

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-12	10:14	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I support the rezoning process to allow for more density in housing. It could add more available housing and make housing more affordable. As a renter in this city, housing insecurity is a huge issue for me and it seems impossible that I will ever be able to purchase a house in the current market.	Claire deBruyn	Fairview	
2023-09-10	19:20	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I strongly support this motion. In the United States, the city of Minneapolis managed to reduce their rents and housing costs, and while their plan had several measures, one of them was a complete change of the zoning regulations: https://www.businessinsider.com/affordable-housing-minneapolis-rates-fed-metro-construction-inflation-rental-zoning-2023-8</p> <p>I don't think the City should stop at multiplex, ideally we should be building more densely than that, but this is a great step in the right direction and I strongly support this motion as is.</p>	Tristan Johnston	Downtown	
2023-09-10	10:33	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I am in support of the rezoning amendment. Constructing more units on standard lots and consolidating multiple zoning types into a single new zoning type will encourage higher-density constructions. Adding missing middle housing is a vital step forward in tackling Vancouver's housing crisis.</p> <p>I would also like to voice the opinion that this proposal does not go far enough in some areas. While limiting 3 story apartments to 6 units is necessary in some lots, I recommend increasing the number of units allowable on the particularly large lots around the city. If the lot is large enough, more than 6 units should be allowed.</p> <p>In addition, I believe that the 1.0 FSR is too small for these constructions. The FSR for middle-density constructions should be bumped above 1.0, particularly for higher-density constructions. This would increase the incentive for builders to focus on middle-density constructions.</p> <p>Finally, I am a concerned about the density bonus contribution, particularly the fee scaling with unit numbers and geographic location. It appears to both disincentivize building denser constructions as well as building them where they are needed most.</p> <p>While I hope my concerns are heard, I also hope that they do not detract from my overall support for this proposal.</p>	Seth Johnson	Victoria-Fraserview	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-10	09:09	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>Dear Members of Council,</p> <p>I strongly support the rezoning proposal to allow multi-unit housing in residential neighbourhoods. I also supported the Broadway plan, but Vancouver cannot achieve its housing and environmental goals only via high rises on busy streets while leaving other neighbourhoods untouched.</p> <p>This proposal will have three benefits from my perspective, all vitally important. First, by increasing density it will expand the amount of housing in Vancouver, and thus improve affordability. My own 20-something children might actually be able to stay in the city they grew up in.</p> <p>Second, by increasing density, it will limit continued sprawl -- and the greenhouse gas emissions from commuting that come with that.</p> <p>Third and finally, I expect that density will increase diversity and a sense of community. I appreciate that this is a concern for some of my neighbours (in Riley Park). We have a lovely and stable neighbourhood, and many fear that will be disrupted by change. But most of the space in the houses on my street sits empty, most of the time. I have lived in communities in the US and Europe with low-rise density -- and it was fantastic.</p> <p>Imagine a four-plex of families, seniors, and singletons, where kids grow up close to elders, and immediate neighbours know and can look out for each other (including in future heat domes, which we know will only be worse.)</p> <p>I look forward to living in that Vancouver.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathy Harrison</p>	Kathy Harrison	Riley Park	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-09	20:26	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I'm full in favour of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing the maximum size of new laneway houses, and simplifying the laneway house regulations; • Encouraging the construction of more homes on each lot by adding multiplexes as a new option with additional height and density. • Systemically reducing carbon pollution and providing incentives to do so. • Increasing permitting process efficiency by simplifying and consolidating regulations for home building and renovations. <p>However, I noticed, you have:</p> <p>"To compensate for tree loss, multiplexes will be required to either retain trees in the front yard or replace trees (1 tree for standard lots and 2 trees for larger lots) to help replace the canopy lost during construction."</p> <p>Why restrict ourselves to tree replacement? Why not e.g., replace 1 loss tree with an 'alternative lawn' (front or back yard) and replace 2 loss trees with an 'alternative lawn' in both the front and back yard e.g. drought resistant 'carpet thyme' lawns, xeriscaping, permaculture or urban vegetable & herb garden.</p> <p>Here's more information re 'alternative lawns': https://www[.]cbc[.]ca/news/science/what-on-earth-newsletter-garden-lawn-1.5200383 .</p> <p>'Alternative lawns' add tremendous value as a carbon sink and systemically reduces water usage without the risk of 'tree root'-related drain issues down the road, and without the added costs associated with fallen trees and branches during future severe wind storms.</p>	Carol Sung	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-09	14:06	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I support the by-laws aimed at adding missing middle housing across the city.</p> <p>Densification is desperately needed to increase the supply of housing and improve affordability.</p> <p>I hope these measures will not be watered-down and will be reviewed regularly to make sure they're successful in encouraging the construction of new homes.</p>	Stanley Turner Fowler	Downtown	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-09	08:57	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	We live in a single family home beside a medium density multifamily development. Having those families from varied backgrounds and economic circumstances enriches our neighbourhood and does not cause significant conflict or inconvenience.	Brian Hamilton	Riley Park	
