

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Missing Middle - considerations prior to first and second reading tonight

From: Chantal [REDACTED]
Sent: July 14, 2022 3:27 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>; Stephen Andrew (Councillor) <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorne-joe@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle - considerations prior to first and second reading tonight

Dear Mayor and Council:

Victoria is in a housing crisis - no one can dispute the need for more diverse housing options. It is a global problem, and we appreciate the efforts of the council and city staff to address it here in our community.

If passed, the proposed Missing Middle bylaws may change the face of Victoria, in part by accelerating the incremental demise of urban green space. Small builders and supporters highlight the consultation the City has been doing over the past year. However, these consultations were based on general principles, lacking details regarding height, site coverage, and setback requirements.

It is only very recently that the details have emerged and been made public. Even then, they have continued to change. One such example is regarding height restrictions: initially, City staff advised that corner townhomes could be built up to 10.5 meters, while houseplexes in the middle of blocks would be limited to 8 meters. A fact sheet posted by the City in July 2022 states that a houseplex could now also be built to 10.5 meters, an increase of over 25%, which was certainly not part of the consultation process. The difference between an 8-meter high houseplex and a 10.5-meter high houseplex is massive, especially in the middle of a residential block of single-story houses, sitting just 1.5 meters from its neighbours' property lines. Such drastic change deserves meaningful consultation based on facts.

Even well-intended political land-use decisions can result in undesirable societal outcomes. And one day of public hearings, on the heels of a long weekend in the middle of the summer, cannot be considered meaningful consultation to formulate a vision for long-term spatial planning.

I urge you to hold more extensive public consultations based on the details of the proposed bylaws and facts sheet, which have only recently been made public. September would allow Victoria residents the time to return from summer vacation. This monumental decision related to land use is a critical issue and should not be forced through due to an upcoming election.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chantal Meagher

[REDACTED]

To: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Missing middle

From: DIANE BALL <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 14, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing middle

Picture a four-storey condo built beside Emily Carr House in James Bay.
Stupid, right?

My understanding of the missing middle, and it's albeit thoughtful waiving of public input, was to help avoid risk and cost to developers, to avoid over burdening city staff when the physical outcome is the same.

Hand over my heart, when I say, I understand the risk of being a dedicated public service professional. As a nurse, myself and numerous allied health professionals have been exposed to various workplace hazards, leaving some with lifelong, debilitating health consequences, long before covid broke our society. I really can't imagine the risks and burden that comes with holding public office, with unfortunately little reward. At This moment I just want to say THANK YOU- is see, likely only a fraction of your sacrifice and tenacious dedication, but I thank you.

Yes unfortunately, with risk comes loss, with commitment comes burden but I challenge this council and the public, to consider loss not just in monetary value, not just in zeros but instead % percentage of life altering consequences. God forbid the devastation, but if a developer risked and lost 80% of their net worth – is that so different of a lady losing her neighbourhood, comfort and independence, being now strangled with rent that is 80% of her pension, now having to cut out the lovely extras, occasional trip to see grandkids, a neighbour who she knows they care, and enjoyable foods. Is that any different from a family that is forced to uproot their currently thriving children – suffering threw 45 hour low paying workweeks, long commutes just to stay afloat.

Looking back at the last 3 years, I think to myself we have all suffered such loss, but also displayed remarkable dedication, commitment, empathy. During the scary delta wave, I saw my colleagues dealing with numerous insults, abusive hostile rants and accusations. My nephew (lifeguard at community pool) said why do you put up with that??? - I answered we try to let people know they are heard, they belong, we care. We understand the protection that comes from a shared commitment and vision, the collaborative development of more empathic, inclusive and kind community . Democracy is messy, but it can work and thrive longterm regardless of the next challenges that we will face.

Thank you for this initiative and the chance for public input, a special thank you to your staff that tirelessly listened, considered countless submissions, likely some more thoughtful and reflective than others, always looking for the underdeveloped potential - I laugh thinking sometimes it must be similar to my husband a teacher, who reads everyword of a 10yr old essay, not in hopes of enlightening himself, but to see and promote and individuals growth.

Like several counselors have commented, I hope public input continues, I hope we can also tackle affordability. Some of my unresearched ideas, Can we not have an equivalent equation – for example if a development displaces 10 people living in affordable 3/units total of 2500 square feet, year round with 50 percent greenspace- total rental income is 3600/month. That same lot is developed to then have 6 units, loss of 25% greenspace, and those 6 units are housing 10 people/ and only 4 people live there year round, mortgages/rent for the property total 8,000.00/month. Can we not

give tax credits to landlords that provide, safe, rodent controlled dignified housing? Can we not survey tenants with significant complaints of health and safety - to discourage demolition by neglect. Just some thoughts, I am sure your brilliant team has thought about it.

[REDACTED]

From: Mark Cosgrove [REDACTED]
Sent: July 14, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Victoria Mayor and Council; Lisa Helps (Mayor); Stephen Andrew (Councillor)
Subject: Re: Missing Middle debate

And, about five years ago, I was sitting outside at the Commons having lunch with my parents. A beautiful day downtown, enjoying a beautiful patio, people watching, etc.

In comes a cruise ship bus; it stops, lets the people off, and continues to idle. Even with a sign reading no idling. This went on for 10 or 15 minutes. I had to get up, walk over, and tell the bus driver to shut that STUPID machine down.

Okay, let's have more of that.

From: Mark Cosgrove [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 9:28 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <mayor@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <malto@victoria.ca>; sdubow@victoria.ca <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; spotts@victoria.ca <spotts@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; stephen.andrew@victoria.ca <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: Missing Middle debate

In addition -- I live on Dallas Road and have a perfect view of the coming and going of those ships.

My observation -- at least 1/2 to 3/4 of the people getting off those ships are walking or biking or etc. Not on a bus! I could be wrong. Correct me.

It's a dumb idea and puts Victoria back to 1960/1970/1980 thinking. This should have been done 30 years ago! Forward-thinking, please!

Get rid of those stupid buses. Get some electric open-air trolleys. Do you honestly think all those gas buses are a good idea in the 1st place? Wake up!

From: Mark Cosgrove [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 9:12 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <mayor@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <malto@victoria.ca>; sdubow@victoria.ca <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; spotts@victoria.ca <spotts@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; stephen.andrew@victoria.ca <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: Missing Middle debate

And a 2nd email in two days.

Regarding Government Street -- remain open to pedestrians or cars.

Of course, Government Street should be pedestrian only. To think and vote otherwise is moving backward. That line of thinking is an architectural fossil.

Have you ever been to Europe or Asia? Even in car-hungry China, they have many upon many examples of pedestrian-only roads. And I should add -- dedicated bike lanes.

Why open Government Street back to cars? So overweight Americans don't need to walk 2-blocks? Give me a break! Grow up and get some exercise.

Mark
James Bay

From: Mark Cosgrove
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 2:58 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <mayor@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <malto@victoria.ca>; sdubow@victoria.ca <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; spotts@victoria.ca <spotts@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; stephen.andrew@victoria.ca <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle debate

Regarding the Missing Middle -- I support the idea.

I've never lived in a single-family home. I grew up in a townhome in Montreal and have since lived in apartments and condos. Never once in a single-family home. I think they are stupid and a waste of space. Think of the yard work alone!

So, build townhomes, but why only on corners of a block? If we are going to open up this idea -- open it up! But smartly.

Mark,
James Bay

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Missing Middle Housing Bylaw

From: d m [REDACTED]
Sent: July 15, 2022 1:29 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Bylaw

The change being proposed in this bylaw is an extreme measure that will adversely affect our residential neighbourhoods for the foreseeable future. The densification and the resulting parking, traffic, and noise issues, as well as loss of green space will degrade our community.

We are concerned that developers will be taking down character houses to densify areas. We are going to lose the very fabric which makes Victoria so attractive.

There is also the issue of how you are implementing this extreme measure without proper public consultation. It seems underhanded, to push it through in the last months before the election. Let the people who you are supposed to represent have a proper voice through a referendum, or wait for the election so we can decide in a meaningful way.

We are disappointed in those of you on council who support this bylaw, which will lead to the degradation of our neighbourhoods.

We are strongly opposed to this bylaw.

Sincerely,

Duncan and Janis McLaren

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Missing Middle

From: Judith Blackwell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 17, 2022 8:29 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to say that I think there are serious problems with the proposed missing middle zoning legislation. It should not be finalized before the fall elections when the voting public will be able to determine whether or not it is appropriate.

Sincerely,
Judith Blackwell

Sent from my iPad

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: July 21, 2022 9:59 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Blanket Rezoning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good Morning Council,

Please see email below.

Sincerely,

Heather McIntyre

She/Her
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria, BC V8W 1P6



The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees and Esquimalt People

-----Original Message-----

From: John Murray [REDACTED]
Sent: July 17, 2022 6:42 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Blanket Rezoning

Mayor and Members of Victoria City Council, Blanket Rezone within established Residential Neighbourhoods .. This is the sort of Government solution to a housing need that will lead to unlimited court actions against the City and its administration.

When purchasing a home in an area "zoned R! single family dwelling" a purchaser in that area does not expect the character of the neighbourhood to change because of changes arbitrarily instigated by other parties. Increased traffic, landscape areas reduced, overshadowing, to their property resulting in their reduced home value. Would any councillor or member of the Administration like to see that happen to their property, their home wedged between two multi family developed lots.

I would suggest that any new subdivision planning should have a percentage of units ...lots .. allocated as LOW cost lots scattered throughout the development, but subsidized and controlled with regard to exterior finishes and front yard landscaping, by the developer in order to get approvals.. These houses would blend into the overall development and enable the city to approve interior completion to suit the owners pocket over the future years of occupancy, without ridiculous red tape. This would enable a couple to enter the housing market to suit their finances by phased interior completion.

I am against Blanket Rezoning...Not a solution.

John Murray, ,A.A.A.(life Long Member), A.R.I.B.A., A.I.B.C.,M.R.A.I.C.

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: What Does the Missing Middle Look Like?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 18, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: 'susanne rautio' [REDACTED] 'anne spencer' [REDACTED] 'Elaine Weidner' [REDACTED]; 'Dianne Pendray' [REDACTED]
Subject: What Does the Missing Middle Look Like?

City Councillors,
The City has presented lots of glossy renditions of what new housing will look like under the Missing Middle debate. It all looks very nice, with pretty buildings and lots of trees. It looks like a marketing glossy.

So, I thought about the marketing glossy that Aryze used to present the Rhodo development.

That glossy waxed lyrically that the final product would resemble “a typical English country village”. It went on the say it would resemble the magnificent row houses in the city of Bath in England. It would also resemble the mansions in the expensive districts of West London. Finally, it would also resemble “a typical English seaside village”. What a wonder that it could resemble all of these architectures!

I challenge City Councillors to go and see the end result of the Rhodo development, now in place on Fairfield Road, adjacent to Hollywood Park.

I challenge you to:

1. Identify the “typical English country village” that Rhodo invokes. You know – the village green with a pond or stream running through it, that hosts a village fair every summer. It is bordered by a church and a mix of cottages and more substantial housing around the perimeter with, of course, a pub with seating outside. It has mighty oak and elm trees to add to the beauty and provide shade in summer. It is the “heart” of the village that acts as a meeting place, and May Day celebrations. I challenge you.
2. Identify “the 1 percent” housing of the City of Bath with the Rhodo development. I challenge you.
3. Identify the “less than 1 percent” of housing in the posh and super-expensive west end of London (e.g. Mayfair) with the Rhodo development. I challenge you.
4. As a born-and-raised Englishman now happily Canadian, I have no idea what a “typical English seaside village” might be. Perhaps you can look at Rhodo and take a guess. I challenge you.
5. Compare the Missing Middle renditions and discussion of maintaining the tree canopy with what you see at Rhodo. I challenge you.
6. Look at the “affordable” units of Rhodo, and see how they stack up to low-income families. I challenge you.

City Councillors, Rhodo was driven through local public opinion, which was NOT against densification, but rather against OVER-densification. The existing City guidelines were trampled by Aryze, in collusion with the City, who ignored local residents, instead listening to residents from all over Southern Vancouver Island, invited by Aryze.

