

Text of Presentation to the City of Victoria Public Hearing
on the Missing Middle Housing Initiative
City Hall, 1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC
September 1, 2022

My name is Mark Hornell and I live at 1026 Clare Street in the Gonzales Neighbourhood, and I am speaking in support of the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

Ten years ago, I was the Assistant Director of Planning for the City of Victoria, leading the work to develop and ultimately adopt in 2012, the new Official Community Plan, through a process that engaged more than 6,000 Victorians in crafting a vision and policy framework for the city's development over the next 30 years.

The OCP, for which the City received a gold award for excellence in policy planning in 2013 from the Planning Institute of BC, set out a policy for a city with a lively, walkable downtown surrounded by humane neighbourhoods, each with a village centre that put a nugget of urbanity and a focus of community life within walking distance of everyone. Part of this vision was the general policy direction to see traditional neighbourhood areas become progressively more housing diverse over time, through infill and redevelopment with a range of attached and ground-oriented housing forms, what has become known as the missing middle of housing between single detached homes and apartment buildings.

I have reviewed the background information prepared by City staff on this initiative and I believe it provides a comprehensive and supportable foundation to move ahead to implement this vision. Why do I think this is important?

The background material provides information that shows how residents in their family-forming years continue to move away from Victoria. Twenty-five years ago, my late wife and I were expecting our first child and we were able to buy our first home in Victoria, where we had moved the previous year. We found our house on Clare Street, a 1947 - 900 square foot bungalow, at the absolute limit of our ability to pay, at a cost approximately 3 X our then annual gross household income.

Were we that young family in the market today, with an income adjusted upward to reflect wage rate increases over the past 25 years, that same house would cost approximately ten times our gross annual household income. Typical young families starting out, even those with good professional salaries, simply cannot afford single detached houses in the City of Victoria. They need more choice in housing with access to a yard and to schools to be able to buy into or rent in this market.

In many ways, Clare Street typifies the kind of diverse housing proposed in the Missing Middle initiative. We have two three storey apartment buildings on the corners with Oak Bay Avenue, duplexes on the corners with Brighton Avenue, and a great many houses with one or in some cases two secondary suites in between. One large lot was redeveloped to two small lot singles though the initial proposal was for a triplex. It is within an easy walk of four schools, shopping, community services and public transit.

Clare Street is the kind of street many young families would love to live on, like our former neighbours Dan and Faye, and their two young children, who rented a ground level basement suite a few doors over. They were on the waiting list for at least one proposed townhouse development in the general area, that has been caught up in the rezoning process for at least two years. These proposed market townhouses were by no means “affordable”, but Dan and Faye could see a way to carry a mortgage on one and were prepared to trade off less physical space for the chance to live in a neighbourhood they had grown to love.

To cut the story short, they couldn’t wait any longer for the rezoning process to reach a conclusion, and decided instead to move to Campbell River, where they were able to buy a house and where both could work. They will no doubt have a good life in Campbell River and are the kind of new residents any community would be glad to have...including Victoria. I have heard older Victorians say many times over the years, that young people shouldn’t expect to be able to live here until they have gone away, made their fortune and then, in their 40s and 50s, move back. I think this is an incredibly short-sighted point of view.

Quite apart from the role young families play in keeping our schools full, and our economy ticking, they enhance our overall quality of life. One of the pleasures of living on Clare Street these past 25 years has been to see three generations of young children grow up. Only a few homes have children now and most residents are retired or nearly so. In its way, losing Dan and Faye and their kids to Campbell River was a small tragedy for our street. We need to provide more kinds of housing so that people like Dan and Faye can stay. Implementing the Missing Middle Housing Initiative can do this.

In closing, those of us who had the good fortune to buy into Victoria 25 or 30 years ago shouldn’t squat on our neighbourhoods like dragons on a hoard of gold, fending off all comers and clinging tightly to an apparently comfortable status quo. The kind of infill and redevelopment proposed respects neighbourhood character and the human scale streets we love. Cities change over time and this initiative charts a way for Victoria to change in a positive, incremental way. I encourage Council to vote for a better future and fully implement the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

From:




Subject:

Middle Missing Housing

Date:

August 30, 2022 1:37:53 PM

We are writing to express our opposition to continued Council discussions and **decision making** on the Middle Missing Housing initiative prior to the election of a new Mayor and Council. Let the citizens vote and then the new Council hold the public hearings and determine a course of action. That is the **democratic**, not **autocratic**, way. The rush to achieve the goals of some members of the current Council during a time when citizens are on vacation and preparing for a long weekend is reprehensible. The citizens of Victoria need time to thoughtfully consider the advantages and disadvantages of the Middle Missing Housing Initiative and be able to debate the options with the **mayor and councillors they elect in October**. Please put a stop to this. Sincerely, Marguerite and Donald Rowe, 100 Saghalié Road, Victoria, BC V9A0A1/ 

Letter in support of the Missing Middle initiative.

We live in the Rockland-Fairfield neighborhood. We would like to express our support in favor of the Missing Middle initiative.

Houses in our region are majority vintage and physically very close to one another. Sound travels so easily, to the point that we think we're in a middle unit of a townhouse. As a matter of fact, we used to live in a townhouse at the beginning of our professional careers. People there were more respectful of one another and the private property, and we were able to enjoy a peaceful and quiet life, but not so much here.

We also find it ironic that some owners of huge houses and mansions in our area oppose "overdevelopment".

Many university students live in this region, due to proximity to UVic and easy access by bus.

In addition, there are many people renting houses or basement suites, due to the current lack of affordable living arrangements in Victoria. In our opinion, the density is not likely to change substantially with the new proposal. Instead, the initiative may bring a breath of fresh air in terms of both newer and more modern dwellings, as well as population demographics to this near central location.

Recently, there were significant structural street changes implemented by the City in the area; for some of these, a public consultation was not held. The current City Council has been in office for many years and knows this area best. We have a hard time understanding how a deferral to a new Council may help or why this matter should be turned into an electoral item.

We nurture the hope that the Council will obtain the necessary votes at the next meeting that are required to proceed with this natural and logical initiative, which may bring affordability and a more balanced lifestyle to the region.

