


**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
2023-09-11	07:32	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I previously submitted a comment about my concerns with poorly planned and designed multiplexes that do not provide adequate space for families. One other concern I have with multiplexes are the maintenance fees which can sometimes be over \$1,000 per month. I have seen up to \$1,500 or more. It's like a second mortgage! That makes it very difficult for people to manage mortgage and maintenance fees, not to mention other costs of living like food and child care.</p>	Ariadna Fernandez	Mount Pleasant	
				<p>Dear mayor and council,</p> <p>My wife and I were looking forward to being able to build a multiplex as soon as they were approved, we engaged with a design / build company to assess our lot and do a cost proforma, so we were shocked to learn that we won't be able to move forward with this if the current proposal is passed as is.</p> <p>This is because our house is located in the Cambie corridor area, and specifically, that our block is one of the blocks that was identified as having sufficient infrastructure for a city initiated rezoning to RM-8A. This meant developers didn't have to go through the expensive and time consuming rezoning process. Great for them, but now bad for us because multiplexes have not been included in RM-8A even though they are 100% compatible.</p> <p>We have been proponents of the multiplex idea from inception and wanted to build 6 new housing units, that this city desperately needs but we, and many other owners with our zoning, won't be able to. Considering the housing crisis, I would think the city would take every opportunity to add new housing choices.</p> <p>When the RM-8A zoning was being put forward for our area, RS-1 homeowners, like us, were assured that we would still be able to do anything we were able to do before under RS-1. We were told that choices would not be taken away. So it's disappointing that all other former RS zones will be allowed to build multiplexes but we will be excluded, even though we can still build anything else that can currently be built under RS-1... Now we ARE having a choice taken away from us compared to RS zones.</p> <p>It also seems to us there is no good reason to exclude multiplexes in RM-8A as they would be compatible with and fit in perfectly with the RM-8A townhouses that are being built in the neighborhood. Why not simply include the line "Multiplex - regulated by R1-1" just like the current RM-8A zoning includes the line "Single detached house - regulated by RS-1"</p> <p>Staff has said to us that we have a better option of building a townhouse under RM-8A that permits a higher maximum density of 1.2 FSR (vs. the 1.0</p>			

2023-09-11	01:53	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>FSR limit proposed for the R1-1 multiplex option). But the proposed multiplexes have a bonus possibility of 19% for using low carbon building practices like passive and net zero, so can be virtually the same... 1.19 FSR vs 1.2 FSR. Plus, multiplex guidelines don't call for any parking requirements versus a single lot townhouse where those requirements under RM-8A are hard to achieve without doing an underground parkade, which is cost prohibitive on a single lot, not to mention the embodied carbon footprint. RM-8A townhouses also have far more onerous hoops to jump through using Part 3 versus multiplexes using Part 9 of the building code.</p> <p>Basically, most single family homeowners likely would not be able to take on an RM-8A townhouse project but many would be able to navigate the simpler multiplex guidelines that were written with homeowners and smaller builders in mind.</p> <p>Multiplexes are the best option compared to townhouses for us and other homeowners in our zoning for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost</li> <li>2. Complexity</li> <li>3. Time</li> <li>4. Parking requirements</li> <li>5. Risk</li> <li>6. Carbon footprint</li> </ol> <p>We don't see any advantage to being in RM-8A. We just see limitations in what we can do on our land because of a zoning change a few years ago, that we didn't ask for, and that was supposed to still allow us to build anything under RS-1.</p> <p>The city of Vancouver is forging ahead with new options for housing, which is a great thing, and we have supported this for many years. Without help, my two adult children will never be able to live in this city if something isn't done about the housing crisis.</p> <p>Until the city is successful in implementing additional higher density areas, such as around transit stations, multiplexes will hopefully help fill the shortage to some extent. Additional housing is still desperately needed.</p> <p>In summary, our main concern with the proposal and being excluded from building a multi</p>	Clive and Carey Bottomley	South Cambie	
				<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>Multiplex is not included RM8A. This letter addresses RM8A in Cambie Corridor (not Grandview Woodland).</p> <p>My lot was formerly RS1 but now zoned RM8A since 2018. It's in the Cambie</p>			

