

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
2023-09-14	11:04	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>I wanted to provide council with ideas to increase FSR above 1.0, specifically regarding the sewer capacity problem.</p> <p>- Credit for Low-Flow toilet and showerheads. This will reduce water usage by >50%, from 20L/min down to 10L/min. The city of Barrie, Ontario implemented this policy in 1995 and was able to defer upgrades by 7 years, saving millions of dollars. [1]</p> <p>Multiple other cities offer credits, including Peterborough Ontario, Coquitlam and Richmond BC.</p> <p>- Detention tanks for new developments. This is already part of the multiplex proposal and can address issues with rainwater affecting sewer capacity.</p> <p>By reducing sewer load, the city can save money on expensive wastewater treatment upgrades, as well as preventing unnecessary sewer replacements.</p> <p>Thank you reading my comment.</p> <p>[1] Barrie Water study: https://www.toolsforchange.com/en/case-studies/detail/103</p>	Jacob Tan	Downtown	
2023-09-13	16:12	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>This is an addendum to comments I made previously.</p> <p>I think it is unfortunate that this proposal only allows multiplex densities for new build projects. We should be aiming to upgrade and retain existing buildings as much as possible to avoid wasting resources. Character restoration projects such as multiple conversions should at least have access to the same incentives as new build multiplexes. Such projects should also be permitted more leniency to comply with regulations (yard setbacks, etc) without needing to negotiate excessive bureaucracy such as rezonings or HRAs.</p> <p>The proposed policy also fails to align with EV goals. If multiplex residents are expected to park on the street, then a solution for on street EV charging is necessary. charging EVs with level 1 cord covers is at best an interim solution. A long term strategy is needed (such as permitting resident owned charging stations at curbside) to solve this problem for multiplex owners and for other garage orphans in the city.</p>	Scott Nelson	Grandview-Woodland	

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
2023-09-13	17:38	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	I support densification of single-family neighborhoods, but think the process should start in areas proximate to transit, schools, shopping, etc. I am concerned that the plan does not adequately address additional infrastructure needs (water, sewer, electrical service, etc.) and does not prevent loss of tree canopies, character houses, and heritage streetscapes. Suggest working with the School Board to incorporate housing and childcare facilities when schools are re-built/replaced and to build homes for educators and child care providers on portions of underutilized school properties.	Nancy Kirkpatrick		
2023-09-13	22:30	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	I fully support densification of Vancouver and making housing more financially accessible. However, the recommendation to reduce the maximum size of new single-detached houses and increase the maximum size of new laneway houses seems unfairly punitive. I read the draft bylaws, and it isn't clear if the maximum size of the primary house will be reduced even if the property owner does NOT build a laneway house. In this case, the primary house size should NOT be reduced. A policy like this penalizes homeowners who choose not to build a laneway for various personal and financial reasons - it does not act as an incentive nor does it increase housing supply. If an owner doesn't want a laneway because it costs more per square foot than a garage or parking pad, giving her more of something she doesn't want makes no sense. Said differently, giving her less of what she does want (a larger primary house) with the argument that she gets more laneway (which she doesn't want) doesn't make sense - that's not incentive, it's punishment. On the other hand, developers who want more FSR will be incentivized by density bonuses with the proposed multiplex change. In short, I fully support the multiplex changes, but I do not support reducing primary house sizes if the property does NOT have a laneway.	Jennifer Chen	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-13	23:13	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Other	<p>Others have laid out good comments, I want to support it, but it seems to have too many poison pills in it's current form, and thus I can't as I believe it will delay and distract from actual progress towards more housing. This is supposed to make more housing, but it's designed to limit development to 200/year...</p> <p>FSR is too low, should be 1.2 for viability, and restricts units to very small sizes which aren't as good for residents.</p> <p>Setbacks are still to big.</p> <p>We have our own building code, make single stair buildings legal which would make it a lot easier to build these buildings.</p>	Sean Chilibeck	Hastings-Sunrise	