Yours truly,

Dr. Adrian Fanat, MD

Ms. Ana Danut, CPA

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 8:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: 6.5% green space ?

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

From: Carolyn Thomas <[REDACTED]>
Sent: August 31, 2022 6:01 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: 6.5% green space ?

Dear Mayor and council,

I am stunned to be told that only 6.5% of MMHI zoning bylaws is to be backyard green space. Meaning a 5500 sqft lot would be required to have approx 357 sqft . One of my apple trees has a 250 sqft canopy. I don't understand how one can be for environmental cost efficiency and middle income housing where community can be created and not insisted upon design that reflects those laudable goals.

Sincerely,
Carolyn

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Ian Macklon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 7:43 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

I am, once again, writing to express my strong support for the Missing Middle Initiative. I sincerely hope that City Council sees through the fear-mongering some residents have succumbed to, and realizes that this is an important first step in the struggle to rein in housing prices in Victoria. Moreover, it's an opportunity to promote vibrant, walkable neighbourhoods.

For those saying that medium-density housing will "ruin neighbourhood character," I ask that you take a look at the following examples from around the world, and tell me that they lack charm and character — especially compared to many of the "modern" flat-top infills that now dot our neighbourhoods. All of the following buildings have been built within the past 10 years-or-so, or will be built shortly.

The Hague, Netherlands



Washington, DC, USA



Providence, RI, USA



Dusseldorf, Germany



Christchurch, NZ



Brooklyn, NY, USA



Thank you for your time,
Ian Macklon

[REDACTED]

From: INGE MAHARAJ <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 4:18 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Our household of 2 opposes the above noted.

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Jacob Hodge <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 7:56 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative - Comment in Support

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

My name is Jacob and I'm writing to express my enthusiastic support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

I've lived in Greater Victoria for 9 years, and in Victoria itself for the past 6 years. In that time, housing has gone from being merely expensive, to being completely unaffordable for a significant number of people. During the time I've lived in Victoria, I've had close friends and family members move away, mostly due to the ridiculous cost of housing in the region. This city simply isn't building enough housing to keep up with demand.

This initiative allows for gentle density; allowing more people to live in Victoria's limited space. Medium-density housing can also help alleviate demand on both high-density and low-density homes, and can integrate seamlessly into a neighbourhood.

Victoria is a vibrant, beautiful city with some lovely neighbourhoods. This initiative is critical in order to support the growth of the city, while maintaining those neighbourhoods by allowing for **gentle density**.

If this initiative does not pass, I don't know what will happen to this city. Some people could still afford to stay, but more and more of your families and friends will be forced out due to ever rising costs.

I sincerely hope this initiative goes through, and I am extremely disappointed in the councillors who have delayed and argued against this for hypocritical reasons.

Sincerely,

Jacob
V8R ***

[REDACTED]

From: Jim Kerr [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 9:14 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mayor & Members of Council

As currently proposed, I believe the Missing Middle Housing Initiative has the potential to increase the supply of much needed ground oriented housing in our City while achieving a reasonable fit within traditional residential neighbourhoods. I wholeheartedly support the stated objectives, the forms of housing envisaged, the proposed zoning standards and the design guidelines as drafted.

With today's exorbitant costs of land and new construction, I doubt that the private sector can deliver many of the newly created units at what is commonly considered an affordable price or rent. However, that should not stop us from pursuing these housing types which should result in some gentle densification over the long term.

My biggest concern is that no public input will be required in the proposed staff approval process for any MMH projects. While this may be tenable for smaller projects involving an average sized single residential property, I believe it is completely unacceptable for larger ones where land assembly is involved. This will typically be the case where 6-12 dwelling units allowed under the draft regulations are proposed for a site encompassing 2-5 standard lots at densities between 0.5:1 and 1.1:1 FSR. Because the impacts of such developments on adjacent properties and streets will be much greater, I believe that they must go thru a public hearing process prior to any approvals. I do not believe City staff alone can adequately assess the potential impacts or anticipate public input.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Kerr, Architect AIBC

JAMES KERR ARCHITECT
1423 Haultain Street
Victoria, BC V8R 2J6
[REDACTED]

From: Kristin crossman [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 4:57 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Sept 1st Vote - Missing Middle

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Re: Missing Middle Housing Proposal

To Mayor and Council

I am writing you to oppose the implementation of the current Missing Middle Housing Proposal you have brought forward. The current proposal does not sufficiently address the needs of renters, low-income families/individuals, those experiencing homelessness, or the issue of housing affordability. Yes, more housing is needed but not if it excludes current residences wishing to remain in Victoria who can barely afford current rental prices, are un- housed, and don't have the capital to purchase or rent these future homes. Current rental and housing prices are unaffordable for most residents and there is no guarantee that prices will become more affordable with this current plan.

I am a renter... I currently pay a decent price for my apartment which allows me to live sustainably and comfortably. However, if my landlord chooses to sell our house or I need to move, I will have to pay double or triple the rent I currently pay in order to stay here (that is if I can even find a place that accepts my dog). I would be left out of the housing market (again). I like many others would not be able to compete with buyers wanting to get housing at a more affordable price which is the purpose of this project. It is very likely that those outside the Victoria region would capitalize on these lower purchasing prices. We all know Victoria is a desirable location to live, this desirability is why we live here- is it not? I do not see any protections in place for those like myself or others in different circumstances within this proposal that ensures we can still be part of this desired community if the proposal is passed. Also, this proposal does not address or prevent the purchasing of homes for long- or short-term rental income such as Air BnB's or vacation rentals.

The other issue to consider is the hard and soft infrastructure needed to support this influx. How will this increase be addressed? How do we ensure that both the hard and soft infrastructure we do have is sufficiently supported and has the capacity to support this influx? What about those who are unhoused and access vital supports located downtown... Do they get pushed out and left out?

I believe further consultations and research is needed to meet the needs of ALL Victoria residents. I am not against density but rushing this proposal through without addressing the

above will not fix the issues we are currently facing. I am in favour of delaying the vote to conduct further research & consultations so that a more fulsome proposal that benefits all residents can be drafted and brought forward to the community.