When I first saw the Rhodo proposal, the City had already approved a number of exemptions from the local guidelines. Residents complained, especially about the lack of a transition from the development to the adjacent park, that Councillors had only just approved, at the City's request.

This process was driven by the developer. The proposed solution contained in the Missing Middle initiative will be driven by developers and property speculators. As a resident of the City, and of Fairfield in particular, I do not believe that the City will be the appropriate arbiter of proposed designs. I simply do not trust the City to act on behalf of citizens. They will act on behalf of the developers and property speculators. Rhodo demonstrated this very clearly to me.

City Councillors, please make a few minutes to view the Rhodo development. Note the density of buildings, very narrow setbacks all round, boring design, the stark lack of trees, and the dominant position overlooking Hollywood Park. This is not what I want Victoria to look like in the future. The problems of lengthy development cycles will not be solved by the Missing Middle initiative. The problems will be solved by dismantling the mechanisms whereby developers and property speculators can be supported by City residents and the City itself, rather than dominating the entire process.

City Councillors – I challenge you!

Sincerely,

Graham Whitehead
1689 Earle Street, Victoria, BC

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Missing Middle Plan support

From: Richelle Funk [REDACTED]
Sent: July 18, 2022 2:10 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Plan support

Mayor and Council

I wish to express my family's complete support of the Missing Middle plan – as is. We currently live at Harbour Park (33 unit townhouse complex) in James Bay and we are frustrated by the level of NIMBY behaviour that is, we believed, fueled by a general/generational fear of change.

If this same type of opposition occurred when Harbour Park was built 50 years ago, the 33 families in our community would simply not have housing. Period.

Our family friends, which make incomes over \$100,000 were unable to find rentals and they were also unable to buy. In the end, they had to leave our community and pull their children out of their family/school groups. It's devastating to watch them move from one unstable housing option to another, to them seriously considering moving away to cities like Prince George to co-habitat with family.

And without the missing middle developments – which require private sector developers – this is only going to get worse. The historical norm of our housing cycle has been disrupted:

- Elderly people are aging in place. That's good for them and our society. However, it also means those homes are not on the market for young families.
- Families are not able to afford mortgages at the single-family dwelling level. We are an example of a family that got into the townhouse market at exactly the right time ten years ago. We wouldn't be able to now and we are public servants with 42 years of combined experience.
- Families are now staying in the rental market, which is pushing single people out of that market. The single people in our life (from pages 58 to 26) are in vans, sofa surfing and living communally. They have no hope of stable housing. People's fear that these units will only be purchased by developers is fearmongering. Townhouses and duplexes are not commonly purchased for the purpose of AirBnB or short-term rentals. As well, the data from the Province on foreign ownership via the speculation and vacancy tax and the additional property transfer tax show that speculation isn't the driver people believe it is, in our community.

We need townhouses and duplexes badly. Our parents purchased in the 1970s in Montreal and Saskatoon. Affordability was boosted in those communities by an influx of duplexes, in particular, and purpose-built rentals. Until the appetite to build purpose-built rentals grows, townhouse and duplexes are the next pressure releases on our housing crisis that we need. World-class cities of all ages, throughout the world have them – New York, Tokyo, London, etc. – and these places are considered hallmarks of culture. We do not have to be afraid of this change.

It is likely the only density-increasing measure, we believe, that might mean our 10-year-old daughter can choose to remain in the community she was born into.

We need course corrections in our housing market. Council's willingness to work with the province on affordable and supportive housing is supported by us. We welcome those people and families into our community. We welcome the Missing Middle change too. Without reservation.

Richelle D. Funk
#6 – 145 Niagara Street
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1G1

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Missing Middle

From: BILLY PAGE [REDACTED]
Sent: July 19, 2022 10:53 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle

Not impressed missing the mark. Neighborhoods as we know it will be gone - huge houses no green space huge benefits to building contractors and home owners who only see the dollar signs. Wow soon we will be like Vancouver! Billy Page

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 1:43 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Mic Check, Ep. 147 - Concerned citizens question Victoria's Missing Middle Housing Plan 1

From: Carolynne Rykhlo [REDACTED]
Sent: July 19, 2022 9:08 PM
To: Carolynne Rykhlo [REDACTED]
Subject: Mic Check, Ep. 147 - Concerned citizens question Victoria's Missing Middle Housing Plan 1

Mic Check, Ep. 147 - Concerned citizens question Victoria's Missing Middle Housing Plan 1

https://www.spreaker.com/user/chek_podcasts/audio-for-missing-middle-critics-episode?sp_action=episode-like&utm_campaign=episode-like&utm_medium=app&utm_source=widget

Thank you,

Carolynne Rykhlo

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: July 20, 2022 8:46 AM
To: Elaine Weidner
Subject: Re: Missing Middle Housing - a possible solution

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Elaine,

Thank you for your email, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

If you haven't already, please also sign up for project updates. You can do that at the bottom right corner of the following link: [Missing Middle Housing | Have Your Say \(victoria.ca\)](#)

For further or more specific questions, I would suggest connecting with staff working on this initiative directly by emailing: housing@victoria.ca

Sincerely,

Lucas de Amaral
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6



The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees and Esquimalt People.

From: Elaine Weidner
Sent: July 19, 2022 12:23 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing - a possible solution

City Councillors,

The City is circulating lots of info about Missing Middle Housing.

To me, the bottom line is this - Is it affordable? For home buyers, does it work for those having an average income? For renters, using BC Housing standards, that means 1/3 of income. That is what is needed. With that, there can be diversity, sustainability, security...

Of course, we need to keep and maintain our green spaces/trees/gardens....

And, if the development were also attractive and fit with the surrounding neighbourhood, that would make it a definite asset in our community.

Is it really so difficult to follow these guidelines? I know there are density requirements to make these developments possible - but there must be wonderful examples around the city/province/country/world where truly affordable, sustainable, secure, attractive designs are available...

I do so hope that the Missing Middle Initiative will work for the large number of Victoria residents who cannot afford to either purchase a property or rent an accommodation.

Respectfully,

Elaine Weidner

**Elaine Weidner – Director
AHVIS Affordable Housing:
Vancouver Island Society**

Home Address:
1648 Earle Street
Victoria, BC CANADA
V8S 1N5



***...advocating for affordable, sustainable, secure places to live...
for low-and-modest income seniors, singles, service workers and families...***

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: July 20, 2022 10:39 AM
To: Christopher Petter
Subject: Re: Portland' donwnzoning of single family lot for straight replacements

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Chris,

Thank you for your email, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

If you haven't already, please also sign up for project updates. You can do that at the bottom right corner of the following link: [Missing Middle Housing | Have Your Say \(victoria.ca\)](#)

For further or more specific questions, I would suggest connecting with staff working on this initiative directly by emailing: housing@victoria.ca

Sincerely,

Lucas de Amaral
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6



The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees and Esquimalt People.

From: Christopher Petter [REDACTED]
Sent: July 20, 2022 10:37 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: Steve New [REDACTED]; susanne rautio [REDACTED]; Irwin Henderson [REDACTED]
Patrick Skillings [REDACTED]
Subject: Portland' donwnzoning of single family lot for straight replacements

Dear Mayor and Council,

There are a plethora of articles on Portland's recent upzoning of its missing middle first introduced in 2020 after Oregon introduced laws compelling all the cities to pass bylaws to upzone for anything up to fourplex. On August 1, 2022 Portland Residential Infill Project" and "Shelter to Housing

Continuum Project will be implemented. The new housing will include sixplexes with measures for affordability and for downzoning for single family replacements. The Portland missing middle is basically like Victoria's, a supply project, with density bonuses but it includes measures to stop the extra density being to increase the volume of single family homes.

[REDACTED]

"Specifically, the plan will allow more duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes as well as more accessory dwelling units and cottages to be built amid existing single houses. New developments wouldn't be required to offer off-street parking. The new policy will also allow up to six units on residential lots where at least half of the units are affordable for families with income no higher than 60% area median income to rent or for families earning no more than 80% area median income to buy."

"The policy lowers the size of new homes that can be built in place of existing homes. Currently, city code allows homes on most residential lots to be torn down and replaced with a single-family home of up to 6,750 square feet. That would be reduced to no larger than 3,500 square feet."

Portland introduced these measures incrementally, over 7 years, with much public consultation (38,000 individual mailings). Their missing middle is regarded as "the best in the nation". I am sure that Mayor, councillors and planners could learn a lot by examining Portland's missing middle process and the guardrails built into their evolving policy.

Chris Petter

1220 McKenzie Street.

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: The Missing Middle proposal

From: David Helm [REDACTED]
Sent: July 20, 2022 10:34 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: The Missing Middle proposal

What say ye?
I am interested in your response.
Sincerely
Dave Helm
Toronto Street

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO VICTORIA RESIDENTS

Mayor and Council want to re-zone all residential neighbourhoods city-wide (called “Missing Middle”) ***which will double the density on every residential lot.***

This means up to 6 units per lot causing "multi-plex" houses to be ***bigger, taller, wider and closer together. And up to 12 townhouse units will be allowed at the end of any residential city block.***

More cars will mean less space for parking.
New units will not be affordable — all market priced.



This is an eye-level streetscape image of what Missing Middle Houseplexes will actually look like, they will not have below grade “Basement Suites.” The peak of sloped roofs will be over 42 feet high, with balconies.

This rezoning also means:

- You won’t get to comment on new multi-plexes before they’re built. City staff will approve them... so you won’t find out till the bulldozer shows up
- Renters face evictions by demolitions.
- Tree cover and backyards will permanently be lost not to mention your privacy and sunshine

THIS AFFECTS YOU!
ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 4TH, CITY HALL

For more information go to: <https://engage.victoria.ca/missing-middle-housing>

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Missing Middle

From: William Lake [REDACTED]
Sent: July 20, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: Missing Middle

Hi Lucas,

I used to work for the federal government, and this is how that employer worked. They would consult by telling us what we wanted and then implement what they wanted.

In the case of municipalities, I thought council was supposed to represent the residents (unfortunately they do not represent the business operators or commercial property owners - they get no votes, they just pay half the taxes).

The missing middle will change all neighborhoods without the existing residents consent how is this fair?

William

On 20-07-22 11:11 AM, Victoria Mayor and Council wrote:

Dear William,

Thank you for your email, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

If you haven't already, please also sign up for project updates. You can do that at the bottom right corner of the following link: [Missing Middle Housing | Have Your Say \(victoria.ca\)](#)

For further or more specific questions, I would suggest connecting with staff working on this initiative directly by emailing: housing@victoria.ca

Sincerely,

Lucas de Amaral
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor's Office

City of Victoria

1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6



The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees and Esquimalt People.

From: William Lake [REDACTED]
Sent: July 20, 2022 11:02 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle

Can you provide an update on the information session, I was working.

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

From: Jim Mayer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 21, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please adopt the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

I have been following the Missing Middle Housing Initiative for some time. Looking at my old emails, I see that my first letter to council on the subject was dated 15 November 2019 and was in response to a Committee of the Whole Report entitled "Missing Middle Housing Forms". I participated in the public engagement, and I attended the information session on the initiative on July 12. I'd like to thank City staff for the excellent job they have done throughout, and for being approachable, friendly, and knowledgeable. It was well done. I have also read the proposal.

The roots of Victoria's (and much of Canada's) housing problems are decades old, and no one should expect that this initiative will solve them. The initiative will, however, make things better by offering more home choices to Victorians, by positioning the city to take further actions, by dovetailing with other initiatives, by reducing displacement pressures, and by fixing some of the poor decisions that led to the current crisis of affordability.

Importantly, this measure will restore the ability to build modest homes like duplexes, houseplexes, and townhomes. Homes like these were legal to build here until the 1980s, when the city, for whatever reasons, decided to reserve most of this geographically small city's land for the biggest and most expensive housing form. In retrospect, that was a terrible mistake, and has led directly to increased cost and displacement issues. This measure will start to address those problems.

We have a choice in Victoria. Either we find ways to let enough people live on our limited land, so young families have a chance to live in the City, or we continue to restrict housing to the most expensive type, push families further from jobs, schools, and transit, and resign ourselves to stagnation.