2023-09-11	01:49	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>Corridor- a 2 minute walk to the King Edward station. The city initiated a rezoning to RM8A to signal to developers where infrastructure upgrades were sufficient to allow Townhouses (TH) to be built-without a rezoning process. Under RM8A a 3 story TH with FSR of 1.2 is allowed.</p> <p>I am really DISAPPOINTED to find out that multiplex (MP) will not be included in RM8A. It would be a great additional option given the density is 1.0 AND that it is a simpler built form. A homeowner might actually be able to take it on. MP has no parking requirement, is above grade (no basement to build and also carbon footprint friendly) and I understand will fall under part 9 of the building code, not part 3. All of this means: a reduction in costs, time and risk.</p> <p>The really STRANGE and UNFAIR thing is that neighbours in the same wider Townhouse zone as me are still RS1 and can therefore build a Multiplex. Because RM8A is just a small pocket, many neighbours just 1 block away from me, both east and west of me, now have a choice. I do not. They can do either: build a 1.0 FSR MP or a 1.2 FSR TH.</p> <p>Does 1.2 FSR under RM8A deliver significantly more housing than 1.0 FSR MP ? NO, it doesn't! There is an RM8A TH under construction right next door to me. An assembly of 3 lots, it's delivering 19 Townhouses and 37 parking stalls. The underground basement for the cars has been under construction for 9 months now. All that time, effort, expense and concrete and just 19 TH units. Three Multiplex buildings on those 3 lots would have delivered 3X6=18 units (1250 sq ft each) in much less time, with a much smaller carbon footprint and at a more affordable price point. It feels like the project next door is doing a bang up job delivering parking stalls but not so much when it comes to housing options. Oh, and nearly all of the site next door is impermeable because of the 37 stalls in the parking basement. AND, again a 2 minute walk to the King Edward station. Why is the parking to housing ratio near major transit stations so inconsistent with the city's "walkable/complete communities" goals? Many other RM schedules can deliver townhouses at much greater density than 1.2 FSR. Such as 1.5, 1.7 even 2 FSR. RM8A is LOW density. One of the lowest forms of townhouse density in Vancouver.</p> <p>Under RM8A, my next best option is to build a 0.9 FSR TRIPLEX. It's only 10% less FSR but it's just 3 units. That would be 3 generous sized units of 2250 sq ft each. However, that's not going to be affordable to buy. Something like \$2.5M each. If for whatever reason, I or a neighbour in the same situation, can't build a 1.2 FSR TH wouldn't you at least want a 1.0 FSR multiplex and provide 6 units that each cost half as much to buy- instead of a triplex?</p> <p>Mayor and Council: I ask that you add multiplex to RM8A. Back in 2018 I was assured RS1 options would still be there for us when the city initiated a the rezoning to RM8A. Make it so. It's one line "multiplex- regulated by R1-1" . What's the worse thing than can happen? More housing that's 100%</p>	Carey Murphy	South Cambie
------------	-------	---	-------	--	--------------	--------------

				<p>compatible with RM8A TH zone.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my request.</p> <p>Carey Murphy  </p>			
2023-09-10	20:33	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I agree that there needs to be more duplex and triplex options for families in Vancouver. However, I have been looking for a larger property to accommodate my growing family for the last 5+ years. Property developers do not build homes large enough to accommodate families. Nearly all new developments do not have proper storage space. None have entries with a place to put coats, boots, umbrellas. There is also limited space for groceries or other essentials of daily living. Let alone space for play or work. New developments have nearly no out door space at all. This seems like an excellent opportunity for developers and investors to gain even more profit while doing nothing to address affordability and provide adequate and livable space for people that live and work in this city. Look no further than the recent development of Turner Dairy with built in fridges that do not even hold a 4L carton of milk (a basic family staple). The missing middle densification will merely be another cash grab for greedy developers and push the cost of single family homes even higher as multiplex options do not provide adequate storage or square footage. A \$2.6 M plus GST duplex with less than 1600 sqft (see rew.ca listing 567 W 17th Ave) does not make for livable, affordable spaces for families. Unless we think that infinity mortgages are equitable and appropriate. Adequate housing (not "luxury shoe-boxes") is a basic need. In my view multiplex developments are likely to exacerbate the exponential price of single family homes unless they are appropriately designed with family and function in mind not maximum profit for developers.</p>	Ariadna Fernandez	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-11	17:06	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>While I generally support an increase in density and further support the idea of the missing middle type of housing, I am totally opposed that 20-40 storey buildings (and possibly higher?) be built in the Kitsilano, Point Grey and nearby neighbourhoods. These places are thriving neighbourhoods that have character and history with a strong community - places tourists and people from other parts of metro Vancouver want to visit because of their unique character. High towers 20-40 storeys and more will destroy the neighbourhood character of these diverse communities and Vancouver will no longer be the liveable and tourist supported city it now is. Many Vancouverites are totally unaware of the Vancouver plan and I am shocked that the city can go ahead with these plans without the proper consultation of its citizens.</p>	Nicole Duelli	Kitsilano	