Kind Regards,

Kristin
Fernwood Resident and Renter

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 8:13 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Not in Favour of MMI

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

It is deeply disturbing that one of the most important decisions our city is making about the essence of our community in each of its residential neighbourhoods is being decided by an outgoing council prior to an election and during the peak of holidays when so many are away. This is simply wrong. The Missing Middle Initiative removes our freedom to dispute development in our residential neighbourhoods. This is a democratic right. Removal of the right to have a say in such an important change to the feel and enjoyment of our properties which we have invested our entire lives in is immoral.

The missing middle concept is deceptive as many believe it to be about creating affordable housing which is not the purpose of missing middle. MMI will unlock the added value to increasing density which will only make land values rise and in the process, Victoria will become even less affordable for the average person whether they are renting or buying a home no matter the size. This will only force the lower income owners out of our city. The only people this MMI is benefiting are developers. As far as I can tell, there are no requirements to make any of the proposed density housing affordable, nor do I see any solutions for tenants being displaced as no rezoning would be required. Where are the creative ideas on giving back to create affordable housing? There is so much that needs improvement.

I am in agreement with the letters written by both the Fernwood Community Association and BCGEU which explain fully the many problems with the Missing Middle Initiative namely:

- 1) MMI Increases land value making Victoria less affordable
- 2) MMI inadvertently will increase the cost of new homes as the land values rise
- 3) MMI WILL encourage the tearing down of existing homes with affordable rents
- 4) MMI will displace tenants who currently have affordable rents
- 5) MMI does not allow the public & homeowners to have input on housing development which may adversely affect them. This is taking away basic rights.
- 6) MMI encourages less sustainable practices by tearing down small homes rather than repurposing existing structures which is less of an environmental impact.

I feel there are better ways to do gentle densification that will not affect current renters. The city should allow additional accommodation within an existing home and allow for larger garden suites which would accommodate the missing middle rather than the tiny garden suites currently permitted. I believe that this will affect neighbouring properties less negatively than allowing 3 storey buildings which will create less privacy, create conflicts with neighbours and shadow neighbouring properties.

I am concerned that we currently do not have enough schools in our area to support the kind of expansion the city is considering.

I am concerned we do not have enough doctors/emergency staff to handle increased populations.

I am concerned that MMI will increase our population of homeless individuals.

I have not seen a cost analysis on what improvements will be needed to Victoria's infrastructure to support the additional density. Who will be paying for this?

I truly believe that the Missing Middle Initiative is not in favour of local Victorian's interest and therefor I am strongly against the NO. 22-045

ZONING REGULATION BYLAW, AMENDMENT BYLAW (NO. 1278)

Sincerely,

Karin Shepard
320 Arnold Avenue

[REDACTED]

From: Karen Skogstad [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 7:05 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle housing Sept 1, 2022 (and more)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'd like to register that I am not in favour of the missing middle proposal as recommended - there doesn't seem to be anything to stop apartment buildings going through in the middle of our residential single home streets, parking is a real issue (and often leads to confrontation with neighbours), if almost all councilors and the mayor are not running again I don't see how you can ram this through in good conscience. I'm not sure of where it's been put in place other than around RAP and see few single houses but nice townhouses. Seems we have alot already (and saw in newspaper that these accommodations are keeping up with incoming demand. Needs more work - sorry I don't really believe in the "we're from the government and here to help you" line. You haven't given this proposal enough planning and thought.

I'm also worried about Community Plans where they can be changed at will! Developers are rich enough and certainly seems like this Victoria municipal council is very pro developer and don't listen to long term residents about anything that disagrees with their pet projects. Clover Point, barging compost to mainland, bike lanes where roads wide enough already, roads needing lots of work (altho thankfully finally got our Coventry done after months of waiting), sending letters and spending tax-payer time on issues that really don't come under your purview and more and more - I had kept a folder with newspaper articles in it with things you've done that hadn't worked but it got so large I recycled it. My husband and I are afraid to go downtown and we hear Beacon Hill Park is a mess again. Pandora is outrageous, but good you don't allow tenting in your "hood" Centennial Square. Way overboard on reconciliation - and taking public art down at your whim (MacDonald statue) is over stepping.

My husband and I were born here, worked here, paid taxes and did without so we could buy a house here. I liken the changes you make to saying you worked for last year and we will only pay you 1/2 of what we had agreed to and paid last time. Like pulling the rug out from under older residents.

Housing, climate action are bigger than municipal councils - provincial and federal responsibilities. Good luck with your new careers, fingers crossed we get people who understand the "job description".

Karen Skogstad
515 Selkirk Ave
Victoria

[REDACTED]

From: Mimi Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 11:17 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Opposition the the Missing middle Initiative

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of Fairfield and I vehemently oppose the Missing Middle initiative. It will not result in more affordability— it will remove rental stock and replace it with homes which are unattainable by most. It is the developers who stand to gain.

Signed,
Mimi Brown

Sent from my iPhone

From: Marlene Russo <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Sept 1st public hearing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Council:

I both own a property and rent business space in Victoria.

Rather than passing a sweeping by-law amendment that would densify Victoria in a way that may not be suitable to residents, I am offering the following possibilities:

1. Have the Strata Property Act amended so that the first floor of any strata-condo building must be available to owners with children and pets – doing this would open up a substantial amount of housing without disturbing all of the other owners who seem to fear noisy children and animals
2. Have the Strata Property Act amended so that any adult 19 or over may purchase a strata-condo. The buildings with age 55+ only owners really constrains the market
3. Have the Strata Property Act amended so that at least 40% of the owners may rent out their unit, provided that the tenant signs at least a 6 month lease. This should apply to condos and to townhouses. This would increase the vacancy rate substantially and provide housing to students while the snowbird owners are away.
4. Pass a by-law that requires a minimum amount of greenspace per lot, and a minimum number of trees. The beauty of Victoria lies, in large part, with its ability to connect us to nature. I am shocked to see owners being allowed to cut down a tree then only replace it with a sapling. I am also shocked to see owners being allowed to pave over their front yard without any trees being planted.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marlene Russo
Victoria, BC

[REDACTED]

From: Nodin Cutfeet <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 9:16 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

My name is Nodin Cutfeet, and I am a resident of James Bay.