2023-09-09	08:37	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	While some may complain about change and densification there are many reasons to support multi-plex and simpler regulations. Whether you're concerned about the people who service our everyday needs, yes the people who work in our grocery stores, restaurants etc, or today's youth who are struggling to meet the milestones their parents made, change is necessary.	R Huber	Riley Park	
2023-09-08	18:22	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I support the idea of up-zoning the city to support the missing middle housing, but I believe that the maximum allowed FSR of 1.0 and the proposed fees associated with achieving even this level of density will not provide results in improving housing affordability. I support the increasing of the maximum FSR in this plan to 1.2 and reducing development fees in order to encourage the redevelopment of our single-family home neighbourhoods. On a personal note, as a resident of the city in my 30's, I am tired of seeing my friends and family have to move away due to housing affordability. Or know that, due to the rising cost of living, some may be forced to move to lower cost areas in the future. Affordability has become the number one issue of our time and it must be addressed at all levels of government, especially the local level here in the City of Vancouver.	Thomas Prescott	Arbutus Ridge	
2023-09-12	11:32	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I support missing middle housing building as a means to build more affordable housing That building more infill housing will create affordable housing and resilient neighbourhoods helping the city meet its climate goals.	Julie Burtinshaw	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-12	11:40	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I'm strongly in favor of rezoning many low-density residential neighborhoods to medium- or high-density residential. Any neighborhoods that insist on remaining low-density should have their municipal taxes increased 2 or 3 fold. For far too long have high-density neighborhoods subsidized the luxury living style of the rich and entitled. It's time the latter START paying their fair share!	Martin Feuchtwanger	Grandview-Woodland	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-12	11:51	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	That building more infill housing will create affordable housing and resilient neighbourhoods helping the city meet its climate goals.	Janet Hudgins		
2023-09-11	18:23	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	We need more housing, fixing zoning is the best starting point and should have done years ago. Also remove heritage house designations for all of Shaughnessy.	Brandon Parnell	Downtown	
2023-09-11	18:53	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	As a long-time transplant in Vancouver, I am very eager to move from a rental into my own place. Even with a high paying job that I am blessed with, I can't even dream to afford the detached house. At the same time apartment living forever doesn't bode well for my future family growth. Missing middle housing is essential to increase the diversity of our neighborhoods, start putting a dent into the housing supply issues, and retain residents who are considering to move out to neighboring provinces just to get some more space.	Dmitrii Cucleschin	Downtown	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	19:27	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>1. Can a laneway have a basement?</p> <p>2. Can they have 2.5 floors? of half story below grade?</p> <p>3. Laneways and houses that have crawlspaces/ deep foundations - can they apply to convert to basement living space with additional FSR?</p> <p>4. How will amendments or requested for additional laneway FSR be handled?</p> <p>5. How do existing laneway / homes: - add FSR to make more livable given previous design restrictions - or apply the new parking regulations to take back space</p> <p>Laneway home design restrictions forced Owners to build laneway homes with tiny, tiny rooms - not suitable for families. The ability to convert crawlspaces to basement living areas would increase the living space of already established footprint.</p> <p>In 2002 all basement suites were allowed to be conversion to safe legal suites which allow thousands of suites to be rented. A laneway utilizing the crawlspace/ basement would allow more families to living in laneway homes which maintaining the height and set back design restrictions</p>	Susan Smith	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-11	19:43	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I support the recommendations of the report to add missing middle housing. This is a long overdue step to move on from the most common and least affordable type of housing in Vancouver and doing so in a way that simultaneously simplifies the City's complex zoning and regulatory environment.</p> <p>I am a resident of Norquay Village, one of the few areas that allows a mix of duplexes, townhouses, and low-rise apartments on neighbourhood streets. These buildings are full of people with children, a place for upcoming generations to plant roots. These opportunities should exist throughout all of Vancouver.</p> <p>Concerns about parking are exaggerated and density will support lifestyles that are less and less reliant on cars. We shouldn't be sacrificing the ability to find a home for a parking space. I urge you to approve the recommendations in this report.</p>	Zak Bennett	Renfrew-Collingwood	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	18:12	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I support the initiative to create more missing middle housing, such as multiplexes. In a housing crisis, we need to phase out single family zoning and add more housing, as fast as we can!	Nicole Chan	Fairview	

