

4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-06-11	14:13	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	<p>I request that Council reconsider using the Vancouver Plan as the basis for future planning on the Official Development Plan, and instead do proper planning now.</p> <p>With the coalition of Vancouver neighborhoods, I request a whole new approach that includes community involvement in planning each neighbourhood that considers the local context and consultation. The plan outcome should reflect community input for livable affordable sustainable communities</p>	Laura Wilkie	Kitsilano	
2024-06-11	11:32	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	<p>Please see this link for formatted version (https://coalitionvan[.]org/posts/20240611-oppose-amendments-rt7-rt9-cd1371-cd1463-bill44-ssmuh-legislation/). PDF attached.</p> <p>CVN is opposed to Item 4 and Item 5.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) includes residents' associations and groups across the City of Vancouver, from a broad cross-section of the population. CVN is both non-profit and non-partisan. Originally launched in 2013, over twenty community and residents' associations, covering almost the entire City of Vancouver comprise the Coalition, which seeks a more respectful relationship between the City and communities.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>June 10, 2024</p> <p>City of Vancouver</p> <p>Dear Mayor Ken Sim and Councillors,</p> <p>Re: Public Hearings - Rezoning to Comply with BC Bill 44</p> <p>The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) strongly opposes these two rezonings since they are proposing to rezone entire neighbourhoods without ANY advanced public consultation process. There also are no red-line rezoning By-laws for public or Council reference.</p> <p>Report 4 rezones Kitsilano (RT7 & RT9) and Report 5 rezones all of the First Shaughnessy Heritage District, without opportunity for meaningful input from the public, the FS Advisory Design Panel, or the Heritage Commission. These proposed rezonings remove all character and heritage disincentives for demolition, without adequate incentives for retention options or</p>	Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) CVN		Attachment 1

guidelines.

Hours before the referral reports were posted online, 2024-05-22, CVN sent Council a letter advising that we have many concerns regarding the new provincial legislation, Bills 44, 46 and 47. We find the current June 30, 2024 schedule for local and city-wide rezoning to be completely unrealistic, as it will neither allow for any legitimate public process nor a proper infrastructure review. We requested an extension to at least the end of 2024 or preferably spring 2025.

See our previous letter attached and posted online at:

[https://coalitionvan\[.\]org/posts/20240522-response-provincial-legislation-bills-44-46-47/](https://coalitionvan[.]org/posts/20240522-response-provincial-legislation-bills-44-46-47/)

[https://cityhallwatch\[.\]wordpress\[.\]com/2024/05/23/citywide-opposition-bills-44-46-47-june30-deadline/](https://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2024/05/23/citywide-opposition-bills-44-46-47-june30-deadline/)

The two Public Hearing Reports 1 & 2 above, coming forward without any public consultation process, only proves our point that the current schedule for rezoning of June 30 is completely unrealistic for any kind of legitimate planning process.

As we pointed out in our previous letter, the City confirmed that Vancouver already exceeds the provincial five year targets based on the record number of developments currently in the pipeline. However, current market conditions have put many new already approved projects on hold, so there is no imminent pressure to rush further rezoning without a proper public consultation process.

The City of Vancouver is also likely already exceeding infrastructure capacity. It is crucial that an infrastructure review be undertaken as part of any further planning for more rezoning.

We also have specific concerns about the proposed rezonings as follows.

Item 4. Rezoning Kitsilano RT-7 & RT-9:

- We oppose the rezoning removal of disincentives to demolition and incentives for retention of character and heritage houses, without adding any incentives for retention other than waiving a few fees on Multifamily Conversion Dwellings.
- Houses and duplexes with suites, of less than three units gets no incentive for retention at all.
- For RT-7 the maximum density for a character retention house with an addition and a suite, or an MCD duplex, only gets 0.60 FSR, rather than 0.75 FSR in RT-9.
- RT7 should also be allowed 0.75 FSR like RT9 for character retention of two units or less.
- Retain the design guidelines that ensure quality design in both RT7 & RT9.

				<p>Item 5: First Shaughnessy District Schedule and Heritage Conservation Area ODP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retain heritage area protections and zoning that incentivizes retention options for more units and infill, without loss of heritage as proposed. Allow growth and more units within the local context. - Retain design guidelines and the First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel for this important area. <p>Therefore, we request that the proposed rezoning reports be instead referred back to staff for a proper planning process with public consultation, with direction to staff to advise the Province that the current schedule of June 30, 2024 for local and city-wide rezoning is unrealistic for Vancouver, so should be extended in order to have a legitimate public process and an infrastructure review.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Co-Chairs Larry Benge & Dorothy Barkley CVN Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods</p> <p>Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods</p> <p>Arbutus Ridge Community Association Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours Dunbar Residents Association Fairview/South Granville Action Committee Grandview Woodland Area Council Greater Yaletown Community Association Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association Kits Point Residents Association NW Point Grey Home Owners Association Oakridge Langara Area Residents Residents Association Mount Pleasant Riley Park/South Cambie Advisory Group Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc. Strathcona Residents Association Upper Kitsilano Residents Association West End Neighbours Society West Kitsilano Residents Association West Point Grey Residents Association West Southland Residents Association</p>			
2024-06-11	10:40	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7,	Oppose	Vancouver Character House Network	organization Character House		Attachment 1

RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation

June 10, 2024

City of Vancouver

Dear Mayor Sim and Councillors,
Re: Public Hearing - Response to BC Bill 44 - 4. Rezone Kits RT7-RT9 & 5. First Shaughnessy
Public Hearing Agenda - June 13, 2024: [hxxps://council\[.\]vancouver\[.\]ca/20240613/phea20240613ag.htm](https://council[.]vancouver[.]ca/20240613/phea20240613ag.htm)

Report 4: Rezoning Kits RT7-RT9 [hxxps://council\[.\]vancouver\[.\]ca/20240528/documents/rr1.pdf](https://council[.]vancouver[.]ca/20240528/documents/rr1.pdf)

Report 5: Rezoning First Shaughnessy District Heritage Conservation Area ODP [hxxps://council\[.\]vancouver\[.\]ca/20240528/documents/rr2.pdf](https://council[.]vancouver[.]ca/20240528/documents/rr2.pdf)

The Character House Network opposes that these two rezonings. These reports propose to rezone heritage and character areas within large parts of Kitsilano in RT7 and RT9 zones and the entire First Shaughnessy District Heritage Conservation Area ODP, without any advanced public consultation process, or even red-line zoning By-laws for review. Instead, advise the Province that the June 30, 2024 deadline is not achievable and advise them that Vancouver will need an extension to allow for a proper planning process that includes public consultation and an infrastructure review.

We have a petition on Change.org calling "...to take immediate action to remove from zoning and building code bylaws any biases favouring demolition and new construction over retention..." and is now over 10,000 plus paper signers at the time of writing.

[hxxps://www\[.\]change\[.\]org/p/city-of-vancouver-mayor-and-council-save-vancouver-s-character-houses](https://www[.]change[.]org/p/city-of-vancouver-mayor-and-council-save-vancouver-s-character-houses)

And the Vancouver Vanishes Facebook has over 14,000 likes and followers, also as a form of support for retention. [hxxps://www\[.\]facebook\[.\]com/VancouverVanishes/](https://www[.]facebook[.]com/VancouverVanishes/)

Clearly the public wants to see policies that encourage heritage and character house retention, while this rezoning goes in the opposite direction. Doing more with what we have through adaptive reuse needs to be a central part of policy and planning for growth.

RT7 should at minimum have some incentives for character house retention options with two units or a house with a secondary suite, raised to 0.75 FSR like the RT9 allows.

We also oppose the proposed elimination of the First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel. This has an important role that will increase in importance over time. Bill 44 only recommends that SSMUH projects not be subject to review by advisory design panels or planning commissions. It is a recommendation not a legislation, so the City can retain this important

Network

advisory panel.

We previously wrote to Council in April opposed to the approach the City of Vancouver is taking regarding the Provincial BC Bills 44, 46 and 47. This is a transfer of municipal land use authority from the City to the Province and is not in the best public interests of the City, that you are obliged to represent. Instead the City is going along with proposed policies that undermine basic planning and sustainability measures required for a livable affordable city within infrastructure capacity.

The BC Bills are a one-size-fits-all approach to zoning across the province that is not responsive to local context. Debate on the bills was closed before the Vancouver Charter amendments were even reviewed or debated. There was no advanced public or local government consultation. The so-called experts advising the province were mainly the biased development industry lobby with no planning expertise. The City of Vancouver should be challenging the Province on the BC bills.

Of particular concern is how the bills do not address the Vancouver context which has many areas of concentrated character and heritage buildings. They often contain converted multiple units of both rental and strata, much of it older, more affordable housing. Zoning and policies that support retention and adaptive reuse are essential to reducing embodied carbon while allowing for growth, and can continue to be a model used for multiplex zoning.

And further, the provincial bills prevent new Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRAs) from limiting future development, therefore preventing adding permanent protection of properties on the Vancouver Heritage Register under an HRA. Restrictions on HRAs should be reversed.

This means that when zoning is changed to remove character and heritage incentives and protections, even the heritage properties listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register cannot be designated for protection to limit future development on the site under an HRA, unless it was already in place on the date of the BC Bills' enactment.

The Province keeps saying that the Heritage Conservation Act still remains in effect. But this is only for Provincially designated property, not municipal designation. There are no more tools for City of Vancouver designation of heritage properties or heritage areas.

Adding additional density by introducing new multiplexes should not, and need not, come at the expense of our heritage and character houses and streetscapes.

While we support planning that allows for growth, this should not be arbitrarily dictated by the Province and should not be related only to transit.