Without increasing density in existing neighbourhoods, we'll have to meet demand by building an excessive number of condo towers near our downtown, or sprawl further out of town and disrupt our scenic ecosystems. Constructing too many condo towers will block sunlight from reaching our streets, and obstruct the ocean breeze from cooling inland parts of Victoria. Expanding our suburbs will worsen traffic congestion and force public transit resources to be spread more thinly across the CRD.

Single-family housing and high-rise condos also can't be built as affordably as middle-density housing solutions, meaning their construction won't do much to support lower-income families and young people. If our policies don't support these demographics, the higher costs of living here will force service staff and recent graduates to take their skills elsewhere. We can not have a functioning local economy without housing our young professionals and those willing to work for lower wages.

Finally, if you are familiar with architecture, it is self-evident that the houses in all our neighbourhoods, including Fairfield, reference very different architectural eras and heritages. It only feels cohesive because we've grown accustomed to the blend of housing styles scattered around our neighbourhoods.

For these reasons, I fully support all four of the bylaws being considered by the city council.

[REDACTED]

From: Margaret Ubukata [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 7:32 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Against the proposed missing middle plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mayor and Council,
I think the plan needs some improvements. One of my biggest concerns is losing green space in Victoria's residential neighbourhoods. I just recently read an informative article about the need of a "spongy" city as the climate changes and rainstorms become more intense. The proposed multiplexes will definitely affect green space and lead to urban tree loss.

<https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods>

Patty Laks

[REDACTED]

From: Sabe Glack <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 3:31 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: MMHI support.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'm busy so I don't have time to go in to detail, but please pass this initiative. I'm 24 and working two jobs to support myself, we need more housing stock desperately. Please stop prioritizing NIMBY concerns about aesthetics over poor people need for housing.

Please pass MMHI.

[REDACTED]

From: Susan Scotnicki <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 4:36 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative - Voicing my OPPOSITION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a Victoria resident who lives in Rockland at 1545 Shasta Place. I would like to submit my **opposition** to the current city councils Missing Middle Initiative for the following reasons:

1. I do not feel that this proposal has been presented to the residents of Victoria in a proper manner. This should be voted on during the next election for a new mayor and council. It was presented without full explanation in a reasonably coherent way until very recently. Most residents have been on summer breaks and at this point are distracted by getting children back to school and returning to offices post COVID.

2. I am worried about the change in setbacks with development and that we will lose much needed green space and tree canopies.

3. I am very worried about how many more residents can be accommodated in the city with the woefully poor infrastructure we currently have.

a. Leaving the city is very difficult by car and as much as this council likes to think that everyone will move to bicycles and few residents will have cars I believe that they are wrong. Families may try to use bikes but they will still own a car and will need to park it. When I turn off my street onto St. Charles, the parked cars from the existing suites already make it difficult to have safe visibility and they are causing extreme gridlock at certain times of the day. Closing off roads for bike lanes has made St. Charles a very popular road and it will only get worse with more suites and homes in the area.

b. Climate change and the extreme heat we have encountered over the last few summers are not usual for Victoria. I worry about water and what the population maximum is that we can safely sustain on our Island, and in our city.

c. Upgrades to community centres and more of them before we add to the population. I use Oak Bay's services... what does that say?

4. In my current employment within the Real Estate industry, the current thinking is that there will be a big adjustment in housing when all the many towers being built are moving towards being occupied. Who will be living in them? Who really is the MMI trying to attract? Rental agents are noticing that suites already sitting longer and landlords are negotiating rents. Banks are lowering appraised values of homes as they do not see the value that the market is commanding. This will cause a shift that we can't even see the end result of at this point. Let inflation and the market sort itself out before making such a huge proposal that could change the look and feel of our neighbourhoods.

5. People have made huge investments to be home owners. The idea that they will lose a say in what gets built next to them seems insane to me. City employees may be well intended, have experience in their field and know the parameters of this initiative, but there should be more oversight and input by the community when it will have such a huge impact on them directly. City councillors and employees do not have to live in the city (crazy stuff!!) yet they can make decisions of this magnitude is astounding to me.

Leave this discussion to the next council and the decision to the residents. I am opposed!

Susan Scotnicki
1545 Shasta Place

[REDACTED]

From: Andrea Lee [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 12:53 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Written Comment for MMHI Meeting Today

Hello,

My name is Andrea. My husband, baby and I live in the lovely Quadra Village (V8T3X8). I wrote in with a comment for the previous meeting, and was planning to leave it at that, but after hearing the shockingly selfish comments from some of the people against the MMHI, I wanted to add to my existing comment, if possible. It stunned me that someone could say something like "living in Victoria is not a human right". Of course, it's not a human right, but neither is living in a neighbourhood comprised only of single-family homes.

For everyone thinking only about what this initiative could mean for them personally, I'd like to suggest something:

It's not a human right to have a family doctor instead of access to a walk-in clinic. If we want to attract more family doctors and keep the ones we have, Victoria needs to be a more affordable city. Family doctors make less money than other doctors, and have more expenses since they have to run their own office like a small business (rent, staff, etc.). The student loans that most new doctors have to content with are very large. I know the prevailing idea is "doctors all have lots of money" but that's not a given. We're losing family doctors left and right, and until the provincial government sorts out how to fix that problem on a larger scale, we are in competition with every other city to attract doctors. We make that a lot more difficult by not addressing the astronomical cost of housing here. Would a new doctor want to buy a small condo in Victoria, or a 3-bdrm house in Calgary for the same price? Simply put, health authorities have difficulty attracting new talent when said talent can't afford to live in the place. And this goes double for nurses and other non-doctor health professionals. I don't believe that the MMHI is a perfect solution to all the affordability problems we have, but it is a step in the right direction.

Honestly, I could write a paragraph like the above for a lot of professions, but I guess it boils down to: the city only works if we're willing to function as a society and care about each other's wellbeing. Even if you have a nice house and can afford that, you need things (or will one day) from people who have less or make less than you. Nurses, health care assistants, baristas, retail workers - people with these jobs need to be able to afford to live in Victoria. Not everyone can or will want to commute in from somewhere cheaper, and we'll find ourselves in a lot of trouble if only people who already own homes can afford to be here.