The City will change. That's a given. But we can choose whether we build modest homes or McMansions. When we allow a variety of modest home types, and allow more than one home on a single lot, all of which used to be legal here, we can choose to remain a city that welcomes families. I strongly believe that a neighbourhood's "character" is determined by the people who live there, not by the shape of the buildings.

My wife and I are retired. We live in the bottom of an "up and down" townhouse in Vic West. Next to us are some mid-rise towers, and a row of rental townhomes run by a non-profit. Our home fits our needs perfectly. My parents lived in a townhouse, and later moved to a detached home. My wife's parents lived in a duplex. When I was young, I lived in a townhouse. When I got divorced I moved from a detached house to a townhouse. Later, with a blended family, we bought a detached home, and when our last child left, we moved to a rental townhome because it was amazing and we were ready for an adventure. After my mother developed dementia, we moved to a townhouse in another city to help take care of her. In one lifetime, I've lived in apartments, townhouses, and detached houses. I had options to find housing that fit my needs as my needs changed.

Sadly, the choices the City of Victoria made in the 1980s have taken those options away from the people who live here. We need to re-legalize what were historically mixed-income neighbourhoods. We need to reverse the rules that forced prices up and that are driving families out of the city.

Sincerely,

Jim Mayer
G3-389 Tyee Road, Victoria BC V9A 0A9



[REDACTED]

From: Leigh Lennick [REDACTED]
Sent: July 21, 2022 6:16 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Objection to Missing Middle housing proposal

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please register our strong objection to the terms of this proposal. I live at 1482 Thurlow Road in Fairfield adjacent to two existing duplex's on a corner lot that would appear to be prime territory for this proposal. The possibility that my modest house and south facing garden might be dwarfed by an enormous development without any opportunity for my input is, quite frankly, a terrifying one. I am not at all opposed to gentle densification - my own property is half of a very modest duplex with an existing height of 24 feet. However, a building (for example) of the height of the new RHODO development on Fairfield Road would dwarf my home, and cast my home and garden into darkness depriving us of all our existing light and privacy. It is not fair or ethical to place approval for such development in the hands of city staff without due public consultation, residential recourse or regard for existing zoning laws. Increasingly we see the views of current tax payers disregarded by council in favour of developers who have no regard for the existing residents, and simply want to make as much profit as possible. Zoning is intended to protect people from exactly this and this proposal removes that protection from the very people who need it most - and it is simply a fallacy that this will provide "affordable housing" as the prices are beyond the means of most young families in any case.

Yours sincerely

Leigh & Martin Lennick

1482 Thurlow Road

Victoria V8S 1L9

Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Patrick Ready [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2022 10:53 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Missing Middle

Hello,

Again i write to ask you to delay this motion to the next Council. As recent surveying has indicated, many residents do not feel you are listening to the public and moving ahead with your own agenda. You have had 8 years of proving you are incapable of managing the housing stock, and I have no faith in you implementing sweeping changes to current Zoning in the remainder of your mandate. What a mess it will be for the next council. Thanks for nothing. I know my voice doesn't matter, but I will choose to speak my mind, even if you do not want to listen.

Pat Ready

[REDACTED]

From: Jorge Aranda [REDACTED]
Sent: July 22, 2022 2:47 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Public Hearing

Dear Mayor Helps and City Councilors:

I am writing to express my **full, enthusiastic support** for the Missing Middle Initiative that will have its Public Hearing on Aug 4.

I have been a resident of Victoria since 2003. My partner and I don't own any property; we have been renting since we moved to town. This is despite the fact that we have a comparatively high income—I am a Software Engineer working in a well-established company. I don't think we can responsibly get a mortgage in the current real estate climate. So I have a selfish reason to support this initiative, if one can say it is selfish to point out that when even high income earners cannot afford a property in their city, there is no hope for the average citizen?

But there are many other reasons to support the initiative. One thing that struck me when I moved to Victoria was the lack of density. Increasing the density in the city will be a boon for all, beyond helping stabilize housing prices. It will increase the appeal of walking, cycling, and bussing as methods of transportation, reducing the need for cars. (We lived in Toronto for seven years. Never needed a motorized vehicle.) It is well known that a denser city is a less carbon-intensive city; **in a heating planet this is likely to be the most consequential vote yet to come to Council**. Density will also make the city more vibrant and attractive—and it will also make it fairer for all its citizens, as an increased housing stock will have ripple effects in the rest of the property market.

I am heartened to see this initiative come to Council, as **it is a pragmatic, effective policy to address the housing problems in our city**, and I urge Council to approve it.

Sincerely,
Jorge Aranda

[REDACTED]

From: James Bachman [REDACTED]
Sent: July 22, 2022 6:24 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle

Please build more housing. It is so expensive here and the wicked city council just blocked a 266 unit rental building downtown.

Also they totally misuse prime sites such as at Government and wharf where that tiny luxury building was built instead of higher density. Why should only the elites be able to live in Victoria?

Best wishes,

James
Victoria BC

[REDACTED]

From: Mike Culhane [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2022 9:31 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Support for missing middle

Hello,

I'd like to give my family's perspective, as we are the kind of people looking for housing like this.

My wife is a middle school teacher, and I work in tech, we are a young family with a toddler, own one car and prefer to bike or walk whenever possible.

We've recently sold our detached home after realizing that a yard was too much upkeep for a family with two children and two working parents. We spent months looking for medium density housing, but the majority of developments like this are found in Langford. That would mean more daily driving for us, less access to parks, and would be a huge barrier in our ability to access downtown Victoria businesses.

We ended up buying a small house in Saanich, which is almost what we were looking for, but still lacks the community that medium density housing would bring. There is also more traffic noise and we need to cross a major road to access amenities by foot, but it was the closest we could find.

Many of our peers have left Victoria because they couldn't find this type of housing, some ended up in Langford, some further out, they are all great people with young families. Those are the types of people being pushed out of the city.

The level of densification the missing middle is trying to achieve would result in fewer cars on the roads as there is less commuting into town and this means more parking for those who do. It also eventually leads to better transit infrastructure, cycling infrastructure, and more foot traffic to local businesses. Another fantastic side effect of densification is more children playing outside. With more families like us in the area, and less commuter cars, it is safer for kids to walk to school, to the park, etc.

My greatest fear is that push back on this type of development ends up with an urban sprawl in the surrounding communities, this is the type of city that I left Ontario to get away from, it is destructive by most measures, the infrastructure cost is subsidized by downtown residents, it is awful for the environment, kills local businesses, leads to inefficient and under utilized public transit, and a more sedentary lifestyle for those living there.

I hope that Victoria continues to push forward with these types of policies, it has made fantastic strides with cycling infrastructure, and more community, family oriented housing would be a much needed addition.

Thanks
Mike

[REDACTED]

From: Sierra Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: July 22, 2022 12:20 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I write today in support of the Missing Middle Housing bylaw amendment. I'm privileged to own a house in Victoria and as a under 40y.o. homeowner recognize that many of my peers are housing insecure and that what it took for me to own a home was a lot more sacrifice in comforts and living arrangements in young adulthood than any previous generation of my family has had to endure to save up for a home. I also am keenly aware that I was lucky to have bought my home back in 2015 in Fernwood and could not afford to buy my own home in today's housing market conditions.

I support the Middle Housing bylaw amendments for several reasons:

- it provides more housing in our already wonderfully walkable, bikeable and transit rich neighbourhoods,
- it fits with the current housing forms (being no larger than most newly built homes, that are allowed by default without zoning changes),
- it would add more vibrancy and different household sizes to our neighbourhoods,
- it would allow for better use of our limited land resources, and
- it could encourage more aging in place opportunities by allowing people to downsize but stay in their neighbourhood on their own property.

I especially appreciate the the houseplexes have limited parking supplied by design, my household does not own a car and my only criticism of some of the few houseplexes built in the neighbourhood already (like on Caledonia between Cook and Chambers) is that there is too much parking provided and very little outdoor space for residents since the yard space was converted to parking. With less parking requirements for houseplexes in the current bylaw now than was previously required I'm a wholehearted supporter of houseplexes on every lot that currently only allows single family house redevelopment.

As I mentioned earlier, houseplexes are no larger than what is being newly built when a house is torn down in the neighbourhood and houseplexes would fit in perfectly well on every block. I think that anyone who still disagrees with the Missing Middle housing options need to wander around neighbourhoods like Fernwood and see how well small apartment buildings fit in on Haultain, or along Vancouver street by Queens ave (they even have yards with gardens!), how houseplexes from 2 to 6 units fit in nicely along Caledonia, Chambers or Walnut and are no different from the surrounding houses, or how townhouses along Vancouver or Cook streets add more housing and interest to the street with different coloured doorways and plantings without adding any perceivable downsides. We have these housing forms already in our neighbourhoods and we need to make it easier to make more of them everywhere in the city.

I am hopeful that you will support this important opportunity to ease the housing crisis in our city and allow for more housing types by default on every lot. 'Missing' middle housing need not be 'missing' anymore in Victoria.

Thank you.
Sierra Brown
resident of Avebury ave

[REDACTED]

From: d m [REDACTED]
Sent: July 23, 2022 2:06 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Missing Middle Housing Bylaw

For your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message.

From: d m [REDACTED]
Date: July 15, 2022 at 1:29:49 PM PDT
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: **Missing Middle Housing Bylaw**

The change being proposed in this bylaw is an extreme measure that will adversely affect our residential neighbourhoods for the foreseeable future. The densification and the resulting parking, traffic, and noise issues, as well as loss of green space will degrade our community. We are concerned that developers will be taking down character houses to densify areas. We are going to lose the very fabric which makes Victoria so attractive.

There is also the issue of how you are implementing this extreme measure without proper public consultation. It seems underhanded, to push it through in the last months before the election. Let the people who you are supposed to represent have a proper voice through a referendum, or wait for the election so we can decide in a meaningful way.

We are disappointed in those of you on council who support this bylaw, which will lead to the degradation of our neighbourhoods.

We are strongly opposed to this bylaw.

Sincerely,

Duncan and Janis McLaren

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: Dave Nonen [REDACTED]
Sent: July 23, 2022 11:10 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing - OCP Bylaw Amendment - Opposition

NO, NO, NO! This is NOT the way to address the housing crunch. No one wants a massive out of control response to this problem that will forever alter the character of Victoria neighbourhoods. When do the wants and desires of existing residents of Victoria matter?

Instead of forcing large, imposing structures on our traditional neighbourhoods, council can assist in other ways like promote and subsidize the creation of secondary suites. Such action will assist with housing, help subsidise existing homeowners with increased costs and better preserve the unique nature of our neighbourhoods.

The housing crunch is a regional problem that requires a unified regional solution -- it should NOT fall onto City of Victoria residents alone to solve the problem.. For example, the municipality of Oak Bay has or will now allow secondary suites. The entire region must work together to address the issue.

PLEASE DO NOT allow this OCP amendment to proceed any further.

Regards
Dave and Linda Nonen
1166 Chapman Street
Fairfield

[REDACTED]

From: Curtis King [REDACTED]
Sent: July 24, 2022 9:05 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: I support the Missing Middle Housing plan

Hi,

I want to voice my support for the Missing Middle Housing plan as it is an important tool to increase the amount of affordable family housing in the city. For example, in my neighbourhood there is a development plan to replace an existing derelict house with a six unit building which meets the Missing Middle design guidelines. But, can not proceed because a minority of community residents are blocking the permit over concerns of on street parking. The last house sold in our neighbourhood to a family cost 1.2 million, an unfordable price for many young families. The development of affordable family housing will not happen without the Missing Middle Housing plan.

Thanks,

Curtis King
1112 Reno Street
Victoria, BC
V9A 4B6

[REDACTED]

From: Mike Birch [REDACTED]
Sent: July 24, 2022 12:13 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Missing Middle

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mike Birch [REDACTED]
Date: July 24, 2022 at 11:16:10 AM PDT
To: engage@victoria.ca, City of Victoria <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: City of Victoria <publichearings@victoria.cam>
Subject: **Missing Middle**

Hello

I strongly oppose this plan.

