

## Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan Implementation - City-Initiated Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law and Building By-law - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-01-13	14:52	Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan Implementation - City-Initiated Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law and Building By-law	Oppose	<p>This is about the agenda item Rupert and Renfrew Station Area Plan Implementation - City-Initiated Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law and Building By-law.</p> <p>I am a resident of the area and I oppose this blanket rezoning. At a recent Council meeting, some councillors from the majority clearly expressed concerns about blanket rezoning. Specifically, they were concerned with seeing thousands of lots in single-family neighbourhoods automatically up-zoned to allow more density and multi-storey buildings. A councillor was concerned about "safeguards to ensure livability remains..." and how the city would "prevent towers from overwhelming lower density neighbourhoods."</p> <p>The same concerns need to be expressed with this proposal. It is one thing to automatically up-zone along arterials, but quite another to do so on thousands of single-family lots over approximately 200 blocks. Apart from a vague reference to consultations with the "industry", the city has not clearly demonstrated how giving automatic rezoning on such a significant area of the city would help bring in housing units at a lower cost. In fact, some might argue that it might very well significantly increase the per-square-foot value of existing lots.</p> <p>Moreover, the city has not assessed the impact on parking (6-storey buildings would not be required to have parking), traffic patterns and safety of residential streets coming from increase vehicle traffic, the water and waste water infrastructure, hydro grid, schools, community amenities, etc. Staff should be required to provide such an assessment.</p> <p>If it this the position of council that this is required to ensure an increase in the supply of housing units, then the proper thing to do would be to expand this approach to the whole city not currently covered by an automatic zoning by-law. This approach would put to rest the sentiment that East Vancouver (east of Nanaimo, that is) is being used as an experiment for significant increase in density in what are currently single-family neighbourhoods and that council would never do the same on the west side. This sentiment was recently reinforced when a councillor commented that he was "quite surprised to see the density proposed that far West..." the proposed Social Housing Initiative. While it is true that it was for towers of up to 20 storeys, council did not object to even taller towers in single-family areas under the Rupert-Renfrew Plan adopted last summer.</p> <p>My final comment will be about the consultation efforts by the city. One would think that when a Public Hearing contemplates such a massive change in the make-up of thousands on lots, the city would ensure that a meaningful consultation process is proposed so that residents are made aware. Sadly, apart from the city's website, no one could have known this was being debated.</p> <p>During the last weekend, I visited with about 75 residents throughout the impacted area. While far from being scientific, this allowed me to conclude without a doubt that about 95% were no aware at all of these city-initiated amendments. It convinced me that East Van definitely needs a voice at city hall.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Serge Corbeil		