

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
2024-06-12	22:59	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 oppose the changes proposed in this item for all the very thoughtful reasons laid out in the 4 letters shown online as of June 12th. Like most Vancouverites, I recognize the need for more housing, but the proposed changes will not give us better, more just, or more successful responses to the current situation, and they risk great detriment to the liveability of the city and the joy it can inspire in its inhabitants. Have you envisaged neighbourhoods stripped of half of backyard and frontyard trees and shrubs? Would those streets still look like special places to live? Except for major streets with median boulevards (16th Ave., King Edward) all the towering conifers characterizing Kitsilano are on private property-- the front or back yards of houses. Ditto all the flowering shrubs, Dogwood trees, etc. Those won't grow in heavy shade or spaces without root room, so they won't be cleaning the air and softening heat, noise, and wind. Would it be worth it if it created more family housing? But it won't. The new duplexes springing up on every block require too many stairs for toddlers or elders; and multiple apartments on a small lot are going to be very, very constrictive, not what those wanting to raise a family here are hoping for. Better to let individual enterprise figure out ways to preserve a neighbourhood while creatively enlarging older homes or creating small-scale co-ops. If you eliminate backyards you will need more parks, but have you planned those out?? And schoolyards? You need to allow more flexibility for small-scale enterprise by those who know and love their neighbourhoods. Don't let Vancouver lose its often-remarked coniferous heritage. Voting on one day for a fabulous # of new street trees won't compensate for voting on the next for policies that will lead to loss of uncounted #s of decades-old proven survivors. Plant the new trees but also protect the old ones. Delay the vote on proposed changes until more public discussions are held. Thank you.</p>	Joan Bunn	Kitsilano	

2024-06-12	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	<p>I am strongly opposed to the arbitrary and dictatorial rezoning of one of the most successful character and family neighbourhoods in the city. This is a family oriented neighbourhood with green space and many character and heritage houses. and also hundreds of affordable rental units that provide much needed housing. Please, if you haven't visited this neighbourhood, go see it and consider what you are consigning to the landfill.</p> <p>This neighbourhood adds value to the whole city. Neighbourhoods like these are what are needed to make a successful city!</p> <p>As staff considered various options for the new zoning, they did not take the time to inform the neighbourhood or to hear their opinions. There has been absolutely no neighbourhood consultation or even a meeting to explain what the new zoning will mean.</p> <p>While the Province has to take the majority of the blame for this regrettable situation, it is also the case, that not one current city councillor has expressed any concerns or objections to what is going on.</p> <p>Having made this point, I would like to point out three extremely bad aspects of what is being proposed.</p> <p>First, an owner of a character house who wants to retain his home and renovate to create a secondary suite is being limited to .6 FSR while all around, houses will be demolished and redevelopment to 1 FSR will be allowed. Surely a homeowner or family should be allowed at least .75 FSR. By limiting FSR to .6 for a character house renovation the City is consigning this wonderful character neighbourhood to complete demolition and redevelopment.</p> <p>Secondly, the by-law proposes allowing a full three storeys for a building in the rearyard. The City limited the size of rear yard residences to 2 storeys for other areas of the City. It is shocking that a homeowner - who is limited to .6 FSR- could potentially have a three storey building overshadowing his property. In such a situation, the value of the property is reduced to its value as a redevelopment site - even if it is a character or heritage house.</p> <p>Finally, the by-law seems to prohibit laneway houses. By only allowing infill, the whole house must be upgraded to code. This is a recipe only for developers. The homeowner who would like to build a laneway house for family is totally ignored.</p> <p>There are so many problems with this kind of six (or more) unit development, such as loss of mature trees and green space, increase in impermeable surfaces, infrastructure and community amenity deficits, challenges creating usable living area, etc, that it is dismaying that City Council seems to have few or no concerns.</p> <p>However, the particular elements of this proposed RT7 by-law seem directed towards to total redevelopment of this wonderful neighbourhood with no regard to the many heritage buildings and streetscapes, the affordable rentals, the existing homeowners or the carbon footprint. How sad and disappointing!!</p> <p>When the Province's Bill was passed or proposed, City planners should have immediately rezoned this area to RT5 to take it out of the Province's legislation. Why didn't they?</p>	Jan Pierce	Kitsilano	
------------	-------	--	--------	---	------------	-----------	--

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
2024-06-13	14:57	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 Counsellors: You will, I believe, soon be holding a public hearing, and then voting on whether to approve yet further increases to building height and density. I strongly urge you to vote NO. A public hearing is required because Vancouver wants to enable even higher densities than stipulated by the Province's blanket legislation.</p> <p>Team for a Liveable Vancouver has prepared a useful list of what is to be sacrificed so 6 or 8 homes can be crammed onto a 33' lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 1. Trees Not required to be kept in what used to be a back yard. Very ironic in a city whose official line brags so proudly about how green it is. • • 2. Daylight and privacy for neighbours. Higher floor-space ratio means taller buildings. • • 3. A place to park on the street. No onsite parking is required • . • 4, Curb appeal. Garbage bins and recycling boxes may have to be in the front because the proposed .density will be allowed even on blocks with no back lane. <p>5. To the foregoing I would add Views, for residents and visitors alike. The general issue of view preservation is particularly personal to me because of the impact of heights and densities on the Fairview Slopes, I know these changes have already been imposed, but I still hope against hope that some people in authority will look at the situation as it is and see what is happening, The Slopes have been our home for 60 years next March, and the wanton desecration of liveability for so little gain does hurt.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ron Sterne</p>	Ron Sterne	Fairview	