You will be removing affordable rent stock when the redevelopment of a residential lot takes place.

You will not create affordable housing as a redevelopment will be sold/rented at market price.
Owners will maximize their selling price, not what the city thinks is affordable.

You will create huge bonus value to any one redeveloping a lot, mostly developers or random homeowners. I am sure the developers can not wait for this to pass.

Density can already happen with the zoning as is now (garden suites, legal suites in homes, strata existing older homes). Spot rezoning can be applied for to create more density as has already happened in some areas, if the neighborhood likes the proposal then it gets approved .

You may open the city to legal issues, if a homeowner bought in a SF neighborhood and expecting neighbourhood to remain. They may take issue in finding a six-plex will be their new neighbour.

This is a mistake to force this on neighbourhoods. This is a major change and should be put on the fall ballot to get an accurate view of what the neighbourhood feels about this change.

Thanks
Mike Birch

[REDACTED]

From: Juanita Loeppky [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:10 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Change in housing

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Missing Middle [REDACTED]
Date: July 25, 2022 at 3:26:05 PM PDT
To: Juanita Loeppky [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Change in housing

thank you for your e-mail. May I suggest you send this e-mail to mayor and council if you have not done so already. The e-mail address is publichearings@victoria.ca

From: "Juanita Loeppky" [REDACTED] >
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 10:35:36 AM
Subject: Change in housing

I object in the strongest terms!! To ruin our beautiful tree filled suburbs and fill with monster housing is totally ridiculous.

Why would anyone want to live in such a congested neighbourhood?

Whatever happened to climate emergency? We need trees to keep our neighbourhoods cool.

No decisions on such a toxic issue can be made prior to our fall election.

We all know who they are and they must to be voted out!

Enough of the guilt trip Mayor and Council are trying to put on those of us who saved for years to buy the homes we now live in. I might add that when my husband and I bought our house we live in we had a 13 percent mortgage.

I have lived in my house for 42 years and made many sacrifices to pay off the mortgage in a timely manner.

Warehousing people is not the answer!

There is not enough space on this page to express my outrage!

Juanita Loeppky
147 Howe St.
Victoria , B.C.
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: L Maasch [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 12:54 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

I have been a home owner in Gonzales Neighbourhood, Fairfield for 25 years. I contributed to the Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan (which was not ratified by Council - not a good sign, after all that work....)

I totally agree that duplexes, tri-plexes, quad-plexus and townhomes should be allowed in our neighbourhoods, as long as they fit within the Community Plan. But, this should not be a not a revised Community Plan does not include affordability. We need to have the ability for people to move into our community and not have to be millionaires to do so. In the proposal for Missing Middle Housing, there is no provision for affordability. So, what's going to happen is: we owners age and want to downsize but stay in the neighbourhood, all of us will sell our multi-million dollar homes and move into million dollar condos and town homes. The flaw of not including affordability in the Missing Middle Housing plan means that only the rich will be able to live here - nothing changes. The Missing Middle is still missing. Or, it's there, but only for the rich. This proposal needs to be returned to include affordability . Otherwise - it's just a plan for Developers and rich boomers, like me.

In a The Missing Middle housing plan, allowing a 4 story condo that fills multiple lots destroys the neighbourhood. There is no "neighbourhood" in rows of condos with no green space. Mammoth condos that fill 3 lots from side to side should not be allowed. They are not in keeping with the neighbourhood look, feel or viability. In the current Plan, new buildings must do this. The size of large condos actually destroys relationships between neighbours. I never knew my condo neighbours when I lived in one - yes we said hello in the elevator, but that was it. We were not friends. In my Gonzales neighbourhood, I have daily conversations with my neighbours on my street. I know their names, their history, their kids, and we help each other all the time - covid groceries, shovelling snow, repairs, child care, gifts, wine and cheese on the lawns, and shoulders to cry on. That's a neighbourhood.

So yes to allowing duplexes, tri-plexes, quad-plexes and townhouses which have green spaces and lawns for kids and for adults to meet. No to massive condos that fill 3 lots and start at \$800,000. No to a Missing Middle plan that does not include affordability. Please send this Missing Middle Plan back for a re-write.

Tx-
Linda Maasch
311 Robertson St
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 1:41 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Housing

From: C Meagher [REDACTED]
Sent: July 25, 2022 10:02 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

As a resident and taxpayer (property owner) I am 100 percent against the Missing Middle Housing movement, it's a fantasy that will do nothing to make housing available or affordable. What happen to the OCP did it just evaporate?

My last time dealing with your planning Department which I have kept records of your planners didn't even understand or follow the OCP, so now they think they know how to redesign the City of Victoria?

As Mayor and Council, you should all step down on this issue, let a New Mayor and Council next year decide what direction the City is going.

You have come close to destroying what was once a friendly livable City time to stop your social experiment and go away.

Richard C (Chuck) Meagher Victoria BC

[REDACTED]

From: Carmen Arnsdorf [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 7:27 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Yes to Missing Middle Housing!

Hello,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the missing middle housing initiative, scheduled for public hearing August 4. I would like to point out a few aspects I appreciate as well as one key recommendation.

I especially appreciate:

- Streamlining applications through staff for applications that fit core criteria. The timelines to date have been atrocious and costly in various ways, so big yes to this.
- widespread "overlay" application across Victoria's residential zones is very wise as it allows options everywhere.
- peaked roofs are still possible through additional height allowances - this is great because the peaked roof style fits with and continues Victoria charm while allowing needed densification.
- Greenspaces for mature tree canopies are baked into the plans.

Recommendation:

- After approving this, please also have staff bring forward mechanisms to incentivize 2+ and 3br units. I worry with so much attention on affordability and below market opportunity creation we are actually squeezing out the financial viability of 3br units that so many families are seeking. Neighborhoods without children are neighborhoods out of balance and meanwhile destructive sprawl beyond Victoria is the consequence. Find a way to bring families into focus as much as affordable housing.

Thank you!

Carmen Arnsdorf

For the MMI public hearing, August 4, 2022

What Victoria residents want in residential areas is affordable housing that is sustainable, predictable, and incremental with gentle density that preserves the tree canopy and back garden green space. This should be managed by “informed consent”. What we have with the present MMI proposal is unaffordable, unsustainable, unpredictable, rapid change with excessive density and “managed consent” by the Planning Department. It aims to upzone 66% of Victoria and remove the approval process to speed up development. However, without first taking steps to automate the permitting process such a change, while it may lighten the load for councillors, is unlikely to speed things up very much. It will also alienate citizens and weaken the community support for Council. And in addition, 18% of Victoria’s renters who presently live in affordable rentals in residential areas can be evicted with little or no process to help them find new accommodation.

This MMI is premature. To protect renters and bring about affordable housing it requires provincial legislation to freeze land values and change the way assessments are made. It needs legislation that makes those who take advantage of extra density to provide a certain number of units that are permanently affordable (i.e. on 30% of resident’s income. It needs legislation to protect renters evicted by demovictions.

Inflation and the rising interest rates will change the Coriolis assumptions of for-profit housing in residential neighbourhoods. Those assumptions were made on a rising market, inflated by investors and speculators. In a falling market profit will most likely only be available for building McMansions to the maximum density allowed on a single lot. These will not produce denser housing to accommodate more families. To take that option away single lots must be downzoned to the minimum density for replacement by single homes.

Under deflationary pressures and when the Federal and Provincial governments produce funding for affordable housing it would be preferable to allow sixplexes and townhouse projects only for non profit coops and cohousing under the “rapid deployment of affordable housing initiative”. For those larger projects the approval process should still be required and indeed strengthened as recommended by the 2014 Provincial “Nimby Toolkit” [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In a falling market such protections are imperative. There will also need to be full online transparency as there is on larger municipal housing projects.

Projects up to fourplex could still avoid the approval process providing their density is “gentle” and the neighbours regard the renovations as “trivial” as the municipal act suggests. An ombudsman would need to be appointed so that neighbours can have some input into a neighbour’s building plans.

My final recommendations would be to avoid wasteful demolitions as much as possible and to look for other solutions to elevate and or expand existing structures. This is more affordable, more sustainable and produces less waste for the landfill.

Premanufactured housing should also be investigated as a possible solution for back garden housing affordable to owners. And Planning should establish a mechanism to bring together individuals interested in coops and cohousing with builders who can enable them to develop projects for neighbourhood coops and cohousing.

With these guardrails, MMI could be rewritten once the appropriate provincial legislation is passed and funding for public housing is available. I therefore urge Council not to approve the MMI in its present form. If it passes, do not implement it until provincial legislation is forthcoming in the Fall and MMI can be amended to conform with municipal norms elsewhere.

Chris Petter

I am a resident and homeowner in Fairfield and I wholeheartedly support increased density and innovative housing solutions to address one of the greatest challenges facing our community. I am certain that the introduction of new housing forms will invigorate our neighbourhood creating new cultural and economic opportunities.

While housing is an immediate crisis this initiative also addresses the larger issue of the climate crisis by combating urban sprawl and supporting a compact urban form. I'm particularly glad this council has also passed a tree protection bylaw that would ensure that future densification does not come at the cost of the environment.

Victoria is already blessed with a more compact urban form than many other communities within the CRD and elsewhere in Canada. We can harness this advantage to ensure the future sustainability of our community through this initiative.

I anticipate that you may hear some objections concerning property values and/or neighbourhood character and I believe these concerns are ill-founded. Already our neighbourhoods are full of unofficial and non-conforming suites as economic necessity has forced the hand of many property owners. The changes some may fear are already with us. Providing a simple and legal path forward will ensure greater vitality and at the same time ensure housing units are safe.

Please move ahead with the approval of the missing middle zoning changes. I will be looking at each of your voting records on this issue when I cast my vote this Fall. I feel that the present council has done an excellent job in making Victoria the best place to live in Canada, and perhaps the world.

Sincerely,

--
Don Gordon
533 Cornwall St
[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:28 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: missing middle

-----Original Message-----

From: Daphne Wass <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 26, 2022 7:48 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: missing middle

Hi there

I am disappointed and annoyed that the public hearing regarding the "missing middle" is taking place on Aug 4th at a time when many people are not home and or on holidays.

There is also an upcoming municipal election and it seems more reasonable to address these concerns once new councilors are elected.

\Daphne Wass

954 Bank Street

[REDACTED]

From: FIN MACDONALD [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:14 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Missing Middle Housing Initiative

I am opposed to this proposal going forward. I agree with the MNP Report. Matters that will affect life in Victoria, for generations to come, deserve sober, thoughtful and sustained consideration. Please leave the Missing Middle to the next Mayor and Council; to people who have a fresh mandate.

Fin MacDonald

204-500 Rithet St

James Bay.

[REDACTED]

From: Ian M [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:38 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative

Hello,

I'll keep this message short and sweet: the Missing Middle Housing Initiative has my unequivocal support. Though I believe that it's only one piece of the housing puzzle, it's an important first step.

Thanks,

Ian Macklon

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:15 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Laureen Belland
Subject: missing middle

As residents of Greater Victoria we would like to add our support for the missing middle initiative. This supports the OCP and we believe council should approve this bylaw.

sincerely yours

Laureen Belland
Paul Jenkins

@ 1840 Crescent Road
V8S 2G8
Victoria BC

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Ferreira [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Middle Middle comments

I support the Missing Middle strategy. While I understand there are a multitude of competing issues to deal with (tree canopy, parking, traffic, densification, heritage, preserving the “character” of the neighbourhood, setbacks, nimby-ism, etc), I believe the current policy before us constitutes an appropriate balance of how to achieve demographic balance within the City. I am also reassured by the commitment to review this policy in two years and make changes, if necessary.

Lee Ferreira
Victoria, BC

Lee C. Ferreira

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Housing specific inquiry

From: Lynne Rippon [REDACTED]
Sent: July 26, 2022 3:22 PM
To: Community Planning email inquiries <CommunityPlanning@victoria.ca>
Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing specific inquiry

Good Afternoon

I refer to the notice of Public Hearing scheduled for August 4th where Council will consider the Missing Middle Housing initiative.