				<p>Transit should be focused on transportation needs. Any new zoning should consider all infrastructure needs that are currently over capacity.</p> <p>Development should be planned within each neighbourhood context to allow for population growth within the infrastructure capacity of each local area. It is not sustainable to promote growth in a one-size-fits-all typology without considering the local context.</p> <p>Most new construction is unaffordable for people with local incomes whether to own or to rent, and demolition and redevelopment increases embodied carbon. This process is unsustainable unless balanced by incentives for retention and adaptive reuse.</p> <p>The City recently confirmed that Vancouver already exceeds the provincial five year housing targets with the record number of developments currently in the pipeline. Therefore, there is no imminent pressure to rush further rezoning without a proper public consultation process, especially since the current market conditions have put many new already approved projects on hold.</p> <p>We request that the City question the provincial bills, advocate for the best interest of the public, and advise the Province that the City cannot meet unreasonably rushed zoning deadlines of June 30, 2024. Instead, refer the current reports back to staff and allow for a reasonable schedule beyond June 30 that allows for a proper planning process with public consultation and an infrastructure review.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Elizabeth Murphy, Jan Pierce, and Carol Volkart</p> <p>On behalf of Vancouver Character House Network</p>			
2024-06-10	20:33	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am appalled by how you continue to ruin this city, pander to the autocratic provincial government and wealthy developers while disregarding the concerns of regular residents.</p> <p>How I wish Vancouver had a mayor and council like West Vancouver who have the courage to stand up to the provincial government's egregious overreach by refusing to comply with the province's arbitrarily drawing circles all over province to mandate what height and density of housing must be built regardless of whether it makes sense in specific contexts.</p> <p>Most egregious of all, none of the new provincial housing legislation mandates affordability for these new builds.</p>	Roberta Olenick	West Point Grey	

Thus it completely baffles and angers me that Vancouver mayor and council not only seem extremely eager to lick the boots of the BC government, but to go beyond that and pander even further by proposing to hugely exceed the province's already undemocratic demands, made through legislation developed in consultation exclusively with developers and then pushed through the legislature with iron-fisted limits on debate.

There is NO justification for allowing 50% higher housing density than the province requires on all larger lots, even if these are not near transit. There is NO justification to double that density if the units will be rentals.

Do you not have any clue how unlivable this will make the city, beyond the unlivability that the province has arbitrarily imposed?

Imagine cramming 6 or 8 units on a 33' lot? Yuck!

Trees will no longer have to be retained on what used to be a back yard. No more green leafy streets, that is what people really want, especially as climate change intensifies the need for greenery to survive heat domes. Whatever happened to Vancouver being the greenest city?

Loss of heritage protections and no incentives for multi unit conversion of older homes. Our heritage will be sent to the landfill, again antithetical to a green city. The greenest, most carbon efficient building is the one already built.

No more daylight or privacy for neighbours as buildings became larger with reduced setbacks.

Crowded streets as no onsite parking is required. Vancouver's narrow residential streets are already choked, and you can be sure people will still own cars even if they live near transit.

Ugliness as new boxy buildings replace charming older homes. Plus garbage bins and blue boxes will litter the front of streets without back lanes where the proposed density will also be allowed.

Vancouver already has tons and tons of zoned capacity to accommodate increased population for decades to come. The same cannot be said of sewer capacity, water supply, schools, parks, hospitals, family doctors and everything else people need to live livable lives.

I strongly opposed the province's overreach into municipal matters with its false narrative that one size fits all and that Victoria knows what is best for every city in the province. So NOT true.

I ardently wish Vancouver's mayor and council had the courage to stop sucking up to the premier and the big developers who are destroying

				<p>Vancouver for everyone and to stand up for a livable city that honours what is most valuable about our city.</p> <p>NO to Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation.</p> <p>NO to Amendments to the First Shaughnessy District Schedule and Heritage Conservation Area Official Development Plan (HCA ODP) to Comply with Bill 44 – Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH)Legislation.</p> <p>Sincerely, Roberta Olenick, Vancouver BC</p>			
2024-06-10	19:31	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	Please find ways to incentivise preserving the remaining heritage homes. I worry that many don't have heritage status. Also, this densification is going to reduce our canopy and quantity of mature shrubs and trees. We need them to reduce green house gases. Don't water down existing protection of our beloved heritage homes...many of them have already been lost to poorly constructed cheap buildings that erode the character of our communities.	Carol-Ann Kunimoto	West Point Grey	
2024-06-11	22:37	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	I think neighborhoods should be left as neighborhoods. We are ruining the charm of Vancouver. The more we densify neighborhoods, the more anxiety will be created among the residents. Keep density to the main traffic routes. Create peaceful residential areas in between.	Donna Simpson	South Cambie	
2024-06-11	15:11	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	Complying with the provincially-mandated blanket density without standing up for citizens' right to be heard is bad enough; voting for even more density than necessary is adding fuel to the fire. 6 units anywhere, regardless of transit service and with no onsite parking? 8 rental units on a 33' lot? Please vote against this motion.	Sal Robinson	Kitsilano	
2024-06-11	18:08	4. Amendments to Restricted Zones (RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463) to Comply with Bill 44 - Provincial Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) Legislation	Oppose	I oppose the official redevelopment plan for Vancouver - we need community input.	Kristine Chapman	Kitsilano	