

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
2023-09-12	20:48	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I have no disclosures to make about being involved in development or real estate in the city of Vancouver or anywhere. I am a citizen concerned about the people who live and work in Vancouver. I think the idea of these building structures for the missing middle is great. I am wondering how you will address the people who are also described as "the missing middle", those who are not eligible for social housing but not rich enough to own or now, sadly, rent in the city. It is extremely that coops, co-ownership and other strategies are developed for people who live and work in Vancouver. Teachers, health care professionals, first responders, service workers for hospitality, retail and others need to live and work here. It is also extremely important to provide tenant protection and relocation to every single tenant to is evicted for development of the missing middle type housing, the same protections as the Broadway plan, top up rent being the most vital to keeping renters who work here in the city to stay in city. The tenant relocation plan needs to be corrected so that ALL tenants receive the same compensation as the Broadway Plan. Mayor and council is it your responsibility to acknowledge all the people who live in Vancouver and not just concern yourselves with buildings. Understanding the people and peoples roles and the economic capacity should direct what is built, who it is for and ensure it is affordable.</p>	sonja magnuson		
2023-09-12	13:29	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I support densification in principle in neighbourhoods that now have mostly single family detached housing. I have strong reservations about the proposal that has been brought forward and would not support it without major revisions. Please see the attached document for detailed comments.</p>	Bob Prosser	Victoria-Fraserview	<p>APPENDIX A</p> <hr/>
				<p>Please see attached letter from the Board of Directors of the Vancouver Heritage Foundation.</p> <p>Thank you, Laura Carey Executive Director Vancouver Heritage Foundation</p> <p>Mayor Sim and Councillors City of Vancouver 453 West 12th Ave Vancouver, BC, V5Y 1V4 Sept 12, 2023</p> <p>Re: Incentivizing Heritage Retention in Missing Middle Housing Proposed Zoning Amendments</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p>			

2023-09-12	15:43	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>On behalf of the Vancouver Heritage Foundation, we are writing to express our concern that the proposed zoning amendments to provide “missing middle” housing, will result in the dramatic loss of heritage buildings across our city. We ask that the policy be changed so that the option to retain rather than demolish heritage homes in neighbourhoods is incentivized by equal treatment in the bylaw. This means providing the same density as multiplexes from 0.85 fsr for heritage to the proposed standard 1.0 fsr. Moreover, using proven tools, such as Heritage Revitalization Agreements, to incentivize and encourage rehabilitating heritage buildings.</p> <p>Last updated in November 2022, there are currently over 2200 houses on the City’s Heritage Register, many in current RS zones. Only about 30% (678) have official designation/legal protection. The Heritage Register in addition to several other City policies, notably the Vancouver Plan, recognize and underscore the importance of heritage and its retention across Vancouver.</p> <p>Heritage retention and increased density do not have to be mutually exclusive goals. By making the necessary changes to the proposed bylaw amendments, City Council can encourage the retention of the vital heritage in our city and avoid wasteful demolitions that undermine the City’s own climate action policy goals. This will also avoid wasteful demolitions that undermine the City’s own environmental policy goals, as stated in the 2020 Greenest City Action Plan and targets.</p> <p>We offer our support and collaboration to ensure this outcome.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Herb Evers, Board Chair, Vancouver Heritage Foundation</p> <p>Laura Carey, Executive Director, Vancouver Heritage Foundation</p> <p>cc: Jurian ter Horst, Board Chair, Heritage Vancouver</p> <p>Michael Kluckner, Board Chair Vancouver Historical Society</p> <p>James Evans, Chair, Vancouver Heritage Commission</p>	Laura Carey	Mount Pleasant	APPENDIX B
------------	-------	---	-------	---	-------------	----------------	-------------------