I understand there will be specific regulations (and design guidelines?) pertaining to these forms of development brought before Council at the Hearing.

I would appreciate being able to review those regulations (guidelines) ahead of time. I believe they are referred to as Schedule P which I was not able to locate.

I am particularly interested in whether or not the regulations/guidelines are specific enough to be administered by staff fairly and equitably . To me it is important that homeowners and developers alike understand exactly what can or cannot be achieved on a site. If regulations are very specific this is possible; however, if the regulations (guidelines) are in any way subjective and open to interpretation then experience has shown that they can and will be "screwed" to maximize development potential (aka profit) at the expense of surrounding neighbours. I would suggest that if this initiative passes most, if not all, proposals will attempt to maximize both the height and FSR potential for a site which could be disastrous in some neighbourhoods unless staff have the authority to enforce a STRICT set of regulations and guidelines designed to prevent such exploitation. Neighbours would be much more amenable to increased housing within a community if they knew and understood how the regulations and guidelines would protect them and ensure compatibility and neighbourliness as redevelopment occurs. Hence the need for clear and concise criteria that cannot be manipulated for gain at the expense of neighbourhood amenity.

With regard to my specific enquiry and my reason for wanting to view the proposed regulations (guidelines) in advance is because my lot at 1538 Brooke Street is not on a typical front yard/ back yard subdivision pattern.

The site to the north of me fronts onto Stannard Avenue and is quite a deep lot. The rear property line of my lot along with 3 others to the east of me abuts the side yard of that site to the north.

This subdivision pattern while atypical is not unique to my situation and in fact is found in many other areas of the City. I would like assurances therefore that the guidelines have adjustments within to take care of this situation given that the design of any development vis a vis overlook, shadowing, setbacks, open space etc should be quite different (and would need different sets of criteria) than a typical front yard/back yard subdivision pattern.

I would appreciate understanding how the new proposed regulations etc included in Schedule P take into consideration this type of situation and how they would be administered to ensure compatibility and neighbourliness with my lot (assuming a houseplex is proposed with maximum achievable density and height)

Given that this matter is time sensitive with the Public Hearing Scheduled for August 4th I would appreciate a response as soon as possible to allow me time to review and respond to Council accordingly.

Best Regards,
Lynne Rippon

[REDACTED]

From: Rick H. [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:22 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Missing middle comment for council re panhandle lots

Categories: Madison - In Progress

Thanks for your response. I've been following along diligently to make sure my property is included in this missing middle blanket re-zoning.

Can you let me know when "panhandles" were suddenly considered not allowed as part of this initiative? How and who suggested this and in what document? It doesn't make sense.

Thanks so much.

'Sent Wirelessly'

On Jul 26, 2022, at 12:14 PM, Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your email. Your correspondence will be added to the agenda for Council's consideration.

Thank you,

Madison Heiser (she/her)
Council Secretary
Legislative Services
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6
T 250.361.0590



The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees and Esquimalt People.

From: Rick H. [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:02 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing middle comment for council re panhandle lots

Dear council,

Please consider panhandle lots for houseplexes.

I am excited about this initiative. I've been following along silently and looking forward to this being approved.

However, for this to be inclusive and fair, it HAS to take into consideration properties that fall into the category of "panhandle."

For example, I am now reading panhandle lots are not allowed to have houseplexes on them. A panhandle lot is a lot that has less than 10% road frontage compared to its perimeter.

What this is saying is for homeowners that own on a cul de sac where their lot is more "pie shaped" so their lot frontage is small but they still have a large lot, they can't have a house plex?

I own a property in Victoria that would easily make a great houseplex location and I'm excited for the opportunity to remove the very small, only one bedroom house to make several units for families. Thrilled! However, based on the fact my lot shape is different, my frontage is smaller, it's considered a panhandle lot.

This is infuriating to know that I'm not allowed to create a house plex for Families. A traditional panhandle with a long driveway that already feeds a rear house—ok sure I can see why a houseplex on that lot isn't ideal. But to lump all the other different lot styles that appear as regular lots, but are actually considered panhandle lots is CRAZY and not inclusive in this mission of our community we are going on together.

Please consider panhandle lots for houseplexes.

To not allow houseplexes on "panhandle lots" is not inclusive and extremely divisive for those homeowners wanting to contribute to the housing crisis.

Appreciate your time.

Thanks.

Rick.

'Sent Wirelessly'

[REDACTED]

From: Rick H. [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:02 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle comment for council re panhandle lots

Dear council,

Please consider panhandle lots for houseplexes.

I am excited about this initiative. I've been following along silently and looking forward to this being approved.

However, for this to be inclusive and fair, it HAS to take into consideration properties that fall into the category of "panhandle."

For example, I am now reading panhandle lots are not allowed to have houseplexes on them. A panhandle lot is a lot that has less than 10% road frontage compared to its perimeter.

What this is saying is for homeowners that own on a cul de sac where their lot is more "pie shaped" so their lot frontage is small but they still have a large lot, they can't have a house plex?

I own a property in Victoria that would easily make a great houseplex location and I'm excited for the opportunity to remove the very small, only one bedroom house to make several units for families. Thrilled! However, based on the fact my lot shape is different, my frontage is smaller, it's considered a panhandle lot.

This is infuriating to know that I'm not allowed to create a house plex for Families. A traditional panhandle with a long driveway that already feeds a rear house—ok sure I can see why a houseplex on that lot isn't ideal. But to lump all the other different lot styles that appear as regular lots, but are actually considered panhandle lots is CRAZY and not inclusive in this mission of our community we are going on together.

Please consider panhandle lots for houseplexes.

To not allow houseplexes on "panhandle lots" is not inclusive and extremely divisive for those home owners wanting to contribute to the housing crisis.

Appreciate your time.

Thanks.
Rick.

'Sent Wirelessly'

[REDACTED]

From: Malcolm Maclean
Sent: July 28, 2022 2:19 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council; Engagement-External
Subject: RE: VISOA - request for clarification regarding Missing Middle Housing

Hi Wendy,

Thanks for getting in touch. I'm happy to offer some answers for you, with numbering below corresponding to the numbering of your questions.

1. These would be secondary dwelling units contained within a single strata lot (i.e. one real estate entity). FYI, the definition of "secondary dwelling unit" in the [proposed regulations](#) is not limited to what the building code defines as a "secondary suite," knowing that the code has a fairly narrow definition of the latter, which may be incompatible with the types of strata buildings where the regulations would require such a unit to be included.
2. Based on your reference to "10% below market" I think you're referring to the Below Market Home Ownership (BMHO) units, which are an option for achieving bonus density. These are defined in the proposed regulations as "a dwelling unit with a floor area, of all floor levels combined, of no less than 60 m2 subject to a registered agreement with a non-profit organization, government agency or local government that ensures the dwelling unit will be sold at a minimum of 10% below fair market value to purchasers that meet specified below-market homeownership income limits in the Affordable Standards Bylaw " and the [proposed affordable housing standards bylaw](#) cites income limits by which households would qualify to purchase these BMHO units. FYI, in similar fashion, the proposed regulations also define "affordable rental housing unit" and "affordable housing cooperative" which also relate to alternatives for achieving the bonus density.
3. The regulations include strengthened bicycle parking requirements, and identify transportation demand management measures that can reduce the base parking requirement proposed within the regulations. The proposed regulations do not establish requirements for specifying relationships between certain strata units and off-street parking stalls. However, where parking requirements are reduced through the provision of a parking space for a car share vehicle, the regulations include a template Secured Right of Way agreement that would be required to secure public access to the car share parking space.
4. Effective since October 1, 2020, our Zoning Regulation Bylaw does require new residential developments to provide an energized electric vehicle outlet for each required* vehicle parking space. *Where more parking spaces are provided than the proposed regulations would require, only the required spaces must have energized electric vehicle outlets. The proposed regulations are not prescriptive about how a strata should manage access amongst residents to these EV ready stalls, however I understand [Plug In BC](#) and [Metro Vancouver](#) have created some helpful materials on managing charging infrastructure in residential strata buildings.
5. Required long term bicycle parking stalls (as opposed to visitor bike parking) must be provided in a secure, weather-protected, dedicated bicycle parking facility. Through the proposed Missing Middle Design Guidelines, this facility is encouraged to be connected or designed into the footprint of a main residential building to minimize impact to green, usable backyards.

Thanks again,

Malcolm MacLean

Pronouns: he, him, his
Community Planner
Sustainable Planning and Community Development
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6
T 250.361.0538



The City of Victoria is located on the homelands of the Songhees and Esquimalt People.

From: VISOA President [REDACTED]
Sent: July 26, 2022 11:31 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>; Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: VISOA - request for clarification regarding Missing Middle Housing

Hello,

My name is Wendy Wall and I'm the president of the Vancouver Island Strata Owners Association. We are a non-profit society that provides education and support for strata owners in British Columbia. We field a wide variety of questions from the public and work with provincial and local governments, and districts on a variety of initiatives and issues that involve strata owners.

I've attended several of the Missing Middle Housing information sessions over the last year, including a session on July 14, and I have a few questions before I prepare a written or video submission for the public hearing on August 4.

Keeping in mind that these stratas could be as small as 2 units, please clarify:

1. Secondary suites for rent. Please clarify what you mean by this. Are you talking about secondary suites within individual strata lots (the owner of the strata lot would be renting the suite) or a strata lot that is common property and rented out by the strata corporation?
2. Will the requirement for rental rates to be 10% below market rates apply to stratas or just purpose-built rental buildings?
3. If the parking requirement is 0.62 - 0.77 stalls per unit, will your bylaws specify how the developer is to resolve the shortage of parking, such as that the strata plan must be filed designating stalls as limited common property for the exclusive use of a certain strata lot?
4. Similarly, regarding EV charging, will each stall be required to be EV Ready? How will use of charging equipment be resolved for those without a parking stall?
5. Regarding bicycles, is the requirement for parking 2 bikes per unit outdoors, or does it require a secure lockup area?

Thank you for clarifying.

Best regards,

Wendy Wall (she/her), President - Board of Directors

Vancouver Island Strata Owners Association (VISOA)

602-620 View Street, Victoria BC V8W 1J6

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

VISOA's office is located on the unceded ancestral lands of the ləkʷəŋən (Lekwungen) people and ancestors, and our work extends across the homelands of Indigenous Peoples within what we now call British Columbia. We honour the many territorial keepers of the lands and waters where we work.

[REDACTED]

From: Brian Spahn [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 5:34 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Middle housing initiative

Hello

I've lived in Victoria for 24 years, and I'm writing in to say "vote yes to missing middle".

Brian

[REDACTED]

From: Chris Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 3:59 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Expressing support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Hello,

I am writing to express my support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative and I urge council to vote in favour to help provide homes for people who want to live in Victoria (who aren't millionaires), and take a small step to reducing the housing crisis facing our communities.

To those with concerns about this proposal, I would like them to consider my neighbourhood, James Bay, one of Victoria's nicest neighbourhoods for locals and visitors alike. James Bay is full of mixed housing types and many missing middle type homes, not to mention much larger apartment buildings. No one would say the "neighbourhood character" of James Bay has been ruined by these buildings. In fact, I would argue the mix of young and old, families, students living with multiple roommates, retirees, all add to the feeling of community here in James Bay.

To those that worry that this policy is not enough to solve affordability, they are right, but they should understand that it is just one piece of policy that is a step in the right direction for certain buildings and certain people. This policy doesn't prevent future work! They should continue to voice their, and my, shared concerns that the city needs more affordable, social, supportive, and rental housing. I hope the city takes strong action on this moving forward, hopefully building on the support and success for the missing middle initiative.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Chris Moore
James Bay, Victoria

[REDACTED]

From: Gretchen Karlebach [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 12:23 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: missing middle

Mayor and Council,

I would like to express my confusion & lack of understanding as to why you are pushing the Missing Middle Bylaw at this time and not postponing the vote so that all of Victoria's citizenship has the opportunity to learn more, understand what Council is proposing, and make a well informed decision on the issue. There is so so much at stake....