None of this is about human rights, just about what is right. Please let's move forward with the MMHI and start taking some steps to address the housing problems in Victoria.

Thank you,
Andrea Lee

[REDACTED]

From: Allie M <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 9:43 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Support for the missing middle

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Simply put, we need more housing for working families. Families are what keep cities young and vibrant. Why is there such a shortage of townhomes in this city? Working families shouldn't be pushed out.

Allow home owners to add carriage homes or suites if they have the space.

Voicing support for the missing middle.

Alice mickelson
Msw rsw

From: Bart Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 9:43 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mayor and Council,

I want to express my support for the missing middle housing initiative. The type of housing proposed in this initiative will provide needed additional housing supply to areas in close proximity to the downtown core. For gentle density to begin to take shape in Victoria a process to streamline applications to build these housing forms needs to take place.

As a local developer I speak from experience as I have built one of only a handful of recent missing middle projects in Fairfield — a 4-plex at 1417 May Street. The rezoning proposal for this project was sought with conflict, nearly rejected, and took more than 3 years to go from rezoning and get a building permit plus another 18 months to complete.

Now that the project is complete it has been praised by the community and has won multiple awards.

On another property, I have been in the rezoning process for more than 3 years seeking approval for 9 townhomes over 2 corner lots (1400 Fairfield Rd. and 349/351 Kipling street). If the missing middle initiative were approved sooner there would be 9 new family oriented townhomes built by now and sold to families instead of continuing to revise and resubmit plans for councils consideration and decision. The lengthy rezoning period which is the same for 9 homes as it is for 99 homes significantly dissuades developers from pursuing this type of housing. The missing middle initiative will change this.

As a developer, I think what is being proposed is by no means perfect, but it is a good step forward that could transform the city for the better by contributing to affordability by increasing housing supply and housing options — especially for families. More engagement, revisions, and delays is not the answer, as there is no scenario where everyone will be in support of all aspects of the proposal.

I encourage you to approve the missing middle housing initiative.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bart Johnson
Developer, 1417 May Street
Owner + Developer, 1400 Fairfield Rd + 349/351 Kipling Street

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Brian Kendrick <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 11:07 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle

I am writing to express my opposition to the Missing Middle initiative,

The problems in this city are not with the concept of zoning and the principle of a rezoning process, but with the administration thereof.

The issue is that the bureaucracy at Number 1 Centennial Square moves at a glacial pace. That the North Park project referenced in a recent OpEd by the Mayor took 2 years to process is an indicator of inefficiency in the process, not a fault of the principle of rezoning, or an inadequacy in the proposal that could have slid through under this initiative.

It may be possible to expedite a planning approval, and still get stuck waiting for a Building Permit. The project at 1224 Richardson took 13 months for one.....and it is affordable housing. I know of a building permit that was delayed a month, because Parks and Streets could not agree on the angle of driveway flare, over a boulevard. Bureaucracy is choking the city in all departments.

This new policy will inevitably result in a new round of property speculation, and can only provide housing at market rates. Forget affordable, or even attainable new housing, and say hello to increased property taxes.

The City should clean house before passing any paradigm shifting bylaws.

That which is founded in Dogma and supported in Rhetoric is doomed to failure.

Brian Kendrick

[REDACTED]
A 35 year Fairfield resident, who fears being tax squeezed out of our home.

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
To: Engagement-External
Subject: RE: Missing Middle Proposal

From: Colin Brooks [REDACTED]
Sent: September 1, 2022 11:17 AM
To: Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Proposal

As public feedback is being sought out, I'd like to express my 100% disagreement with proceeding with the Missing Middle proposals at this time. There are other options that should be explored prior to implementing a change as drastic as what is being proposed. Both my wife and I are also very worried about the unintended consequences this decision could bring about.

Regards,
Colin Brooks

[REDACTED]

From: Christine Smart [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 12:51 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Letter regarding the MMI for tonight's hearing

Dear Mayor and Council

I do believe we need flexible and creative housing, which includes various forms of owned and rentable homes. However, I'm against the missing middle proposal as it's currently designed for the following reasons and I offer some considerations to find a path that may lead us the right design with more time and work.

I don't believe that removing public consultation, from either individual residents or neighbourhoods should ever be part of our democratic system of governance. There should always be deep involvement from our communities and neighbours.

There hasn't yet been sufficient research into how the MMI could affect communities. We need more curiosity and time spent understanding the fabric of our neighbourhoods.

People may worry about privacy, but I think that there may be ways to carefully enquire on a deep thoughtful level about every SFH property and those who call the house or building home. There may have been surveys or discussions, but I don't think the city truly understands what is underneath all the roofs in our city and how houses are used by so many.

For the type of changes the City of Victoria is proposing, there should be a "census" style enquiry. One that can determine how many residents are in each house, how long have they been living there, do they own, do they rent, do they have special needs, are there multiple generations, could they afford to move, buy, or afford a change in rent? How would being evicted change their lives? Do they need rental protections? What would make their living conditions better? What would make their living conditions worse? I'm sure there are many important questions that could be asked to understand the dynamics of our neighbourhoods. Everyone is talking about what "market rent" is – but what about the cost of losing the established controlled rents that do make our city affordable for so many.

We need to ask all the tough questions and gain an understanding of the unintended consequences regarding how this MMI will displace or create hardship. There are so many people that have lived long term in housing arrangements with rental protections from the province, the MMI could easily remove their assured rental expenses that allows them to stay in the neighbourhoods they love and in the City of Victoria.

Please leave this decision for the next council, give them more time to build in nuance, offer our community more protections, because something worth having is worth waiting for.

Victoria should not be doing this alone, even the reports that you have from city staff state that this should not be undertaken in a single neighbourhood, but should be city wide. Take that knowledge and apply it to the CRD or the Province.