2023-09-11	21:03	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>Hello Council,</p> <p>I'm writing in SUPPORT of "adding missing middle housing and simplifying regulations in low density neighbourhoods."</p> <p>In general council should approve of this policy from city staff. We badly need more flexibility to create the housing we need. This is a small step forward.</p> <p>Please consider the following suggestions for amendments or direction for further near term staff work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider increasing density beyond 1.0 FSR. Victoria was willing to go further with their similar policy. Larger allowed infill is a good way to do this. 2. FSR for heritage retention projects should equal if not exceed multiplex FSR. <p>To do otherwise would implicitly be encouraging people to destroy rare historic buildings to make multiplexes. If there is any interest at all in preserving old buildings, the FSR must be the largest of any option.</p> <p>I would suggest increasing the FSR of the infill building in such a project to be larger (as is done in Strathcona). If more of the FSR is in the infill home it means the heritage home doesn't need to be as meddled with.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. City staff should follow this work up by doing a pass on the RT zones, swiftly normalizing all other RT zones with this new R1-1 zone as the common denominator, so that no other RT zone is in any way less dense than R1-1. <p>For example in the proposed R1-1 the maximum height is 11.5m, but in Strathcona's RT3, the maximum height is 10.7m. It seems odd and remarkable that Strathcona should now be in some ways less dense than the relatively low density zones elsewhere in the city. A simple change is to use R1-1 as the "baseline" for every zone, so 11.5m is the minimum "max height" across the city.</p> <p>Now clearly there is good cause for Strathcona's RT3 to be comprehensively modernized and upzoned, but that will take a great deal of time and further consultation. A quick pass to make RT3 (and other RT zones) at least as dense as the new R1-1 seems appropriate to me in the mean time.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my thoughts,</p> <p>Tavis MacCallum</p>	Tavis MacCallum	Strathcona	
------------	-------	---	---------	--	-----------------	------------	--

2023-09-11	21:12	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I think a higher fsr is better	June Tang	Sunset	
2023-09-11	21:15	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	1.5FSR	Emmanuel Tran	Sunset	
2023-09-11	17:47	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I support more missing middle housing. It does not make sense to have SFH zoning within the city. The city should be at minimum zoned for 2-3 story apartments/duplexes everywhere. Near transit, it should be higher, and anywhere close to a sky train station, there should be no limit at all. We are in the middle of a housing crisis!	Medley Flamecourt	Kerrisdale	
2023-09-11	16:44	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I strongly support the Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations. This zoning change is much needed and hope greater number of homes. One question is why not allow for greater FSR on purpose built rental sites?	Diana L.	Marpole	
2023-09-11	21:22	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	Single family zoning has no place in Urban areas. Vancouver considers itself an international city yet there are single family houses a block away from major commercial/retail stretches like commercial drive, Main Street, and 4th Ave. Vancouver needs way more high density housing. We need livable 2 and 3 bedroom apartments and townhouses, all walking distance from shops, restaurants, and cafes. The suburban experiment has failed. Let people live free of car dependancy, and let's also eliminate housing scarcity. Stop Building luxury micro suites for investors. Build for people to live in.	Alan Bowden	Strathcona	
				<p>I am in support of amending the Zoning and Development By-law to add missing middle housing. Housing affordability should be the primary concern of council. I am 34 years old and working for one of the largest companies in Canada in a senior position making well over 150k annually. Housing is simply unobtainable and unaffordable for me. I have given up on the dream of owning a home here in Vancouver, and Canada at Large. I am a recently naturalized Canadian Citizen and dual-citizen of the USA. I feel as if I have no choice but to leave Canada for the USA at this point.</p> <p>I firmly believe that the growth of real estate prices here over the last 30 years has made this city affordable only for those who currently own real-estate. The incumbent land owners have raised their families, and their children are now independent. Those parents and incumbent land owners are now selling their homes, downsizing, and moving to much cheaper</p>			