**Victoria is currently immersed in construction, yet they are desperate for workers, skilled & unskilled, to do the work. Therefore, even if the Bylaw is passed & all steps removed --
1 will there be any companies or workers available to build?
secondly, will any of the construction address the question of "affordable family housing?"
Thus, why is there a rush to remove all steps in ensuring our city grows as the citizens feel is appropriate?

**

**Victoria is currently experiencing climatic change, & re-learning the importance of our urban forest & the roll it plays in our lives.
Thus, why is the Council considering opening the doors to NOT protecting the our urban forest & our neighbourhoods?

**

There is NO need nor any responsible reason to be rushing into a decision that will affect the city forever.

[REDACTED]

From: Charlene Sambrooke [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 3:40 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: our opposition to the proposed by-law Missing Middle initiative

To Victoria Mayor and council,

As home owners and taxpayers in the Victoria City, we strongly disagree with this proposal.

The reasons are:

1. reduced urban green space
2. needing more meaningful consultation regarding the height limits
3. more meetings needed, just not one. And especially just before a long weekend
4. more meetings in September after family vacation and children go back to school
5. and finally this will not cure the homeless population. These dwellings will be priced out of their reach.

Sincerely,

A. Glen Sambrooke and

L. Charlene Sambrooke

1430 Angus Road, Victoria, BC, V8S 1Y6

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 12:39 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Support for the Missing Middle housing initiative

From: Garth Wardle [REDACTED]
Sent: July 27, 2022 10:15 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: Garth Wardle [REDACTED]
Subject: Support for the Missing Middle housing initiative

Hello Mayor and Council
Support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative

This is to express my support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

PROBLEMS

Trends like fewer families living here and fewer workers being able to find accommodation even though they have a job will have a big impact on Victoria in the near future.

The Victoria housing market is distorted by lack of supply. This may be a Canada wide problem but its worse here.

SOLUTION

You councillors have made a great start with the great work your staff have done on the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

If implemented, the initiative will not solve all of the problems above but will make a real contribution to the solution.

If you implement this, you will be seen as the council that did something about these big problems. You will be courageous and show leadership where its needed most.

If you don't, you will be seen as the council that gave in to fear and NIMBYism. Yet again.

What the NIMBYs maybe don't realise is while they are protecting what they think is a great place to live, they are hollowing it out and undermining it, by perpetuating the problems listed above.

You are at the end of a term. Leave this as a legacy for the city. Show leadership. Implement this and let's get started!

Congratulations again on allowing staff to create this important solution.

Best regards
Garth Wardle

OnRock Holdings Inc.

4, 1765 Rockland Ave
Victoria, V8S 1X1
July 26, 2022

Mayor and Council,
1, Centennial Square,
Victoria

Via email

Re: proposed revisions to zoning, the “missing middle,” comment directed to the August 4, 2022
Public Hearing

I came to Victoria as a student in the School of Architecture, as part of a project to awaken Victoria to its unique urban and social values, and to provide support to citizens and politicians. They were working to engage the public in confirming the value of our built environment as a resource, which had been nurtured sometimes, and often ignored. Pretty much wholesale redevelopment was taking place in inner City neighbourhoods under the guise of providing housing, a process that eventually ran out of steam having served to produce low quality housing and enrich the development community.


Since those early days, Victoria has evolved to be a City which has been concerned, to the best of its ability, about its built environment. Official Community Plans have been developed, at considerable expense, and updated. Such documents are intended to incorporate the diverse and aspirational goals of our community: economic development, population increase, areas suitable for densification, heritage and preservation values, mobility. Such documents also consider less tangible goals: the natural environment, skyline and view corridors, regional context. The interests of the development community are not overlooked. In my view, one of the major goals of an OCP is to indicate where, and how, development could take place, thereby providing developers, and citizens, with a predictable framework for where they might invest and live.

Turning now to the “missing middle,” this blanket rezoning is based on the premise that housing will be made “more affordable.” I believe this is very questionable, there is considerable research pointing to the fact that rezoning, site specific or otherwise, leads to a massive increase in land values which eliminates the affordability concept. Writers such as Patrick Condon, from UBC, have dealt with this phenomenon in some detail as it applies to Vancouver. Victoria would be no different.

The City, with limited capacity in a rapidly expanding region, cannot solve the issue of affordable housing. A lot of the housing stock is, by its age and nature, affordable, on the other hand neighbourhoods which are in the inner City tend to be more expensive, due to urban amenities, easier access to work and leisure activities, and so on. Victoria is not going to be able to make any serious impact on affordable housing without the cooperation of the surrounding jurisdictions, thereby treating housing as a regional issue .

Earlier, I used the word aspirational, I would like to return to it. Victoria cannot be all things to all people, it is not large enough, or wealthy enough, and impetuous revisions to zoning will not serve the City well. Victoria should aspire to be the historic and cultural core of the region, and its infrastructure, expressed in its architecture, natural environment, and forward thinking planning should reflect this. Its residential housing stock, character laden yet having proven to be highly adaptable, should be valued as a precious resource. It is a very complex environment, constructed over time, and should be respected and nurtured, not diminished through poorly considered and untested zoning changes.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'John Keay', written in a cursive style.

John Keay, Architect, retired

cc:

mayor@victoria.ca

malto@victoria.ca

stephen.andrew@victoria.ca

sdubow@victoria.ca

bisitt@victoria.ca

jloveday@victoria.ca

spotts@victoria.ca

cThornton-joe@victoria.ca

gyoung@victoria.ca

[REDACTED]

From: Robert M Appleton [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 3:29 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council:

I do not support the Middle Initiative because I do not believe it will on a sustainable basis resolve the issue of sufficient affordable housing for young families and others who wish to reside in or close to the City core. Victoria's housing problem is an issue that is being experienced globally. I believe the higher density proposal contemplated under the Missing Middle Initiative will only increase land values while progressively destroying the ambience and character of the highly desirable community we all enjoy today.

Victoria and its surrounding Municipalities are comprised largely of single-family residences, which to a large extent create the interest in our city and the ambience that we all desire. Many of our residents

have lived and worked in major cities throughout the world and retired or returned home to Victoria because of its slower pace, smallness, unique character, and charm.

The Missing Middle Initiative is a substantial high density rezoning initiative, not provided for within the existing Community Plan, for single-family residential properties, which represent most homes in Victoria. If allowed on a wide scale it will be harmful to our city and do very little with respect to making homes more affordable over the longer term. Understanding cost was a key driver behind the Missing Middle Initiative, more effective and realistic avenues might be strongly lobbying the Provincial government to eliminate transfer property tax for first time home buyers, and to invest internally in rebuilding and streamlining the city's building permit process to ensure decision are rendered within a maximum time frame of 90 days from submission. Such a timeframe should also encompass

public consultation/input because this is a critical part of such a process for proper governance and oversight.

Unfortunately, success invariably creates demand and higher prices. Consequently, if we manage the city's business successfully Victoria will continue to be an expensive place to live. This should be viewed as a positive not a negative especially when done in the context of value versus price alone. Notwithstanding, we need on a continuous basis to explore and endeavour to provide for alternative forms of low-cost accommodation and to establish bedroom communities by being the primary catalyst for modern public transportation island wide in the context of speed, cost, and daily convenience.

We should remember that we have just concluded a decade of nearly zero interest rates, and in Canada this has resulted in housing prices reaching unsustainable levels. However, free markets usually do they correct and in fact this has probably already started. An article by Pamela Haven in the July 25,2022 issue of the Financial Post styled

“Canada’s Housing market headed for Historic Correction, says RBC.”

suggests we are on the eve of the worst decline in housing we have seen in this country in the past 40 years. Many economists are now saying rising interest rates will have a material downward effect on housing prices. In time this will impact on affordability.

Finally, the Governance report for candidates, outlined in today’s issue of the Times Colonist, prepared by the accounting and business-consultancy firm MNP, makes it clear that both at the council and staff levels management of our city is quote “staggeringly wasteful” and that council members only have themselves to blame. In fact, it would appear councillors make decisions based on their own personal agendas versus the overall good for the city. Regardless, it is evidently clear that the management group now in place at City Hall do not have the ability to identify and focus on the priorities critical to running the business of the city. In other words, they can’t get their house in order. As a result, until this is accomplished presumably under the direction

of a new Mayor and Council after the November election, any initiatives which constitute a major change from the status quo such as the Missing Middle Initiative should be shelved.

Mark Appleton

902 St. Charles Street,
Victoria, B.C., V8S 3P6



[REDACTED]

From: Nikki Elliott [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Approve Missing Middle

Please approve OCP amendments supporting missing middle policies on August 4th.

We are very fortunate to be homeowners in Quadra/Hillside neighbourhood. It is an amazing neighbourhood with walkable/bikeable amenities that I want others to be able to enjoy in the future.

We need more policies, such as missing middle (mmh) to offer a more, diverse set of housing options for our current and future residents. We need to continue to be leaders in the region. Please approve on August 4th!

While I am sure you are aware of why this is important, these ones are compelling to me and many other residents I have chatted with:

-a lack of housing diversity and family friendly housing is pushing families out of Victoria, contributing to sprawl and traffic issues.

-requiring rezoning for modest density increases adds years of time and thousands of dollars which only disincentivizes triplexes to 6-plexes and townhomes from being constructed and makes them more expensive than they need to be.

-we already allow single family homes to be torn down and rebuilt with no requirement for tenant protection, no increase in units, no thought to "form and character" of the neighborhood, and no requirement to maintain green space (just open space, which can be paved) items that are considered in the mmhi strategy

-While missing middle isn't "affordable" housing, it gives options to the people who don't need or qualify for low income housing options but can't afford the \$1.2+++ needed for a single family home

-it is one piece in the housing strategy that is working to address a huge challenge, and it works in tandem with other strategies

-lastly, I want there to be a chance my kids could live in Victoria if they chose, and if we continue to restrict housing options, it significantly reduces the likelihood of them being able to stay here.

We desperately need housing options that fall between a high rise condo and a sfd.

Thank you,

Nicole Elliott & Scott Smits
1102 Vista Hts. Victoria, BC

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Missing Middle Housing - input

From: Ted Davies [REDACTED]
Sent: July 27, 2022 12:40 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing - input

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am unable to attend the August 4 public hearing on this topic but wish to provide some brief input on the topic.

I support aspects of the initiative especially given the slow approvals for new construction of housing in Victoria which has reduced the growth rate of supply, added to developers' costs and so raised the cost of housing in our city.

I understand the concerns of some citizens about appearance changes and parking problems. It seems best to set a time span after which the Missing Middle initiative is re-evaluated and, if no consensus, the current zoning and approval process comes back into effect, by default. That time span may be best set in the 5 to 10 year range although smarter people within the City may have better ideas on a more appropriate time frame.

Best wishes in your careful deliberations of what will be best for the City of Victoria.

Ted Davies
439 Cook Street, Unit #106

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Please support the Missing Middle initiative

From: Alice [REDACTED]
Sent: July 28, 2022 3:06 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Please support the Missing Middle initiative

Dear Mayor and Councillors

I'm a 2nd generation Victorian, and a legal triplex conversion of a big, old house in the early 70's allowed my parents to become homeowners fresh out of high school, and put them on the path to lifelong home ownership. Consequently, my brother and I grew up with stable housing, even after our parents divorced.

Fast forward 50 years, and the kind of housing I grew up in contradicts the zoning in most neighbourhoods, and home ownership has been out of reach for me and for my brother. We're now renting, meaning our families are at the whim of our landlords, and we've each been renovicted in the past from long-term, affordable rentals. My family has been fortunate to land in a rental duplex, in a neighbourhood full of such homes, converted when zoning allowed. But they were converted on the cheap, and are poorly insulated for sound and temperature. We feel lucky to have a home we can afford, for now; and I know there are very few options out there for family sized housing for those who can't afford \$1 million.

Missing Middle housing would open up more options for us. Purpose-built multi family homes, with appropriate insulation and soundproofing, would accommodate all types of families, much more efficiently than chopped up old houses and basement suites currently do. Gentle density in our urban neighbourhoods is the ideal solution to both the housing crisis and the climate crisis. Please don't give in to the NIMBYs who act like Victoria is only for those who can afford single family homes. We need diversity in our neighbourhoods and the Missing Middle initiative is the best way to do it.