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-13	10:08	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>The core of increasing missing middle housing is not only to increase the number of residential units, but also to return a missing middle life style. This way of life declined due to the emergence of automobiles, the beginning of urban suburbanization, and high-density development in urban downtowns. In order to make the city livable, affordable and sustainable, increasing missing middle housing has become an important option for government decision-making agencies. It is not a good approach if the livability and sustainability are compromised just to solve the problem of affordability. Therefore, simply converting detached house land into multiplex residential land will most likely have a negative impact on the livability and sustainability of the community. Therefore, as a designer who has participated in urban planning and urban design, I make the following suggestions from the aspects of functional improvement, transportation organization and public space:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The increase in residential units will lead to an increase in residential density, and supporting commercial and public facilities will increase accordingly. In order to increase the possibility of walking, it is recommended to set up a sub-neighborhood with a lower service radius, equipped with small grocery stores, cafes, and library-service-outlet, etc. Land on street corners or near bus stops can be used to add ground-floor businesses and provide public facilities space in proportion. Mix-use are the heart of mixing middle life style. 2. After the detached house land is adjusted to multiplex residential land, it is recommended that the parking space requirements remain unchanged. The increase in parking spaces will facilitate parking of motor vehicles and increase traffic attraction. In order to improve the possibility of walking, it is recommended to set up more pleasant and safe walking roads and make it more difficult for motor vehicles to pass. If possible, add non-motorized lanes to provide more travel options. Mix-traffic is a necessary condition for mixing middle life style. 3. The density of public transportation routes and stations need to be increased, improving the choice rate of public transportation travel. 4. Combined with Sub-neighborhood commercial outlets and public facilities, the government provides more incentives to increase the creation of public spaces. Good public spaces, which are magnets that attract residents to get out of their homes, Safe pedestrian paths and street-eyes together become benign regulations to ensure community security. A good transition between public and private spaces creates a mixture of spaces of different levels. Mixing space is the soul of mixing middle life style. <p>In short, missing middle life style is based on a pedestrian-friendly and public transportation-friendly urban travel mode. It is also a way for missing middle housing to solve the affordability problem while ensuring livability and sustainability.</p> <p>Roger Xiao</p>	Roger Xiao	I do not live in Vancouver	

Feedback on the “Missing Middle” Rezoning Proposal

Vancouver certainly needs a wider range of affordable housing options for individuals and families with middle and low income, and there is an urgent need to greatly increase the number of affordable housing units in all neighbourhoods. **Adding density within the large segments of the city that are currently filled with single detached houses is a good idea in principle. The strategies for this densification need to be carefully planned and implemented.**

Unfortunately, the proposal being presented is problematic in a variety of significant ways – many of which City staff themselves have identified. **It should not be approved in its current form and needs to be fully revised to better address the shortcomings.**

The most fundamental shortcoming is that the proposed solution will probably not have much impact on the shortage of homes that middle and lower income people can actually afford in today’s high-interest inflationary market. No evidence is provided in the proposal that this shortage will be significantly reduced and that the anticipated benefits outweigh the significant downsides. There isn’t even evaluative evidence presented concerning the impacts of the relatively recent laneway housing and duplex policies.

City staff have conceded that the proposed maximum FSR, for example, will likely not encourage the construction of new purpose-built rental units. Renters need more affordable options too, and this proposal will do nothing for them.

Even if average new multiplex units are priced at 50% of the cost of a new single-detached house as City staff optimistically estimate, they will still be out of reach for lower income households. It is easy to foresee that amenity share contributions (passed on to buyers) together with an almost certain increase in land values due to this rezoning will make multiplex units unaffordable for all but the wealthiest of middle income households. Basically the proposal does not adequately come to grips with a key driver of unaffordability – the high cost of land – and does nothing meaningful to prevent speculation.

This major shortcoming of the proposal is possibly a consequence of planning process failures by the City: (1) the public consultation to date has been totally inadequate for a change of this magnitude; and (2) there is no trial period or pilot project to evaluate effects of the rezoning and fix any problems before a rollout to the whole city. This haste and lack of a phased implementation seems reckless and likely to diminish rather than increase public support for densification.

There are other problems that the rezoning proposal does not adequately address. Here are three:

1 Parking

The proposal will almost certainly not discourage car use or increase neighbourhood livability. Rather, not requiring the provision of on-site parking spaces is a recipe for a diminished quality of life for every household on a block containing a multiplex. If each household in a multiplex has just one car (an optimistic assumption in my experience), and if little or no parking is provided on the multiplex property, the resulting scramble for street parking could easily foster resentment of newcomers to the neighbourhood.

APPENDIX A

Furthermore, there is no provision to ensure that charging facilities for electric vehicles will be available in the multiplexes.

On my block with one duplex and numerous renters in other houses' basement suites – the house next to mine has four distinct units in the basement and one on the main floor – the curb space is often completely filled with (huge) vehicles. The idea that multiplex occupants will have only one car on average per household or will switch to public transit or biking is naïve. Many households on my block have two or more cars or SUVs. People invite visitors – some long term – who park additional cars and trucks. When all the spaces are taken up on narrow streets like mine, where will ambulances, fire trucks or even service suppliers park?

