

**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 - Other**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-06-13	11:04	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	Other	<p>This is a waste of time.</p> <p>It should be embarrassing for everyone involved in this -- from planners to councilors to the Mayor -- that it took provincial legislation to finally extend multiplexes to this area.</p> <p>But why did the city have to get dragged, kicking and screaming to this point?</p> <p>And more to the point: why are you all still doing the bare minimum?</p> <p>Multiplexes don't make any sense in Kits Point, or any of these other RT zones. These are all centrally located areas close to tens or hundreds of thousands of jobs. In any rational planning system apartments would be allowed here.</p> <p>Just look at Senakw, right next to Kits Point. The City only allows detached houses and now, maybe, multiplexes. The Squamish Nation is building apartments that demonstrate the ACTUAL level of housing demand in this area.</p> <p>I suggest the city send its planners to the Squamish Nation to learn how to actually get anything meaningful done, because apparently the city is incapable of any actual housing action.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>-Peter Waldkirch</p>	Peter Waldkirch	Fairview	

2024-06-12	18:24	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	Other	<p>Dear Mayor Sim and Council,</p> <p>Despite the fact that Vancouver is suffering from a deep shortage of housing, your council is not providing any meaningful action to try and densify . For a neighbourhood that is so close to the future Broadway station, positions so closely to downtown and well connected by buses, there is no action taken to upzone for apartments and multiplexes as per provincial ruling.</p> <p>As a young professional living and working in this city, I am tired of footing the tax bill for rich retirees living in these neighbourhoods. Why must other neighbourhoods in the build up density, provide and provide huge upfront taxes for development while places like Shaughnessy and Kits Point.</p> <p>I thought the current government is a government of fiscal responsibility and pro local business. They why would this government protect areas such as Shaughnessy and Kits Point from development while simultaneously running into a budget shortfall and in need of new revenue sources?</p> <p>The issues in Vancouver and Canada are very simple to solve and multiple local urban planners and investigative journalists have been giving the appropriate guidelines to solve the issue. If you need any inspiration, Vancouver's finest investigative journalist, Uytay Lee's published the video:</p> <p>How Breaking Rules Could Create Better Apartments</p> <p>which touches on all the major regulatory issues facing apartments today by analyzing the Urbanarium design competition submissions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Amir Basiratnia</p>	Amir Basiratnia	Fairview	
2024-06-12	19:12	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	Other	<p>Great Job aligning these zones with the city's development goals, now it is turn to allow additional multiplex forms in other areas of the city as required by legislation.</p> <p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>As Rt 10 residents, we urge that upcoming legislative zoning changes include revisions to ensure RT 10 zones are not left behind the advancements seen in R1 Zones</p> <p>The current FSR discrepancies - 60% foot lots within RT 10 zones, compared to 85% for wider RT 10 zones, and up to 100% R1 zones- highlight an urgent need for equitable development standards. Such revisions are vital for our community's inclusive growth and to prevent rt 10 zones from becoming outdated in Vancouver's evolving urban landscape.</p> <p>We request the council to consider changes to its by laws to allow additional</p>	Alejandra Rodriguez-Klakowicz	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	<p><a href="#">Attachment 1</a></p> <p>Appendix A</p>

				<p>"multiplex forms" in other areas of the city of Vancouver, including RT 10 zones, as required by legislation prior to June 30, 2024.</p> <p>We have been waiting 10 years for guidelines to be updated. Here is the poster showed by previous council, we waited for the Vancouver city wide reviewed, and here we are excluded again and deemed not restrictive by city planning because the zone allows RT 10 to build duplexes however, FSR is restrictive in the guidelines. The guidelines are outdated, causing people going to board of variance and staff to become frustrated. Constructions pending and price of construction skyrocketing, displacing families. In these 10 years, I have met people feeling frustrated with this. The city planning asked us to talk to you council at this meeting so you could give them direction on what to do.</p> <p>Treat RT 10 as the areas reviewed here - other RT areas or at least match RT 10 areas FSR to what is given to any typical house in Vancouver R1 which is also outdated because doesn't fit with SSMUH provincial legislation, despite of it being updated recently.</p> <p>Kensington Cedar Cottage triangle of Fraser Knight King Edward and Kingsway is RT 10 zone, is close to downtown, and has schools and parks in a corner lot, only a 60 % FSR new built is allowed by the city.</p> <p>RT 10 zone guidelines are outdated for too many years and need urgently a revision</p> <p>sincerely</p> <p>Alejandra</p> <p>ps. attached are names of neighbors that I have reached out to as no consultation was given or posted nearby library or parks and our questions of addressing Rt 10 zones have been unanswered in previous years.</p> <p>attached is poster of what was "promised" many years ago before the city wide review.</p> <p>Alejandra</p>			
2024-06-12	19:42	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	Other	Current home owners cannot use the land they own to build but developers can ? This is nuts	Patrick Kirstein	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

**PETITION:**

**Ensuring RT-10 Zoning Aligns with City's Development Goals; Allowing additional multiplex forms in other areas of the city as required by legislation**

Dear Vancouver City Council,

As RT-10 zone residents, we urge that upcoming legislative zoning changes include revisions to ensure RT-10 zones are not left behind the advancements seen in R1 zones.

The current FSR discrepancies—60% for 33-foot lots within RT-10 zones, compared to 85% for wider RT-10 lots, and up to 100% in R1 zones—highlight an urgent need for equitable development standards. Such revisions are vital for our community's inclusive growth and to prevent RT-10 zones from becoming outdated in Vancouver's evolving urban landscape.

We request the council to consider changes to its by-laws to allow additional "multiplex forms" in other areas of the city of Vancouver, including RT-10 zones, as required by legislation prior to June 30, 2024.

Sincerely,

Aljandra Rodriguez - Klakowicz

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

John Eddy

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

DAVE OSATO

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Tiffany Yang

ESTHER LAW LOU

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Natasha McHardy

Kamran Izadpanahi

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Diane Long

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Barron

Alexandra Minnis

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Jagntle Charett

Richard Miners

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

James and Charissa Farmer