Sincerely,
Alice Cochran

[REDACTED]

From: Bruce841 [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 3:38 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Public Hearing Submission

1. **This "Missing Middle" proposal to amend the Community Plan Bylaw and Zoning Regulation Bylaw should be cancelled now.** It should be left for consideration of the new City Council after the fall election. It is unconscionable for this Council to try to ram this through in the two remaining months of their tenure. Council's attempt to do so is an election issue and voters will know before the election how each Council member votes on this matter.

2. The process of information dissemination and "consultation" to date has been seriously flawed at best - many would say deceptive and manipulative. Critical aspects of the proposal such as height restrictions and setbacks have been delayed, then changed without adequate notice. Such a significant proposal should be fully transparent, with all broad and detailed information made public in the clearest possible way and with reasonable timelines to allow the public to fully consider all aspects of the issue.

3. The specifics of this proposal as known at this time would have major negative impacts on the City and the various neighbourhoods. When assessed in a rational and fair manner, not just wishful thinking, there would be very little benefit. Rather, it would irrevocably damage the character and livability of Victoria, on top of the damaging changes of recent years in regard to development and traffic. It would be devastating to property owners that have one of these monstrosities built next to their home. Beyond that and given the flawed process to date, it is fair to ask if there could be more changes to the "details" of the proposed bylaw(s) before passing - changes that could be even more damaging.

4. On a related matter, it must be noted that the Official Community Plan and the Neighbourhood Plans have not been honoured in recent years by the City Council and staff. Council and staff have seen fit to ignore significant aspects of these Plans in order to approve some major development proposals. There has been no mechanism short of provincial court action to force Council and staff to abide by these laws, and this is a major issue that also needs to be addressed. Ironically, this Council is now attempting to change the Community Plan to support their ideology in regard to this densification.

Bruce Letvak
Victoria BC

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle

From: BRIGITTE SUTHERLAND [REDACTED]
Sent: July 28, 2022 3:02 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle

Mayor and Council Member: My assessment is that this policy has been rushed through and the Aug. 4 public hearing is way too soon to be considering such a far-reaching policy.

The MMI needs to be an election issue and should be postponed and the Councillors need to state their position on this serious matter clearly to the voters.

Key reasons why a decision on the MMI should be delayed:

- Inadequate engagement
- Lack of public understanding of the policy
- Flawed and incomplete
- No affordability component built in
- No protection for existing renters
- Required a clearer vision for the reduced parking requirements for 6-unit buildings (will residents be charged to park on streets?)
- Requires integration with broader municipal and provincial policies for housing, renter protections, transportation and infrastructure
- No speculation mitigation strategy
- Requires more research on the risk of local government delegating away their ability to “level the playing field” when it comes to development
- Requires more research on the impact on property taxes (not just a homeowner issue as these costs are typically passed down to renters)

Please take these suggestions into consideration. Thank you, Brigitte Sutherland and James Vitti

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 9:56 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: MMI

From: DONNA RUPPEL [REDACTED]
Sent: July 28, 2022 5:36 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: MMI

Mayor and council

Apparently this is the only way I can send you my comments on the MMI. Your website was not usable.

Please delay this decision regarding MMI until after the Fall election.

I realize by the deliberate manner in which not informing the Victoria home owning citizens, you will be successful in ramming through a positive vote.

It is this council's total disregard for the existing residents that has been very upsetting. As supposed elected representatives of Victoria homeowners, you should be ashamed of this sleazy conduct.

As well as the disgusting announcement of the four who will deliberately leave council and allow the incoming council deal with the results.

I am not very proud of our city of Victoria at this moment.

Donna Ruppel
Home owner and tax payer

[REDACTED]

From: Daniel Yona [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 5:15 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Support for Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Dear Council,

As a resident of Victoria and someone who cares deeply about the future of our city, I would like to express my support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

I believe the proposal is well balanced, will eventually address the huge gap we have in terms of available supply, and is a step in the right direction to keep young people of various backgrounds in town, as well as attract new diverse populations who don't want or need SFHs. There is risk in any change, but to see people's current struggles (including people who live in illegal basement suites throughout the city), and do nothing, is in my opinion the greatest risk to those of us who care about our collective future in Victoria.

I hope you approve it, and hope you report back in 2 years with lessons learnt and future steps to improve density and modernize our city.

Thanks,
Daniel Yona
704-1010 View Street
Victoria, BC
V8V 4Y3

[REDACTED]

From: Kathie Wagner [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 9:00 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Housing and public hearing August 4 comments

I have asked this many times: is the city looking at commercial areas for redevelopment? Paradise has already been paved in these areas for buildings and parking lots. Why not offer tax incentives to those buildings that are just a few stories of commercial space with no residential above?

Compare Save on Foods at Pandora and Vancouver to Save on Foods at Foul Bay and Fort. The latter is a giant parking lot. No housing.

In Europe they are doing everything possible to maintain green spaces. New developments can't take more green space than the original footprint. Our housing we have in neighbourhoods have gardens and eco systems. Our streets have green boulevards.

Why displace people living in homes and make them/us feel guilt for the space we worked for? Why not look at the above as a solution? Many of the businesses in the commercial spaces can move to other locations (many empty commercial spaces all over Victoria area) either permanently or temporarily.

If going to increase the density of current R-1 properties, then please change the parking rules required for properties and look at more creative ways of building so gardens are kept.

Kathie Wagner
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Kelsey Waller [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 2:00 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Policy

Hi there,

I wanted to email to show my support for the Missing Middle Housing Policy! It's very much needed and an awesome step in the right direction.

Thank you,

KELSEY WALLER

[REDACTED]

From: Laurie McAmmond [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 3:09 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Laurie McAmmond
Subject: Missing Middle

I am strongly opposed to this initiative, there are far better ways to increase sustainable housing without changes to zoning i.e. re-purpose all existing old three story apartment buildings in the city increasing height to provide more units rather than removing the green canopy and cementing over arable land in residential areas with three story walk ups.

Laurie McAmmond
1815

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Initiative and Help's Arterial Road Comment

From: Neil Banera [REDACTED]
Sent: July 28, 2022 8:12 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative and Help's Arterial Road Comment

I am sending you the following copy of a submission I made to the Times Colonist (TC) yesterday regarding Mayor Help's apparent statement that the Missing Middle Initiative would increase heights of new development only along arterial roads...which is entirely incorrect.

Either Mayor Helps has been misinformed, does not actually know what the Initiative and draft Bylaw says, or is being disingenuous. The draft Bylaw does not limit the increase in height...and potential impact on adjacent properties...to arterial roads. Arterial roads are not even mentioned in the Bylaw and it refers only to Corners. And there are many, many corners on residential streets in our small city.

This type of misinformation creates totally unrealistic expectations by the public and leads to poor, misunderstood decisions.

My letter to the TC was limited to 250 words, but I could have written much, more about how our Mayor/Councillors have manipulated information and public involvement over the last 4 to 8 years. The Missing Middle Initiative is just another example of that. One writer to the TC said that during the City's recent Open House that he attended, staff responses to his questions were vague and even evasive...sadly.

I respectfully request that you and our City staff present accurate, factual information at the upcoming Public Hearing with which the public may then provide informed input....not input based on hype and spin.

Neil Banera
428 Kipling Street

[REDACTED]

Re: "City of Victoria's housing strategy falls short of targets," July 27

The last paragraph of the article states that "Helps said that if the city wants to make room for everyone in the community, it will have to come to terms with....a bit more height along main arterial roads". In fact, the increase in height will apply to the corners of all residential streets in the City.

The draft Bylaw does not limit its application to arterial roads, as specified by Mayor Helps. In the Fairfield Neighbourhood, there are 154 intersections (I counted them on the City's Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan (2019)) with up to 4 corners each; mostly located on residential side streets and not arterial roads. As such, there are hundreds of

corner properties in the Fairfield Neighbourhood alone. Each has neighbours on 2 or more adjacent properties who will be affected by this initiative.

The Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan limits heights to 2.5 to 3 storeys/10.5 m. along arterial Fairfield Road and 2 to 2.5 storeys/8.5 m. in all Traditional Residential Areas. The Missing Middle Initiative proposes to increase the allowable height from 8.5 m. to 10.5 m...and reduce other requirements...of new townhouses on all corner lots.

The current Initiative does not adequately address the potential negative impacts on existing properties. The Initiative does not provide the balance reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan and Guidelines. At the very least, those requirements should form an integral part of any draft Zoning Regulation Bylaw.

Neil Banera
Victoria

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

[REDACTED]

From: Chris [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 8:01 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Public Hearing: Written Comment

Dr. Chris Stackaruk
306-120 Douglas Street
Victoria, BC, V8V2N9

Hello,

I am a homeowner in Victoria and **I enthusiastically support the missing middle housing initiative.** I have carefully studied the proposal and I believe this proposal will help our city to meet its critical housing needs.

Homeowners like me have received windfall after windfall from this ridiculous housing market. It is wrong for us to lock others—and especially young families—out of ownership (while inflating our own assets) for marginal concerns around density, parking, height, shadows, etc. The Missing Middle Initiative is a great proposal to make homeownership available to more people, and especially families.

Best,

Chris

[REDACTED]

From: Neil Banera [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 11:49 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Stephen Andrew (Councillor); Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Missing Middle Initiative and Help's Arterial Road Comment

Thank you Mayor Helps for your email and clarification. Much of the TC article was about the Missing Middle Initiative so you can see how your comments could easily be interpreted as describing that initiative. Clarity is essential.

As many residents of our small city may have also thought the way I did upon reading the article and assumed you were saying the Initiative itself would only result in "a bit more density in neighbourhoods, a bit more height along main arterial roads", it is imperative that City staff present an accurate, factual description of the Missing Middle Initiative and draft bylaws at the Public Hearing on August 4. Only then may Councillors and the public alike make the necessary informed decisions.

There are many hundreds of corner lots on our residential side streets (not just main arterial roads) to which the Initiative and draft bylaws will apply and the proposed increase in townhouse heights at those locations is greater than "a bit more".

Location and height are just 2 of the critical considerations that the Initiative warrants and the public has a right to know whether they might be negatively affected. Most people are not against gentle densification but they are against arbitrary increases in height, and, townhouse developments on every street corner (up to 4 at each intersection).

Thank you once again for your email and I still find your choice of words and sentences in the TC article to be most curious.

Take care and I wish you well in your life after small city politics.

Neil Banera
428 Kipling Street
Victoria BC

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>
Sent: July 28, 2022 6:15 PM
To: Neil Banera [REDACTED]; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor)

<jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Stephen Andrew (Councillor) <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>


Subject: Re: Missing Middle Initiative and Help's Arterial Road Comment

Hi Neil,

In the paper I was referring not specifically to Missing Middle Housing but to all housing, saying we needed more density in neighbourhoods (missing middle) and along arterials. I was commenting generally on the 2021 housing strategy update, not the Missing Middle Housing initiative. Hope this helps!

--

Lisa Helps, City of Victoria Mayor
Lekwungen Territory



"It is not an either / or world. It is a real world." – Rachel Naomi Remen, M.D., *Kitchen Table Wisdom: Stories That Heal*

From: Neil Banera <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thursday, July 28, 2022 at 12:47 PM

To: "Ben Isitt (Councillor)" <BIsitt@victoria.ca>, "Lisa Helps (Mayor)" <LHelps@victoria.ca>, Marianne Alto <MAItto@victoria.ca>, Sharmarke Dubow <sdubow@victoria.ca>, Jeremy Loveday <jloveday@victoria.ca>, "Sarah Potts (Councillor)" <spotts@victoria.ca>, Charlayne Thornton-Joe <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>, "Geoff Young (Councillor)" <gyoung@victoria.ca>, "Stephen Andrew (Councillor)" <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>

Subject: Fw: Missing Middle Initiative and Help's Arterial Road Comment

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

I am forwarding this email onto you individually as I don't know whether you will actually see it otherwise.