2 Loss of Trees

The City's current efforts to enhance the tree canopy and mitigate the climate emergency (declared in 2019) are already weak. Boulevard trees that have been removed are not replaced in a timely manner, for example. Ugly stumps left behind speak volumes about the City's lack of genuine concern about tree replacement.

The rezoning proposal will further reduce the number of trees in blocks with multiplexes. There is no provision to adequately compensate for this loss. This is significant given that the number of vehicles in these multiplex blocks will increase. The blocks with multiplexes will look less green, provide less shade on hot summer days and be less attractive places to live.

3 Stress on Existing Infrastructure

The proposal is totally inadequate in terms of projecting the potential impact of the expected expansion of multiplexes on usage of electricity, water, the sewer system, sanitation services and infrastructure like schools, community centres and parks. Are proposed density bonuses adequate to cover the cost of providing for the increases in demand? No discussion of this issue is provided.

Conclusion

The proposal in its current form makes a poor case for a well-intentioned but sketchy plan intended to help lower and middle income households to obtain housing in Vancouver. It needs major revisions and should not be adopted as is.

Vancouverites in potentially rezoned neighbourhoods need much greater assurance that the proposed plan would really provide a significant quantity of much-needed housing for the full range of households in the target population. We deserve a full and detailed analysis of the costs as well as the benefits from the rezoning: the downsides, although poorly discussed in the proposal, are not insignificant. We also should expect nothing less than:

- a much greater level of public consultation based on a revised proposal and discussion materials addressing a full range of questions and concerns that current and potential future residents of rezoned neighbourhoods may have; and
- an incremental and fully evaluated approach to change that encourages replication of the best ideas and rapid correction as unforeseen problems or unintended consequences arise



VANCOUVER
HERITAGE
FOUNDATION

APPENDIX B

303 - 3102 Main Street
Vancouver BC V5T 3G7
604 264 9642
mail@vancouverheritagefoundation.org
www.vancouverheritagefoundation.org
Charitable Registration # 891765968

Mayor Sim and Councillors
City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Ave
Vancouver, BC, V5Y 1V4

Sept 12, 2023

Re: Incentivizing Heritage Retention in Missing Middle Housing Proposed Zoning Amendments

Dear Mayor and Council,

On behalf of the Vancouver Heritage Foundation, we are writing to express our concern that the proposed zoning amendments to provide “missing middle” housing, will result in the dramatic loss of heritage buildings across our city. We ask that the policy be changed so that the option to retain rather than demolish heritage homes in neighbourhoods is incentivized by equal treatment in the bylaw. This means providing the same density as multiplexes from 0.85 fsr for heritage to the proposed standard 1.0 fsr. Moreover, using proven tools, such as Heritage Revitalization Agreements, to incentivize and encourage rehabilitating heritage buildings.

Last updated in November 2022, there are currently over 2200 houses on the City’s Heritage Register, many in current RS zones. Only about 30% (678) have official designation/legal protection. The Heritage Register in addition to several other City policies, notably the Vancouver Plan, recognize and underscore the importance of heritage and its retention across Vancouver.

Heritage retention and increased density do not have to be mutually exclusive goals. By making the necessary changes to the proposed bylaw amendments, City Council can encourage the retention of the vital heritage in our city and avoid wasteful demolitions that undermine the City’s’ own climate action policy goals. This will also avoid wasteful demolitions that undermine the City’s’ own environmental policy goals, as stated in the 2020 Greenest City Action Plan and targets.

We offer our support and collaboration to ensure this outcome.

Yours sincerely,

s22(1) Personal and Confidential

Herb Evers, Board Chair, Vancouver Heritage Foundation

s22(1) Personal and Confidential

Laura Carey, Executive Director, Vancouver Heritage Foundation

cc: Jurian ter Horst, board chair Heritage Vancouver
Michael Kluckner, board chair Vancouver Historical Society
James Evans, board chair, Vancouver Heritage Commission



VANCOUVER
HERITAGE
FOUNDATION

303 - 3102 Main Street
Vancouver BC V5T 3G7
604 264 9642
mail@vancouverheritagefoundation.org
www.vancouverheritagefoundation.org
Charitable Registration # 891765968

