilot.
10. This proposal will result in the loss of many existing and affordable secondary suites.
11. This proposal will force many seniors to leave Vancouver as it will be very unsettling and chaotic. It will change the city into a construction zone and therefore an unpleasant place to live and raise families.
12. This proposal will place an uncertain design condition on infrastructure. It will be an engineering chaos impossible to design for.
13. No parking provisions have been outlined.
14. The 22 current neighbourhoods will be reduced to six or less. There is a recipe for an unfriendly city.
15. This plan ignores character houses and heritage homes.

16. This proposal will have a significant effect on property tax increases forcing people to leave Vancouver.

17. This proposal needs a serious rethink. It shows no forethought or serious issues facing residents.



Dunbar Residents' Association

Box 45047—4326 Dunbar Street, Vancouver, BC V6S 2M8
Phone 604-222-9824 • info@dunbar-vancouver.org

PRESIDENT Bruce Gilmour • SECRETARY Theresa Juba • TREASURER Sonia Wicken • PAST-PRESIDENT Colleen McGuiness
MEMBERS-AT-LARGE Elizabeth Ball • Olivia Edwards • Angus McIntyre • Andrea Sara

September 13, 2023

By email

City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue, Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor, Council and City Staff,

Re: Public Hearing – Multiplexes and RS-Zoning Changes

The Dunbar Residents' Association wishes to state its opposition to the Multiplex proposal now before City Council. We have long been on record as supporting increased density to our area, but this proposal would allow excessive, overwhelming change without proper consultation with residents.

The information and engagement processes surrounding this proposal have been so poor that most residents aren't aware of it even to this day. The reality is that not everyone is on social media or avidly following City Council or Shape Your City on the internet. No postcards were sent to affected addresses, so people did not receive any written notice either and are unaware of how severely impacted they soon may be.

While developers were heavily involved in the creation of this plan, community associations like ours weren't even informed about it. Where were *our* workshops?

We urge Council to put the brakes on this proposal while a better engagement process takes place. Improve the plan. Then, begin with a small pilot project that tests its effectiveness and impact, and revise it accordingly before instituting something citywide.

The loss of trees and green space, along with parking and infrastructure problems are of major concern, especially when the resulting housing will be affordable to so few. And the plan would incur the demolition of older homes which have long provided affordable secondary suites for seniors, students and young families.

The DRA is a member of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods and supports the points in its extensive submission on this issue. Please refer to CVN's informative [Appendix September 11, 2023](#).

Please consider our concerns and vote *no* to a plan that would drastically transform our neighbourhoods without the informed engagement of Vancouver residents.

Yours truly,

Board of Directors

Dunbar Residents' Association

APPENDIX D

September 11, 2023

Dear Members of Council,

We wish to strongly ask Council to delay any further amendments to the zoning and development by-law before adding “missing middle housing and simplifying regulations” until such time as the planning and implementation of the same has been better considered and the ramifications of this thought through. We request this for three reasons.

1. It has not been clearly demonstrated that such changes in regulations will have any beneficial impact on home prices in Vancouver. Rather, expensive condos, townhomes and apartments will benefit only the developers and still ensure that home prices in Vancouver remain out of reach for many. The developers stand to reap enormous profits through this effort to ensure densification with little if any benefit to hardworking persons in Vancouver. We will only see many more expensive homes available with no improvement in affordability.
2. There has been a completely inadequate consideration of the civic infrastructure required to support the changes proposed including utilities, sewers, parking and the critically important role of trees on carbon footprints. Even this past year on 49th Avenue, we had to replace the main sewer line from our home to the main city line under 49th Ave. This only partly resolved drainage issues as the current city drain running along 49th will require complete replacement in the near future. Adding multiple new homes into this aging drainage is complete folly.
3. Finally, these proposed changes completely ignore existing Vancouver residents who may have lived here for many years, paid high city taxes, worked diligently to pay off mortgages, maintain their properties and now are forced to leave their existing homes with a complete devaluation of past work, savings, and careful fiscal management on their part. This is not NIMBY but rather a complete disrespect of hard-working Vancouver residents.

It is certainly not clear to most regular citizens in Vancouver, what other options have been considered other than that driven by developers. We would wish to learn what if any options are seen as alternatives. We sincerely hope that you

reconsider what we believe is premature, reactive and poorly planned policy. There are multiple issues that have not been worked through adequately. The pressure to generate huge profits for developers should be ignored.

Yours Sincerely,

Janet and Gavin Stuart