2023-09-11	21:29	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>retirement communities on Vancouver Island or the interior. This downsizing and generational wealth transfer creates a literal windfall of funds for the next generation of incumbent Vancouverites, who are currently purchasing homes. If you, The City Council, do not intervene and disrupt this negative feedback loop, prices will continue to escalate. I firmly believe creating more Missing Middle housing will help disrupt this negative feedback loop. I understand you, The Council, have a conflict of interest in the matter of home prices. Specifically, as prices rise so does your revenue from property tax. But please realize you stand to gain much much more by broadening the breadth of your tax base, rather than your current strategy of maximizing the depth spend on taxes you earn from each individual tax payer. As you reduce the size of your tax base, you also limit how flexible you can be when raising real-estate taxes. Since these taxes are traditionally derived from a percentage of the perceived value of a home, with such high prices, even 1% would be untenable and unaffordable by the average citizen. The current effective property tax rate here in the city is %0.2, which is far less than 1%. For a comparison, my home city of Detroit Michigan charges %3.2 in property tax. If one of the poorest cities on the face of the earth can afford to charge 3% property tax to its citizens, how can one of the most wealthy cities only afford to charge 0.2%? By building more Missing Middle Housing, you can and will increase the breadth of your tax base, creating more households through which you can tax. The city can grow well beyond the 670,000 current residents in 305,000 households, you must make policy changes in order to make room for the city to grow. The City will make more tax revenue from 400,000 homes (adding 100k homes), even if home prices of homes fall in lockstep with the increase in supply, so long as you very very slightly increase the current tax rates as home prices fall. Even if you maintain the current tax rate as home prices fall, every 10,000 households you build, would only decrease the total revenue from property tax by %0.05. The benefits from other types of taxes that those additional citizens bring will far outpace the costs. Those are just the simple economics of the situation, and our property tax rates should indeed return to normal 1% or higher rates, as our home prices return to more sane figures. Keep in mind you are in direct control of this issue. The more households you can tax, the more money you make. The Missing Middle will create plenty of more households for you to tax. This is the clear and obvious solution for this city to gain the revenue it needs to become one of the most prosperous on earth. Because the past City Councils have not intervened on this issue and prices are far-detached from reality, and far detached from the wages its citizens are earning. You are left with very few choices, and a very sensitive group of current home owners you will no-doubt be hearing from.</p>	Ronald Filloon	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-11	15:38	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	Please just do this--the city needs to progress to address the housing crisis.	Ricardo Bortolon		