Neil Banera
428 Kipling Street

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Neil Banera

Sent: July 28, 2022 8:12 AM

To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>

Subject: Missing Middle Initiative and Help's Arterial Road Comment

I am sending you the following copy of a submission I made to the Times Colonist (TC) yesterday regarding Mayor Help's apparent statement that the Missing Middle Initiative would increase heights of new development only along arterial roads...which is entirely incorrect.

Either Mayor Helps has been misinformed, does not actually know what the Initiative and draft Bylaw says, or is being disingenuous. The draft Bylaw does not limit the increase in height...and potential impact on adjacent properties...to arterial roads. Arterial roads are not even mentioned in the Bylaw and it refers only to Corners. And there are many, many corners on residential streets in our small city.

This type of misinformation creates totally unrealistic expectations by the public and leads to poor, misunderstood decisions.

My letter to the TC was limited to 250 words, but I could have written much, more about how our Mayor/Councillors have manipulated information and public involvement over the last 4 to 8 years. The Missing Middle Initiative is just another example of that. One writer to the TC said that during the City's recent Open House that he attended, staff responses to his questions were vague and even evasive...sadly.

I respectfully request that you and our City staff present accurate, factual information at the upcoming Public Hearing with which the public may then provide informed input....not input based on hype and spin.

Neil Banera
428 Kipling Street

[REDACTED]

Re: "City of Victoria's housing strategy falls short of targets," July 27

The last paragraph of the article states that "Helps said that if the city wants to make room for everyone in the community, it will have to come to terms with....a bit more height along main arterial roads". In fact, the increase in height will apply to the corners of all residential streets in the City.

The draft Bylaw does not limit its application to arterial roads, as specified by Mayor Helps. In the Fairfield Neighbourhood, there are 154 intersections (I counted them on the City's Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan (2019)) with up to 4 corners each; mostly located on residential side streets and not arterial roads. As such, there are hundreds of corner properties in the Fairfield Neighbourhood alone. Each has neighbours on 2 or more adjacent properties who will be affected by this initiative.

The Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan limits heights to 2.5 to 3 storeys/10.5 m. along arterial Fairfield Road and 2 to 2.5 storeys/8.5 m. in all Traditional Residential Areas. The Missing Middle Initiative proposes to increase the allowable height from 8.5 m. to 10.5 m...and reduce other requirements...of new townhouses on all corner lots.

The current Initiative does not adequately address the potential negative impacts on existing properties. The Initiative does not provide the balance reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan and Guidelines. At the very least, those requirements should form an integral part of any draft Zoning Regulation Bylaw.

Neil Banera
Victoria

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

[REDACTED]

From: Neil Banera [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 12:23 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Missing Middle Initiative - A Reality Check

Please accept this email as input to the Missing Middle Initiative and Public Hearing on August 4, 2022.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Neil Banera
Sent: May 16, 2022 5:56 PM
To: stephen.andrew@victoria.ca <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>; bisitt@victoria.ca <bisitt@victoria.ca>; mayor@victoria.ca <mayor@victoria.ca>; malto@victoria.ca <malto@victoria.ca>; sdubow@victoria.ca <sdubow@victoria.ca>; jlomeday@victoria.ca <jlomeday@victoria.ca>; spotts@victoria.ca <spotts@victoria.ca>; cthornton-joe@victoria.ca <cthornton-joe@victoria.ca>; gyoung@victoria.ca <gyoung@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative - A Reality Check

I am writing to you as a result of the City's recently released Missing Middle Initiative report and because of comments I have heard on the radio and read in the newspaper from some of you. Most notable are the report's recommendations to essentially discard the current requirements of recently approved documents such as the "Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan" and the "Design Guidelines for Attached Residential Development: Fairfield Neighbourhood". As well, Mayor Helps stated on CFX radio on May 6 that this initiative is not about housing affordability and that an \$800,000 townhouse was better than a \$1,400,000 house. As such I feel that it is time for a reality check before you give further consideration to implementing the report's recommendations.

1. In May, 2017 our son and his wife wanted to buy a single family dwelling (SFD) in Victoria. They could not afford to do so and for your information I have extracted the following data from the website of the Victoria Real Estate Board (VREB). In that May of 2017 the benchmark (typical) price of a SFD in the City of Victoria was \$803,000; a townhouse was \$562,300; and a condominium was \$406,300.
2. Our son has a position with the Navy and his wife is a full-time teacher. Both have good paying jobs and yet they could not afford to buy a house in our city. So we helped them with the largest financial gift we could and that enabled them to buy a SFD for \$628,000 in Colwood and that was with the maximum mortgage they could carry.
3. The VREB website statistics state that after 5 years in April, 2022 the benchmark price of a house (SFD) in Victoria had risen to \$1,186,500 (an increase of \$383,100); a townhouse was \$894,000 (an increase of \$332,500); and a condominium was \$623,900 (an increase of \$217,000) and now equivalent to the cost of the SFD they bought in Colwood 5 years ago.
4. The borrowing ability of our son and his wife..who now have 2 little boys...has not changed at all in 5 years. And we are not able to give them any more money than we did 5 years ago. So now they could only afford to buy a typical condominium in Victoria....not even a typical townhouse.

Comments by Mayor Helps that the Missing Middle Initiative is not about affordability and that an \$800,000 townhouse is better than a \$1,400,000 house border on being flippant and condescending. Who is it better for if the average hard-working local young couple with 2 small children and 2 good paying jobs can now barely afford a typical 2 bedroom condominium in our city? I will tell you who.....rich people from other places

(e.g. from other countries, high-end Airbnb'ers, money launderers, real estate commodity investors/flippers, downsizers from the west end of Vancouver, well-to-do retirees from Calgary and Toronto, maybe even a few prairie retirees....and now well-to-do young couples or couples with wealthy parents or grandparents...that's who.

At the Committee of the Whole (COTW) on Thursday, May 12 Councillor Isitt suggested...perhaps half-jokingly....that Victoria was becoming a playground for the rich..to which Mayor Helps took exception. The reality is that Councillor Isitt was much, much closer to the truth than Mayor Help's offhanded remarks (good for him). This Missing Middle report and it's recommendations do absolutely nothing to help average local young families like our son's.

5. There has been suggestion that some people will be able to transition upwards by selling a condominium and buying a townhouse...which then frees up a condominium for others to buy.

Sadly, in the 5 years from May, 2017 to April, 2022, the VREB statistics show that the increase in the benchmark price of a townhouse in Victoria was \$114,900 (\$332,500-\$217,600) more than the increase in the price of a typical condominium. Therefore, to buy upwards to a townhouse, owners of a typical condominium would have had to save \$114,900 in those 5 years to offset the differential increase or would have to increase the new mortgage by that amount. And who would be in a position to do that? Certainly not an average local young couple like our son and his wife. So it is a myth to suggest that this report will free up housing for others to buy.

6. During the COTW meeting on May 12, Councillor Andrew asked if densification would result in increased land values and used an example from Vancouver. A representative from Coriolis Consulting Corporation strenuously responded that land values did not go up due to densification and that it was the developed property value that increased...not the land value.

A local example is warranted in response to his question and the Coriolis response. Here in our city there is a property at 1224 Richardson Street which has just recently gone through our city's rezoning and development permit processes. The property had one small, old house and an old single car garage on it. Council approved the rezoning and development permit for a gentle densification consisting of 3 buildings containing a total of 24 units. The BC Assessment Authority website reveals that the 2021 Property Assessment was \$106,000 for the house and \$1,409,000 for the land...totaling \$1,515,000. The house and garage have been removed and nothing has been constructed on the property so far. The 2022 Property Assessment has a value of 0 for the house and \$4,013,000 for the land. Why did the land value go up from \$1,409,000 to \$4,013,000 in one year if Coriolis says densification does not increase the value of the land?

7. The Missing Middle Initiative proposes to amend the Official Community Plan by increasing the height of housing to 3 storeys instead of 2 to 2.5 storeys in Traditional Residential Areas. This initiative is therefore recommending that the legitimate concerns of and considerations for existing property owners be discarded and that new, more lenient requirements be produced.

The existing requirements ensure that infill housing will provide sensitive transitions to adjacent lower-scale development, considering massing, access to sunlight, appearance of buildings and landscape, and privacy. The intention is to mitigate potential negative impacts on existing residents and neighbourhoods. Those considerations remain valid.

A local example is a rezoning application at 1400 Fairfield Road & 349/351 Kipling Street. The proponent has been attempting to obtain approval to build 9 high-end towering townhouses on 2 small lots since 2019. The developer had continually wanted to build up to 3 storeys on Kipling Street whereas the Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan only allows 2 to 2.5 storeys. The COTW rejected the penultimate version on February 11, 2021 but allowed the proponent to revise the proposal and resubmit it rather than denying it outright. As of May 12, 2022 new revised plans have been submitted. If the Missing Middle Initiative had been implemented, the penultimate proposal with heights of 3 storeys might have received staff approval.

And the developer's builder stated at a CALUC presentation in 2019 that the units would sell for \$1 million each. With the increase in townhouse prices noted previously, these units will probably sell for \$1,300,000 or more if built. These townhouses will do little to support Objective 2.1 of the October, 2021 Draft Missing Middle Housing Policy which states "Improve options for families to stay in the city" as the townhouses will be completely unaffordable for local young families. Then who is this Missing Middle Initiative for?

And there are probably some developers who are waiting for the outcome of the Missing Middle Initiative because they think it will relax development requirements, minimize their development costs, speed up the process and therefore provide for greater profits.

8. The Initiative provides for delegation of development permit approvals to city staff, where development permit applications are clearly consistent with the guidelines and no variances are requested.

There appears to be a misconception that the housing pressures our city is facing is a result of bureaucratic processes, application costs, community benefit requirements, design limitations and NIMBY'ism. Most of that thinking is perpetuated by the development community and those people who have bought into their hype...citizens and politicians alike. For example, I have never heard a member of the public say that there are not enough million dollar townhouses in the City of Victoria.

If the development community simply complied with the existing design requirements, the adjudication process would be relatively quick and they would have the certainty of outcome that they desire. We do not need to soften requirements which are intended to ensure compatibility with existing residential development and to minimize negative impacts. If the purpose of having those requirements was valid in the past, they remain valid today. To suggest otherwise is to say that the concerns of existing residents are no longer valid and should be ignored because.....well just because. A good example is the above-mentioned proposed development on Kipling Street and Fairfield Road. It has taken the proponent 4 years to finally submit a proposal that complies with the Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Guidelines for Attached Residential Development: Fairfield Neighbourhood. He could have done that in the first place but he did not want to. He wanted to do it his way. Does that sound familiar?

My wife and I would support the delegation of development permit approvals only if the existing guidelines and requirements are strictly adhered to. We do not need to water down any of those...all the development community has to do is abide by them. That will give them the certainty they want and the certainty the public deserves. And that will ensure timely decision-making.

In summary, the Missing Middle Initiative will do little to "improve the options for families to stay in the city." Housing prices are already out of reach for the average local middle income family with children as per the following table which was extracted from the City's original Missing Middle Initiative report. You will

notice that as of April, 2022, a condominium is now worth as much as a townhouse was in 2019 (\$623,900 vs. \$632,900).

Median family household income (2015)		
	Victoria	Capital Region
All families	\$80,200	\$92,500
Couples with children	\$103,000	\$117,500

Benchmark Prices vs Incomes Needed (Prices: VREB, Victoria, 2019 Benchmark)			
Type	Benchmark Price	Income Needed (5% down)	Income Needed (20% down)
Condo	\$468,400	\$121,384	\$101,820
Townhouse	\$632,900	\$158,528	\$133,627
Detached house	\$823,900	\$189,981	\$159,309

And in order to buy that condominium now, the household income would need to be about \$158,000 with a \$32,000 downpayment (fat chance), or a household income of \$134,000 with a downpayment of \$127,000 from their wealthy parents or grandparents (good luck). I won't bother doing that analysis for a townhouse as I am sure that you get the picture....it is much worse.

Mayor Helps et al, the housing dilemma our local young families are facing is all about affordability and nothing else. To suggest otherwise is simply disrespectful and borders on ignorance. As this Missing Middle initiative is not about affordability, we should immediately stop wasting time, effort and money on it as it will do nothing to help local young families stay in the city.

Neil G. Banera, P. Eng. (Retired)