2024-06-13	16:13	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>Report 4: Rezoning Kits RT7-RT9 https://council[.]vancouver[.]ca/20240528/documents/rr1.pdf</p> <p>Report 5: Rezoning First Shaughnessy District Heritage Conservation Area ODP https://council[.]vancouver[.]ca/20240528/documents/rr2.pdf</p> <p>This is to express my strong opposition to both of these rezonings. Changes like these should not be rushed through to meet arbitrary and dictatorial provincial deadlines. As our local representatives, councillors should be considering the community instead of blindly following provincial orders. Please ask the province for an extension so proper planning and consultation can be done.</p> <p>If this council was truly "green," it would be doing everything possible to encourage retention of heritage buildings through additional infill and other measures. Instead, it is encouraging demolition, which means waste to the landfill and increasing greenhouse gas emissions caused by the resulting new construction.</p> <p>A green council would also be working hard to save the mature trees and landscaping that characterize both of these areas. Instead, this council seems all too willing to sacrifice the greenery that protects us from heat domes and makes our city livable to the god of ever-increasing density. Now we see some councillors proposing measures to plant new trees to increase the diminishing tree canopy in this city. Why not just save the mature trees we have?</p> <p>Sincerely, Carol Volkart</p>	Carol Volkart	Dunbar-Southlands	Attachment 1
2024-06-12	16:44	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 oppose any amendments requested under Bill 44 for RT-7, RT-9, CD-1 371 and CD-1 463.</p> <p>Why?</p> <p>There are other ways to obtain gentle infills in these areas than by the completely undemocratic edict of Bill 44.</p> <p>The consequences of accepting this amendment will further lower the qualitative livelihoods of those residents living in the districts impacted and quantitatively, it will increase costs for those who want to buy in these neighborhoods.</p> <p>These areas were never built nor meant for that type of density. We don't need this type of density for a "livable" city.</p> <p>Further, schools, parking, & sunshine is already in short supply in these areas. Building more will only make this worse and continue to lower the standards of living.</p> <p>Trees may not be preserved under these changes. What kind of "green city" are we to remove them when there is no requirement to do so?</p>	Kathy Hochachka	Kitsilano	

As well, we Metro Van already has a crisis on their hands. The \$2B overage on the Water Treatment Centre with no resolution, shows poor planning and even worse execution has hard costs and consequences. Continuing to blindly rezone for higher density in areas that were not meant for that type of density will only make this situation worse – quantitatively & qualitatively. We don't want to have the situation Calgary's water system just incurred. That would be disastrous politically, financially, & for all our health.

I also vehemently oppose the Provincial government's one-sided proclamations for these changes with no public input. This was a material overreach. The municipal governments have their jurisdictions and so does the province. I appreciate the Province can change legislation, but the question is, should they? And without consultation? Each should stay in their lanes.

Most importantly, there is absolutely NO way building more homes by rezoning these sections will make housing "more affordable". The math will never work no matter what proponents say. And the City knows that: the land, labor & regulatory costs are ONLY going up. We'd be lucky if they stayed stable. They will NEVER come down. Pretending rezoning these areas will help when in fact the opposite will actually happen, (because the land lift will exacerbate land costs - & you already have proof in the Oakridge areas), make this bylaw change disingenuous at best & deceitful at worst to say "this will make housing more affordable by delivering homes faster".

Further, because the cost per square foot will only increase, the sizes of those "homes" will be nothing more than shoe boxes. That size will never attract middle income workers, like nurses or firemen, especially those who want and/or do have a family.

So please reject this bylaw amendment.
Thank you

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
2024-06-12	16:47	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 oppose adoption of these amendments on several grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Lack of consultation with the public on the issues –No pushback from city government to the provincial high-handed "decrees"; rather, a ceding of municipal powers –Disruption of lives due to loss of affordable rental suites. With the affordable housing crisis, where are the displaced to go? (Could this lead to an increase in the homeless population?) <p>Has the Planning Department considered the following issues?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased density, esp. regarding family units: Where are the plans for new schools and daycare? Where are such schools to be located? 2. New community centres to service the increased population. Locations? 3. Infrastructure concerns: sewers, parking, traffic control 4. Public safety: new fire halls should be built to contend with increased population. Where would these be located? 5. Urban canopy: trees will be lost at a time when urban areas need more green space 	Veronica Yakoleff	South Cambie	