Thank you for listening

Christine Smart

James Bay (one of the most dense, diverse neighbourhoods in Canada)



[REDACTED]

From: David W. Mathers [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 1:12 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle

My name is David Mathers. I live on Howe Street in Fairfield, a half block from Dallas Rd and the ocean. It is a lovely street in a beautiful setting, and I have lived on it since I was forty years old with a young family. I am now a retired school teacher and 77. I have lived here just about as long as anyone else - other retired and non-retired teachers, stock clerks, retired nurses and lawyers, government workers, a marine worker, a school assistant, people who own their own businesses, health workers etc. We are the middle class, and not missing at all. Everyone on this block that I know of worked for decades and rented or lived somewhere else before buying a property here. It was as much as they could afford, and many are still paying off mortgages. We are the middle, and we are not, as has been portrayed rich, out-of-touch and racist.

I will never be able to afford a house on 10 mile point or in the Uplands, or on the water in Oak Bay or Gonzales or in the British Properties or Shaughnessy for that matter. But I do not want to tear these areas down or radically alter their character so I can live there. This 8 year old city administration, in their last few weeks in power, has no right to do this to large parts of Victoria so more people can move in - people who are just starting off, people from outside the city and province. We, the middle, had to work and save for decades, live and rent somewhere else, and we now have a right to enjoy what we have earned, just as those who come after will have. Leave this issue to the coming election, and the candidates for council and mayor. Find out what the people of Victoria really want, not say the people who live in Saanich or Langford. To do else is not sensible, reasonable or fair. The past is the future.

[REDACTED]

From: Drew Millen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 9:19 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: SUPPORT Missing Middle Public Housing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear council,

By maintaining single-family zoning and saying no to new density, you are in fact saying no to the thing that makes communities great. People. Character is not about buildings or scale or view. It is about people. I SUPPORT moving forward with the Missing Middle Housing initiative.

Drew Millen
545 Cornwall St, Victoria, BC V8V 4K9.

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 12:56 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Missing Middle Housing and Plan to Increase Density Throughout Victoria.

From: Doug Turner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 1, 2022 12:53 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing and Plan to Increase Density Throughout Victoria.

Dear Council & Mayor,

In consideration of your upcoming decision regarding the plans to increase density throughout Victoria, please consider the following recent [study](#) completed by the London School of Economics that shows increased density does not translate to affordable housing.

If council is truly interested in addressing housing affordability for Victorians, then you need to consider the cause of high prices, which is not solely dependent on increasing supply. You also need to look at demand, which is largely a result of our Federal Government policy whereby the intake of new residents is occurring at a rate greater than the absorption rate, resulting in shortages in housing as well as other services.

The argument provided by the government is that Canada needs a high intake of new residents to address the shortage of workers and to compensate for the retirement of baby boomers. This is not backed up by research. The majority of media throughout Canada is controlled by corporate interests that are not interested in having a balanced discussion on this topic.

It appears that Victoria City Council would have more of an impact on housing affordability by lobbying our Federal Government to adjust the intake of new residents.

Thank you,

Doug Turner

High-density cities are economically beneficial but lead to greater inequality

by London School of Economics (LSE)



Credit: CC0 Public Domain

Densely built cities with people living and working in close proximity are economically efficient but lead to higher levels of inequality, according to new research from the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).

The new study, published in the *Journal of Urban Economics*, shows that dense cities have a range of benefits, including: higher productivity, more innovation, shorter commutes, better access to private services (such as restaurants), cheaper provision of public services, the preservation of green space and a lower carbon footprint.

However, these advantages come at a cost. With space at a premium, housing is more expensive and there are increased levels of inequality. The study shows higher skilled workers benefit from higher wages but lower skilled workers, renters and first time buyers struggle with housing costs, making cities less affordable places for them to live.

The research reveals denser built cities also lead to traffic congestion, exposing residents to higher levels of pollution and, partially as a result, higher mortality rates.

The researchers pulled together a wide breadth of existing evidence (from 180 studies) and novel evidence on the economic effects of density and aggregated all the effects. They found that, despite the drawbacks, densifying a typical city in the developed world is likely to have a positive effect overall. For cities in developing countries, the costs and benefits of density are larger and the evidence is scarcer, so the overall effect of densification policies is less clear.

With predictions from the OECD that almost 70 per cent of the world's population will be living in urban areas by 2050, the researchers note most countries are already pursuing policies which encourage the building of dense cities. However, this is the first study to consolidate the research on the effects of densification and compare the costs and benefits.

While the researchers warn more work is needed in this area to draw strong conclusions, these findings suggest there is a trade-off between economic efficiency and equality, to which urban planners and decision makers should pay attention.

Commenting, paper co-author Dr. Gabriel Ahlfeldt, from the Department of Geography and Environment at LSE, said: "Most countries pursue policies that implicitly or explicitly aim at promoting 'compact urban form,' but so far these policies have not been well-grounded in evidence.

"With this article, we hope to contribute to transparent evidence-based policy making, by highlighting the various economics costs and benefits of density, and showing the trade-off between economic efficiency and inequality."

[REDACTED]

From: J B [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 8:14 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing with significant concern regarding council's deliberations on the "missing middle" housing initiative.

Consider me to be firmly opposed. Single family neighbourhoods do not have any of the structural capacity to absorb 4-6 times as many people, cars, recreation. I live in a neighbourhood with significant secondary housing and parking is a considerable problem.

Every major city in the world struggles with the reality that some parts of the community are unable to live in the centre of the city and need to move to suburban areas. Rather than socially engineering a response, and in turn destroying the reason many choose to live in Victoria, I suggest many people will indeed need to live in Langford as the cost in Victoria continues to rise.

I would also argue that I see little evidence that the missing middle initiative would result in middle cost housing. All complexes I see being completed are selling townhouse units for more than one million. Council's initiative will result in tremendous profits for land developers and likely for existing homeowners but will not result in middle cost housing (unless council believes 1.2 to 1.4 million is middle cost housing).

i would also argue this is a council whose mandate has expired and did not include this initiative in anyone's platform. This question needs to be left for new council.