**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
2023-09-11	23:24	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I support the general direction of this proposal to increase density, but there are a few things I take exception with that I would like to see changed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal maximum FSR for a multiplex is too low. This will result in ~1000 square foot units, which I don't really think of as being family sized. An FSR of 1.2 would be more appropriate and yield units on the smaller side for a real family sized unit at 1200 square feet.</li> <li>2. This proposal offers no certainty over the fair allocation of street parking. Many multiplexes without off street parking could overwhelm the street parking capacity of a block. I depend on street parking as I have no access to off street parking. The city needs a fair parking permit policy, such as allocating 1 or 2 (depending on the size of the lot) rights for parking permits to each property, and then limiting the number of permits issued to the capacity of the street. The present situation in the west end (where the number of permits vastly exceeds the number of parking spaces) is unfair and untenable.</li> <li>3. I strongly oppose applying DCLs to multiplexes in place of the affordable unit requirement. DCLs are a tax on dense housing that suppresses it and encourages the rebuilding of single family homes. Taxing housing in this way only locks in housing as being expensive.</li> <li>4. I also object to the expectation / plan that more multiplexes ought to be built on the east side of the city. As per the Vancouver plan, the west side has bigger lots that are more suitable for multiplexes, more parks, better air quality, less traffic, less parking congestion and is less prone to extreme heat. I think it's only natural that more multiplexes ought to be built on the west side so more people can take advantage of these amenities. In this context, it makes no sense to have higher DCLs for the west side. It's just the more natural place to develop multiplex housing so we should just embrace that instead of trying to fight it with taxation.</li> </ol>	Scott Nelson	Grandview-Woodland	
2023-09-11	23:58	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>When considering the new plan, please consider that even those of us who are in favour of it want to ensure that it genuinely includes middle class affordability. Making smaller spaces with higher end, more expensive fittings keeps prices higher, defeating the purpose and keeping our exclusive neighbourhoods exclusive. Also, please ensure that we keep our open spaces, trees, and urban wildlife healthy. And remember to balance our healthcare and education provisioning with our growing population, and modernize our transportation infrastructure--to include public transit and parking</p>	Elizabeth Loughney	Kitsilano	

**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
2023-09-11	14:08	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I strongly support the densification of single family neighbourhoods and the stated intentions of this proposal.</p> <p>However, I do not believe the Density Bonus Payments proposed are sufficient to prevent land speculation. I also doubt that the other two options will prove viable. Consequently, the unintended result of this proposal will be the creation, yet again, of more unaffordable luxury strata units. This does not serve the missing middle who will continue to leave the City in large numbers. A more radical intervention in Vancouver's out of control housing market is required. Is it possible for the City to cap land value increases to prevent speculation and make this proposal work?</p>	Marta Goodwin	Fairview	
2023-09-11	12:51	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I support the motion, with a simple caveat that it should permit higher density per lot. An FSR of 1 is fine, but more density is better. Have a review of buildings in Fairview, they have generous setback that is tighter than current zoning with significantly higher density. There's a few triplexes in the area that are similar to the apartment complexes. I do think the current FSR proposal is limiting. If we're zoning for multiplexes, the building footprint is effectively reduced the taller they build. This is fine, but it wouldn't be competitive to just dividing an existing house into 3 or 4 floors for example. Allowing a 4 story missing middle to take 1/3 to 2/3 of the land space it occupies would go a long way to securing both affordable and denser housing supply while still maintaining setback distances and green area.</p>	Matthew Bachelu	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-11	10:36	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>We should be focusing city resources on rental stock, and we should be putting all city resources into not-for-profit housing organizations - i.e. coops. We should be giving very limited tax breaks or incentives to 'for profit' developers. All financial incentives from the city should go to not-for-profit organizations only</p> <p>We should encourage the provincial government to expropriate the little mountain site and dedicate this to social housing by non-profit housing organizations.</p> <p>When increasing density, we should focus on low density areas first instead of demolishing existing 3/4 story apartments (I'm thinking of the main/broadway development plan). It doesn't make sense to pushout renters from existing 'missing-middle' apartments at this time.</p>	Mark Stoakes	Riley Park	