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	15:26	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	We don't need big towers, we need to rezone spaces to allow more townhouses, triplexes, low rise apartment buildings.	Marilia Costa	Riley Park	
2023-09-11	22:49	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	Yes! It's about time the Missing Middle problem gets addressed in Vancouver. I am very happy to see this proposal finally reach the stage it has, and eagerly look forward to its approval.	Jesse Li	Marpole	
2023-09-12	05:19	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I am so grateful to see the city taking these steps in the right direction on missing middle housing by making way for more multiplexes. I support the proposed zoning changes but wish they were bolder about allowing for the density we need to address our housing crisis.	Katherine Wilde	West Point Grey	
2023-09-11	14:14	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	Vancouver needs to be practical in regards to solving our housing crisis - solutions need to exist at every income level. The streamline of 'Missing Middle' development applications will bring certainty to developers who are interested in meeting these market needs. While I am not pleased by the FSR being proposed I also appreciate that we have to start somewhere and I do not want perfect to be the enemy of good in getting this policy over the line.	Christine Valdes	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-12	09:46	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I strongly support the proposed change to allow multiplex development without rezoning. Adding missing middle housing City wide is an essential step in addressing housing affordability by increasing housing supply and housing options. Although the homes themselves likely won't be cheap, they will provide an attractive housing option for wealthier or existing owners who cannot quite afford a SFH, reducing the competition for condos. Having a range of housing options is essential in ensuring that the price of the smallest/more affordable units aren't pushed up by additional demand from wealthier residents who can't quite make the jump to a full SFH or duplex.	Stephen Clark	Mount Pleasant	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	14:00	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>We have a real opportunity here to make some important and positive decisions for the future of our city. I fully support the proposed changes to the RS zoning and dearly hope that the same sound city planning logic used to create this proposal will also be applied to other residential zones such as RT.</p> <p>Creating opportunities for missing middle housing is absolutely the best solution to keeping our city livable and also to address the housing and affordability crisis. Missing middle housing will not solve these problems on its own, but it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add density in a way that allows residential areas to maintain the neighbourhood feel. • Add density to areas served by public transportation and bike lanes. • Create opportunities to build new housing in a sustainable way, such as net zero. • It's difficult to say that these proposed changes to the zoning will make housing more "affordable". But we can be absolutely certain that by keeping single family zones low density the cost of housing will climb faster and higher. 	Michael Lemon	Grandview-Woodland	
2023-09-11	13:19	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I strongly support changing zoning to allow multiplexes throughout Vancouver.</p> <p>However, I am concerned about the fees required to build high density 6-plexes that will slow the construction of multiplexes which are much needed in the housing crisis.</p> <p>I would urge council to reduce the fees to allow more projects to be viable.</p>	Matthew Niedoba	Kitsilano	
2023-09-11	13:16	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I think it is a great way to create affordable housing. It is needed especially for the younger generation who have been priced out. There is no future without densifying our housing.</p>	Jaskaran Brar	West Point Grey	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	12:14	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I was born in the Vancouver Children's Hospital 28 years ago and have since been priced out of the city. I used to commute 1.5 hours each way from the suburbs in order to get to university via public transit, and it was disappointing to see low density, less affordable SFH right next to Skytrain stations. It was not an effective use of land resources to have relatively few people living within walking distance of the valuable infrastructure that is public transit. If we want to encourage increased adoption of public transit and its environmental benefits, then we need to be increasing density around transit hubs.</p> <p>I am also in favour of increasing density throughout the city in general. The Missing Middle upzoning of all low density zones is a welcome change. I hope that it will become easier to build multiplexes on all existing RS lots and provide housing that is suitable for families. I currently live in a 300 sq bachelor suite with my partner. We like it because it is affordable, but it is not suitable for raising a family in. However, we would be happy to raise a family in missing middle housing and would love to see more of these residences get built.</p>	Vivian Li	I do not live in Vancouver	
2023-09-11	11:51	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>More housing and density in Vancouver is a desperate need as the housing crisis becomes worse and worse at an unprecedented rate. We can't afford to waste time having a public hearing for every new multiplex housing project in residential areas. Therefore I strongly support this initiative.</p>	Jakub Kupcik	Downtown	
2023-09-11	11:39	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I fully support the proposal to add missing middle housing and simplify regulations in low density neighbourhoods, which goes into Public Hearing on September 14, 2023.</p> <p>By diversifying housing options, we can accommodate the needs of a broader range of residents without compromising the character of these neighbourhoods - a large complaint whenever new developments are proposed. Simplifying regulations will also streamline the development process and make it more cost-effective and efficient for both builders and homeowners.</p> <p>Ultimately, adding a policy to allow for missing middle typology in Vancouver would help address pressing housing shortages while fostering a stronger sense of community.</p>	Sheyla Cavalcanti		

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	11:14	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>Please note submission is from Mr. Ron Rapp. ron@havan.ca</p> <p>Dear Council and Staff,</p> <p>On behalf of Ron Rapp, CEO of Homebuilders Association Vancouver, please find attached two pieces of correspondence for your consideration as part of the Public Hearing that is being held on Thursday, September 14th.</p> <p>The first is a letter that Mr. Rapp wrote in April 2023 to senior staff as part of the engagement process being held as part of introducing proposed new policies regarding missing middle/multiplex/laneway homes.</p> <p>The second letter, submitted to Council and staff in July 2023, was in regards to a related report that was considered by Council prior to giving readings and forwarding recommendations to the Public Hearing which is being held this week.</p> <p>We are submitting both pieces of correspondence for your reference and consideration as part of the Public Hearing process.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>~ Diana</p> <p>Diana Dilworth Director of Government Relations Homebuilders Association Vancouver s22(1) Personal and Confidential</p>	organization Homebuilders Association Vancouver	I do not live in Vancouver	<p>APPENDIX A</p> <p>AND</p> <p>APPENDIX B</p> <p>Attachment 1 Attachment 2</p>
2023-09-11	10:30	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	Our city is in desperate need of missing middle housing, and housing supply in general. The current zoning needs to be reflect this need.	Matthew McQueen	Mount Pleasant	
2023-09-11	10:01	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	if we want Vancouver to be a sustainable city for the future we need to diversify the type of housing we allow - and move away from the current binary of single family homes or huge towers.	Tim Fitzgerald	Hastings-Sunrise	