Regards,

John Boraas
2543 Graham Street

K. van Drager
38001 King Edward Mall
Vancouver British Columbia, Canada
V5Z 4L9

September 1, 2022

Victoria City Hall
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, British Columbia, CANADA
V8W 1P6

Dear Mayor Lisa Helps and City Councillors, and School Board Trustees, Parks Board Councillors, relevant Departments, relevant staff, + open letter:

As a Greater Vancouver resident who may one day move to Victoria, (I love quaint homey beautiful Victoria), I question “over development” for Developers/Investors, and “gentrification” - the destruction of Heritage (Jane Jacobs questions such gentrification), and “unnecessary” “erasure” of some Single Family Homes communities by “pro- density- at- any- cost- advocates”, whereby I think the Victoria Missing Middle Plan should be an October Election issue.

As such, I request Mayor Lisa Helps and Victoria City Council defer any final vote or final decision on the Victoria Missing Middle Plan to the October Election in the name of democracy and trust in government.

I see public trust in government as part of responsible density and this Plan, whereby leaving this Plan for the October Election and future Mayor and Council, shows Victoria and B.C. residents that you are interested in more conversation and the best density development possible moving forwards

When governments push legislation through, like recently the Broadway Plan in Vancouver, it probably creates even more resistance, criticality, dislike, suspicion of density – ie. pro Investors profit / pro Developers profit / increasing Construction Industry Revenue / increasing City Property Tax Revenue, all at the expense of livability and affordability and happiness for everyday people.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: Lisa Gordon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 11:09 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Ancient homeowner supports MMHI

Dear Mayor and Council,

My home is ancient and so am I. I could die happy knowing that when our 2-bdrm Fairfield cottage is sold out from under our dying bodies, that it isn't torn down to become a monster home. Sure, monsters have to live somewhere, but not in areas near schools and transit where greater density is desperately needed.

This neighborhood is full of renters, children, and ancient pensioners like me. But with every tear-down, it's getting more exclusive. As the saying goes, "if we want things to stay the same around here, something's gotta change," and that change has to be ending single family home zoning in Victoria.

I deeply appreciate the bold changes you've already led during your terms. In these last days, please leave your legacy by voting YES.

Sincerely, Lisa Gordon
533 Cornwall St.
Victoria, BC

To: Council of the City of Victoria
re: Missing Middle proposals, Housing Rights and Decolonization

1 September 2022

I am a tenant in Victoria, a senior citizen, living on a fixed income. I have been a tenant rights advocate and activist for almost 50 years, half of that time in Victoria. I sit on the board of the Victoria Tenant Action Group and I am a member of the city's Renters Advisory Committee.

I completed the planning surveys and attended Renter's Advisory Committee meetings and other public meetings about the missing middle, and about other planning department proposals to solve Victoria's housing shortage through densification. Never once did I read nor did I hear about the impact of these densification programs on the housing rights of tenants who will be evicted from houses that are being up-zoned. Tenants who are living collectively in houses or living in houses that have been divided into apartments. Housing that will as of right be able to be demolished or renovated to make room for multi-plexes, strata or condominium housing, none of which is projected to be rental housing. The proposed tenant assistance of a month's free rent and moving costs does nothing to ensure that evicted tenants will find alternate housing, particularly housing that they can afford.

All those students, all those artists, all those service industry workers who won't be able to stay in Victoria because there is no vacant affordable housing for people who are without stable incomes and who might present inconveniences like children or pets or disabilities that require accommodations.

Your planning department may have reported to you that tenants participated in public consultation about the missing middle program. But in my experience, that consultation never touched on addressing the housing needs of tenants in residence.

Nor does the missing middle proposal address the loss of affordable rental housing stock at a time when the rental housing crisis is at an all time high, which means homelessness is also at an all time high.

Had tenants been consulted appropriately, we would tell you much more than what I can fit into 5 minutes this evening. We would address the impact of the current Missing Middle proposal on tenants and on the supply of affordable rental housing. We would bring to Council's attention phase two of the **Victoria Housing Strategy 2019 - 2022**. This Housing Strategy opens with the statement:

Safe, affordable, and appropriate housing at its core means housing that accommodates our needs at a cost we can afford..... No matter what our specific needs, housing is a human right, and every Victorian deserves a safe and affordable place.

The first two of the Housing Strategy's goals are:

- 1. Prioritize renters and renter households.***
- 2. Increase the supply of housing for low to moderate income households in Victoria.***

Not only did the City of Victoria declare housing to be a human right, so has Canada through the National Housing Strategy Act and through United Nations Covenants. As a tenant who has fought for housing rights for almost 50 years, I believed that these declarations would represent an improvement for housing justice. But now I understand that housing rights are selectively attached to situations that don't fringe on the perceived property rights of 'owners' of land.

If that is not the case, then how does the declaration that *Housing is a Right* apply to the tenants who are dispossessed of their homes when they receive eviction notices for missing middle redevelopment? Or any redevelopment for that matter?

Further, the city's housing Strategy states:

we need to take care of the supply we already have by making sure it's safe and secure, and that tenants are protected from hazardous living situations or precarious housing

As the city and senior levels of government commit significant expenditures to newly constructed affordable rental housing, the loss of existing affordable rental housing needs to be taken in to account in order to ensure a net increase. Yet I'm told by housing planners that no records have been kept to indicate rental units lost when houses are demolished. Without the loss of existing rental housing put into the formula, then the numbers about new affordable housing projects do not tell the whole story.

Pouring funds into new affordable housing without protecting the existing affordable rental housing stock is much like trying to fill the bath without putting in the plug.

Not the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and no other Canadian statute, as far as I'm aware, establishes private property rights. So how is it that the right to own someone else's home and the right to unconscionable profiteering, rights that are not established in Canadian legislation, can trump the rights of human beings to continue to have a roof over our heads?

Dispossessing the of homes of people without consideration for their rights, designating that a person who lives elsewhere can own another person's home – this is evidence that colonization thrives in this city and this society. What is reconciliation without decolonization? How can reconciliation not look at where the constructs of colonization remain in the foundation of our so called society? Aren't we learning that land is so much more than real estate?

Please do not ignore the interests of tenants, who form 61% of Victoria's population, please let us know that this city council will look at the big picture and walk your talk about housing rights and about reconciliation. Please let your commitment to housing rights take you to housing justice. Please let your commitment to reconciliation take you to decolonization.

