

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-06	16:43	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	I support simplifying the regulations. I am opposed to reducing the density for single family houses from 0.7 to 0.6 fsr. The density for single family houses should be 0.7 fsr. I am opposed to permitting multi family housing ("Multiplexes") everywhere in the RS zones. That would lead to overlooks, loss of privacy, crowded unsafe streets full of parked cars, shadowing of private outdoor spaces, loss of landscaped areas and a general feeling of density that is too high.	Craig Rowland	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-07	09:43	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	I support the missing middle policy with one amendment. Zoning of single family should not be downzoned from .75 or .7 FSR to .6 FSR. I currently live on a single family lot with an old house. I bought the lot based on the existing single family density with plans to rebuild a single family house in the next 5 years. I would ask that council consider maintaining the existing single family density. Downzoning creates uncertainty in the housing market and adds to the housing volatility we have in Vancouver.	Chris Rowland	Arbutus Ridge	
2023-09-07	21:06	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	To simply processes, I believe it is time to scrap the character home incentive program due to the high cost of renovations to lift and preserve the front structures of the house so this option will no longer be desirable. Instead of allowing multiplexes on new builds only which favors developers, would like to see same guidelines for everyone as homeowners often like to build in stages. Going from one parking spot for each strata unit to zero is too much . There should be 1 parking for every 2 units..	Bonnie Jung	Kerrisdale	
2023-08-30	14:30	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	Hello city concil,  While I generally support multiplexes, based on the information presented this plan will do almost nothing to address housing affordability or supply challenges as it is only expected to create 150 projects per year. We need to be far more ambitious in our goals in creating missing middle housing throughout the city. Why wait until the Vancouver Plan is implemented when we can do this now. The limit of 1 FSR would seem to be the main barrier to building more units. I would encourage you to amend the plan to allow greater FSR immediately. We are already so far behind on housing that this is the least we can do.	Andrew Nolan		

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-25	17:04	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I appreciate the wonderful discourse we had in emails back and forth earlier in February. I saw this article on Globe and Mail about the multiplex laws and how some of the specifics might make it actually harder to build some multiplexes:                      Here is the article                      The article is referring to some heritage revitalization projects around the Grandview-Woodlands neighbourhood, which carved up some existing heritage mansions into beautiful multifamily complexes which still fit nicely in the neighbourhood.                      I actually remember the mansion from before it was redeveloped and I think the developer did a wonderful job with making that space much more livable and vibrant by adding townhouses around it and turning the house into an apartment building.                      With the new multiplex laws, while in some zones it is making multiplexes easier to develop, it seems in this case that developments like this would become impossible to build again.                      This seems counterproductive to the original mission of the multiplex project, which is to eliminate the red tape to building multiplexes on single family lots.                      I hope you will reconsider your FSR restrictions to allow more beautiful family-oriented developments to be built out of our existing heritage homes.</p>	Julia Schertzer	Grandview-Woodland	
2023-08-28	12:04	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>adding density and options for type of housing is great, but I would like to know what the cost of "affordable" and "market secured" housing is. Probably still un-attainable for singles or one-income families. Which is the point I would think. Providing housing for low-to-middle-to-market affordability. THE CITY SHOULD BE BUILDING FAMILY CO-OP HOUSING. It's a proven success in False Creek and many other neighborhoods in Vancouver.</p>	Gere Curtiss	Marpole	
2023-08-28	12:10	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>When affordable housing is in place, please ensure they also have parking available to tenants at same address at no cost</p>	Martha kahnpace	Hastings-Sunrise	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-28	14:43	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>It would be good if planning staff could directly address how the new R1-1 regulations will impact the Secondary Suites Program. At this point it appears that regulations in the RS zones that permit up to .75 FSR to permit the addition of basements or cellars for secondary suites in homes built before July 7, 2009 are not carried over into the R1-1.</p> <p>Parking: the proposed reduced or none required on site parking requirement is potentially problematic. People are most likely to still have vehicles that need to be parked for the foreseeable future. A 33' lot frontage can handle parking for 2 small cars at most. On street parking on residential streets in Vancouver are currently highly utilized for parking. People who utilize parking can be territorial about parking in front of their house and extra pressure on street parking will lead to conflict.</p> <p>EV charging issues are also a concern if there is no on site parking.</p> <p>Design Guidelines: The R1-1 removal of design guidelines will take the City back to the era of "monster homes" in the 1980's that spurred the creation of design guidelines. In my opinion the deletion of the design guidelines will lead to a deterioration of the quality of design and construction in the R1-1 zone.</p>	John Henshaw		
2023-08-14	15:12	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I am worried about saving character houses and heritage houses. With the proposed multiplexes I don't see heritage being well protected. The best part of Vancouver is its character residential neighbourhoods, and I see these new regulations eroding this in favour of large "boxy" apartment type buildings. I am also worried about parking, as there will be very few stalls for the number of people living in each project. On a 33 foot wide by 120 deep lot there might only be one parking stall for four families. I also see the existing trees being much more difficult to protect as the building footprints will be much larger under the previous zoning. I support density but think it can be handled on the edges of neighbourhoods. The existing zoning allows for houses (or duplexes) with basement suites and laneway houses. How much density is too much on a single lot?</p>	Keith Jakobsen	Hastings-Sunrise	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-08-14	18:07	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>The City of Vancouver's official policy places a strong emphasis on fostering the growth of multi-family residential units within designated preferred zoning districts. In alignment with this overarching densification strategy, I endeavored to acquire a standard lot situated within Zone RM4, a recognized locale that encourages the establishment of multi-family dwellings.</p> <p>It is of significance to acknowledge that Zone RM4 has been undergoing a noticeable transition towards multi-family developments, characterized by the replacement of older single-family residences with multi-family structures in line with the city's forward-looking vision. However, despite the prevailing momentum of multi-family expansion within this zone, my endeavor to transform an existing residential property into a multi-family dwelling encountered a setback through an authoritative denial.</p> <p>Your attention to the intricacies of the city's policies in this matter would be greatly appreciated.</p>	Rajeev Jain	Mount Pleasant	