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2023-09-11	09:44	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	I support making it easier to build missing middle housing. I live near 29th station with my family and no other families with small kids can afford to live around here. A 1.5 lot has been for sale across the street for an entire year without being sold because developers are uncertain anything can get passed here. They should be able to build 7 or 8 family townhomes or apartments on that lot! I would support! My kids need friends their age in the neighbourhood!	Kristine De Marchi	Renfrew-Collingwood	
2023-09-11	09:31	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>I fully support the idea of allowing multiplex buildings on single family lots. I like the idea of one unit being below market price.</p> <p>I applaud the idea of creating complete neighbourhoods so that fewer car trips are needed. However one important issue that isn't covered from what I read is the issue of schools! I assume that many of these units would be occupied by families. Already there are schools children need to join a lottery to try to attend. A complete neighbourhood provides a neighbourhood school. Otherwise parents will be driving and adding to the rush hour. (Have you noticed the drop in morning traffic when schools close for the summer?).</p> <p>I urge you to work with the VSB and assure that schools will be kept open, added to as needed, (or new ones built: Olympic Village, River District) in order to ensure that your excellent plan is successful!</p> <p>Thank you, Ildi Varga</p>	Ildi Varga	Dunbar-Southlands	
2023-09-11	09:00	PH 2 - 1. Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations – Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law	Support	<p>It is urgent that you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -allow more units -allow more floor space -remove parking minimums <p>Please make your proposals more bold!</p>	Denis Agar	Hastings-Sunrise	



HAVAN

Homebuilders Association Vancouver

778-565-4288
info@havan.ca
www.havan.ca

#1011, 7445 – 132 Street
Surrey, BC V3W 1J8

April 17, 2023

Mr. Paul Mochrie
City Manager
City of Vancouver
paul.mochrie@vancouver.ca

Ms. Theresa O'Donnell
GM, Director of Planning
City of Vancouver
theresa.o'donnell@vancouver.ca

Re: City of Vancouver – Proposed Zoning Changes

Dear Mr. Mochrie and Ms. O'Donnell,

We are reaching out to you and members of your team to share our thoughts on the proposed Multi-Plex program and express our support for this approach to increasing housing supply. We have heard a number of concerns from our members regarding the proposed roll-out of the Multi-Plex program that is currently being reviewed by staff and the potential impacts on existing laneway housing policy which we would like to share with you.

We understand that staff will be bringing forward policy direction related to changing single family lot zoning to allow for the development of multi-plex housing, and if approved by Council, bylaws would be prepared for enactment in September. With applications subsequently to be accepted in the fall, it is likely no permits for this form of housing will be issued until early 2024.

We have three key concerns that we would like staff to consider, and that we could work on together to develop strategies to address the potential implications.

Firstly, our members whose businesses are focused on providing much needed laneway housing infill, are concerned that the permitting process for these applications will be delayed or stalled until the new multi-plex bylaw(s) come forward, which would have a significant impact on in-stream applications potentially resulting in costly delays or suspension of contracts. We would recommend keeping the multi-plex application process separate from the laneway process, which can be easily accelerated and approved by Council in early summer, prior to the other changes in RS zoning being enacted. It is hoped that changes to the RS zoning, harmonizing, and simplifying applications will create the opportunity to expedite permitting processes.

We would also ask if there will be any consultation or alignment with the changes being contemplated by the province to support similar changes to RS zoning across BC, and hope that there will be a close reflection and similar specifications.

Secondly, we have heard from members operating in this space, concerns related to the proposed floor-space-ratio reduction on the principle building from 0.7 FSR to 0.6 and the potential impact on liveable spaces/suites if the lot is developed to the maximum number of units allowed. With the concurrent proposed increase of FSR on accessory building(s) from 0.16 FSR to 0.25 FSR this may incentivize property owners to rush in applications before the new rezoning is put into effect, potentially overwhelming staff and increasing wait times.

In allowing the opportunity to have 4-6 dwelling units per single family lot, it will be an opportunity to generate additional homes, but there must flexibility to ensure that these new units can house couples and young families with units of one, two, or more bedrooms. Unit count is important, but the size of those units must be practical to serve the needs of the occupants. While not specifying maximums for the main house, or laneway home, analysis points to a minimum of 1.0, to 1.2, or even 1.5 FSR to achieve a flexible, viable opportunity to provide usable homes while still respecting the scale and character of a neighbourhood.

Our suggestion is to create more flexibility for property owners by allowing a shift in FSR between the principal structure and accessory dwelling, with a maximum assigned to either, creating a higher opportunity to meet varying needs of property owners. Notwithstanding these changes, we propose a twelve-month grace period where this new approach to RS applications can be phased in.

The third, and very serious concern is related to the direction toward, and cost of, installing hydro pad mount transformers on private lands to accommodate laneway and multi-plex housing, which compromises developable space, affordability, and parking opportunities already strained under the proposals to increase housing supply. The cost of upgrading hydro infrastructure and service to meet loads specified to serve mandated electrification are being levied upwards of tens of thousands of dollars and in some instances well into six figures, and these costs should not be burdened onto individual property owners seeking to provide affordable housing.

Electrical load requirements should be verified, as our members experience points to much lower service thresholds in fully electric homes already in the field, but if zoning is going to be universally applied to support and incentivize ADU's in SF zones and the extremely high load specs stand, then the cost to upgrade the capacity should be borne by BC Hydro allowing the overall expense to serve gentle densification through all RS zones in the city, versus spot upgrades, and with hydro plant components and equipment situated in existing right of ways. We believe that the use of public lands to accommodate an additional or upgraded transformer is a more effective, efficient, and appropriate solution.

There are other issues regarding multiplex development on SF lots that will need to be considered including tenure, fire separation, access, exposure to unprotected openings, setback, and height. We would be pleased to offer our insights on these matters in conjunction with the experiences of our members who have been building infill scenarios in the City over many years. We appreciate the consultative approach the City has with HAVAN and its members, and we hope to work collaboratively with you on these issues.

We look forward to future announcements and policy developments that we may comment on and welcome the opportunity to bring forward active builder members building in-fill housing, and we would be pleased to help in arranging consultations where city staff can hear directly from members willing to share their experiences. Thank you very much, we look forward to hearing from you and continuing to engage on this important initiative.

Sincerely,

s22(1) Personal and Confidential



Ron Rapp
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Andrea Law, GM Development, Building and Licensing, City of Vancouver
Jake Fry, Smallworks
Bryn Davidson, LaneFab
Khang Nguyen, Architrix Design Studio

Recognized as leaders in the homebuilding industry since 1974, HAVAN members include builders, developers, renovators, designers, suppliers, sub-trades, and leading professionals. We are an association of knowledgeable, trusted, resourceful and local professionals who build over 65% of Metro Vancouver's homes.





778-565-4288
info@havan.ca
www.havan.ca

#1011, 7445 – 132 Street
Surrey, BC V3W 1J8

July 21, 2023

Mayor Sim and Council
City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

Submitted via email

Proposed Zoning and Development Bylaw Amendments: Adding Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations

Dear Mayor and Council,

At your next Council meeting of July 25, 2023, you will be deliberating recommendations from staff related to proposed amendments to the Zoning and Development Bylaws to add Missing Middle Housing and Simplifying Regulations. We have previously participated in information sessions that have been held with industry stakeholders and have provided written concerns to your senior staff as recently as April 2023 (*as attached*).

We appreciate the consultative approach that the City has taken with the development sector, and the many opportunities we have had to provide insight on new initiatives being created by Council and staff. The report presented to Council is comprehensive and provides a great level of detail and is consistent with what has been shared with stakeholders through the consultation process.

Firstly, we applaud the action that is being taken to provide legislation to support the much needed missing middle housing across the City. Particularly, the consolidation of the current nine residential zones into a single Residential Inclusive, R1-1 zone, will lessen confusion, increase process efficiency and support a wider range of housing allowed in these areas.

At this time, we are reaching out directly to yourselves, as elected officials, to both express our support for this innovative approach to increasing housing supply and to share concerns related to impacts on laneway housing policy, base density and hydro infrastructure.

Laneway Housing

We appreciate the proposed maximum density of 0.25 FSR for new laneway homes with a 0.6 FSR primary home. We support the City's goal to create significant volume of attainable home ownership units and recommend that there needs a greater incentive for property owners to realize the potential of their properties.



We recommend that the City permit the stratification of lane-way homes, with no upgrades needed for a primary home, if there is no change in use of principle residence.

Base Density for Multiplex Properties

We would encourage Council to create more flexibility for property owners by allowing a shift in FSR between the principal structure and accessory dwelling(s), with a maximum assigned to either, creating a higher opportunity to meet varying needs of property owners. Our members have indicated to us that the density as proposed is too focused on restriction and limits opportunities for genuine creativity.

Our members have made it clear to us that the maximum single family home should remain as 0.7 FSR not reduced to 0.6 FSR, and that reducing the maximum may result in much smaller livable units if a lot is developed to the maximum allowed under the multi-plex program. The opportunity exists to generate additional homes, but without flexibility, the size of new units may not be practical to serve the needs of couples and young families.

While not specifying maximums for a primary house or laneway home, our analysis points to a minimum of 1.0 – 1.2 FSR to achieve a flexible, viable opportunity to provide usable homes while still respecting the scale and character of a neighborhood. We appreciate that the proposed regulations allows for a density bonus of 0.30 FSR, to total at 1.0 FSR across a property, but with criteria that may provide to be challenging to achieve.

To achieve a desired 1.0 FSR, a property owner would need to:

- Pay a set-rate, floor area based financial contribution
- Provide one below-market home ownership unit
- Secure all units as purpose-built rental housing in perpetuity

The City's commissioned report from Coriolis Consulting identified that the ability to make a density bonus contribution will be difference for each project and that smaller lots that can accommodate a maximum of 4 units cannot support any significant contribution. Further they noted that the inclusion of one below-market home is likely only viable in six unit projects.

We strongly believe that providing an increased density, with additional flexibility for property owners, will help the City realize its goal of a successful multiplex program.

Hydro Infrastructure

As shared with staff in our correspondence in April, a final concern is related to the direction toward, and cost of, installing hydro pad mount transformers on private lands to accommodate laneway and multi-plex housing, which compromises developable space, affordability, and parking opportunities already strained under the proposals to increase housing supply. The cost of upgrading hydro infrastructure and service to meet loads specified to serve mandated electrification are being levied upwards of tens of thousands of dollars and in some instances well into six figures, and these costs should not be burdened onto individual property owners seeking to provide affordable housing.



HAVAN

Homebuilders Association Vancouver

778-565-4288
info@havan.ca
www.havan.ca

#1011, 7445 – 132 Street
Surrey, BC V3W 1J8

Electrical load requirements should be verified, as our members experience points to much lower service thresholds in fully electric homes already in the field, but if zoning is going to be universally applied to support and incentivize ADU's in SF zones and the extremely high load specs stand, then the cost to upgrade the capacity should be borne by BC Hydro allowing the overall expense to serve gentle densification through all RS zones in the city, versus spot upgrades, and with hydro plant components and equipment situated in existing right of ways. We believe that the use of public lands to accommodate an additional or upgraded transformer is a more effective, efficient, and appropriate solution.

In Closing

The multi-plex program is one of great opportunity to provide gentle densification contributing to neighborhood vibrancy, but our members fear that with current land costs, construction costs and the cost of financing combined, is a perfect storm that might not initially be as successful as anticipated.

While the Government of BC is moving along in implementing a province-wide approach to multi-plexes, we hope that City staff have been working with them to ensure consistency between the municipal and provincial approach.

We thank Council, and your staff team at City Hall, for proposing and enacting substantive actions to streamline, and make more efficient, the housing and permit processes, through your Housing Vancouver Strategy, Vancouver Plan, Regulation Redesign, and most recently, the commitment to a 3-3-3-1 Permit Approval Framework.

We look forward to continuing to work with the City of Vancouver in advancing much needed housing supply in an affordable manner.

Sincerely,

s22(1) Personal and Confidential



Ron Rapp
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Theresa O'Donnell
Andrea Law

Recognized as leaders in the homebuilding industry since 1974, HAVAN members include builders, developers, renovators, designers, suppliers, sub-trades, and leading professionals. We are an association of knowledgeable, trusted, resourceful and local professionals who build over 65% of Metro Vancouver's homes.