Leslie Robinson

To: City of Victoria Council
1 September 2022

I am almost 65 years old and live with multiple disabilities. Every day I spend some part of my day thinking about my housing options (or lack thereof) and the housing options for other folks who live on low or no incomes. What is going to happen to us?

The Missing Middle proposal does not support renters nor those without housing. There is nothing being done to replace, let alone increase, the housing for folks who live on lower incomes even though the city's housing strategy is to take care of the current supply of rental housing and to keep tenants protected from hazardous living situations or precarious housing. We, renters and the under or unhoused, need housing options. Some of us have none. Rather, the Missing Middle proposal takes away many of the options that we currently have.

Those who dream of owning their homes are living a very different reality from those of us who dream of affordability and accessibility. The Missing Middle proposal is protecting those who own or can afford to own housing over those who rent. This makes housing a privilege, not a right.

A Human Right is available to all: that is why it is called a right. To be entitled, you need nothing more than to be a Human. Not only has the *Victoria Housing Strategy 2019-2022* declared safe, affordable and appropriate housing a human right, so has the federal government through its *Housing Strategy Act* and the United Nations through various covenants.

The Missing Middle proposal denies human and housing rights for renters in Victoria. Providing a month of free rent and moving costs does not restore a human right, it merely makes it appear that the denial of the right has been compensated for, that the Right has been restored. But what needs to change here is the system so that our human right to appropriate housing that accommodates us at costs we can afford is never denied. Already, tenants are telling our stories of repeated evictions due to redevelopment; the Missing Middle proposal will make this situation worse by putting all rental housing that exists on single-family zoned lots at risk of removal and more tenants at risk of forced eviction.

It seems to me that development is done backwards. We need to take care of our neighbours and communities before we agree to a proposed redevelopment. We need to make sure there is affordable housing for those whose income are in the bottom 20%. We need to make sure that every development includes options for those needing affordable housing. We need to protect that right to housing before the development is approved. The Victoria Housing Strategy states that renters and renter households need to be prioritized. If every Victorian deserves a safe and affordable place no matter what our specific needs, that implies to me that the needs and Rights of renters be put above the desires of developers.

I don't see anything in the Missing Middle proposal that protects tenants from hazardous living situations nor precarious housing. In fact, the city's housing strategy goals are superseded by the Missing Middle proposal because the proposal decreases housing stock for lower income people: decreased rental housing, unavailable rental housing, exorbitantly priced rental housing all create precarious housing, increase homelessness and makes more people vulnerable to homelessness.

If housing is a right, then it must be available to all, otherwise, it is a privilege. The folks who do not own our abodes are more than 60% of Victoria's population. By protecting the privilege of ownership over the rights to housing, grief and chaos erupt in public: for where else can people go? How do we have a shower in order to get a job or keep job? How do we die with dignity? Where do we eat, shit, love, sleep, find food, insulin, medicine? No one should have to learn to live without a roof over their heads. No one.

To over simplify, what do I think would help? BEFORE any new housing is built, before developers continue setting terms on what becomes the rents in this city, every person without a home, every person affected by new constructions must be housed in real spaces, with real roofs, with a possibility for making home and futures. AT THE SAME TIME, the number of spaces for low income housing must increase. I think that all levels of government, including the city, can make this happen.

Our rights to housing needs your attention now.

With hope,
Lahl Sarson
1243 Bay St.
Victoria

The purpose of this statement is neither to downplay the gravity of the housing issue, nor to take sides. Simply, it is to express frustration with this Council's total disregard of democratic principles and processes in this matter.

In its overly hurried pursuit to implement these measures, the Council is neglecting to respect the principles of transparency and accountability. By pursuing this venture in this manner, the Council is abusing its power by making a unilateral decision that will affect all Victorians for generations.

To correct this error, the Council must put this issue forward in a referendum or establish this as a key issue in the upcoming election. This new course of action will provide transparency for voters in that they will have actual results detailing the level of support for this decision. Furthermore, it will either hold decisionmakers accountable, or enable the responsibility for the decision to fall to the voters as is proper in a democratic system.

Ultimately, this decision exceeds the mandate of this Council and cannot be made arbitrarily based on anecdotal evidence of voter support. For a monumental decision of this nature, all taxpayers need a legitimate and binding platform to express their position and decide the issue. That platform is not a soapbox but the ballot box. That is binding and that is democracy.

[REDACTED]

From: Marc Storms <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 1:56 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: OPPOSITION to the Missing Middle Initiative

As a resident of Fairfield, I strongly oppose the Missing Middle Initiative. It will not result in more affordable housing. It will remove rental stock and replace it with homes which are still not attainable by most. The only people who will benefit are the developers. Neighbourhoods will be absolutely changed in their appearance, structure and natural evolution. Why not support through loan guarantees more carriage houses in these neighbourhoods, and keep densifying down town and along the major arteries?!

As part of NATIONS' rebranding, please note my new email address.

Marc Storms
NATIONS Co-Founder & Chief Marketing Officer

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | www.growingforgood.ca



[REDACTED]

From: Nancy Harrison [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 7:33 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle-Lost green space

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am concerned about the loss of tree canopy and green space if the missing middle housing proposal is approved, as written. Further, I request that council adopt measures to prevent homeowners and developers from paving the open space left available. Double wide driveways and gravel landscaping are taking over from what used to be yards that have historically provided green space, a home for pollinators and birds, absorption of rainwater and a tree canopy to keep our city cool. Please increase the green space requirement and limit the amount of hardscaping allowed.

Nancy Harrison,
95 Moss St,
Victoria BC

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Nakira 1996 [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 1:32 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle public hearing

Address: 960 Wilmer Street

Please add my submission to the council meeting agenda regarding the Missing Middle proposal. It is as follows:

I have lived in this city my whole life. I am against your solution to the “missing middle” problem. As long as development is done for profit, it will not be affordable. Growth is not the answer. Gentrification will continue. Please reconsider your proposal.

I agree with others who have likely mentioned the lack of green space that will occur as a result of new developments. Our global food system that feeds Vancouver Island is in a precarious state. We need to be moving to more green spaces in the city, not fewer. We need to be growing our food in the city as part of the solution to the many global crises we face today. Again, development is not the answer. As long as profit is the driver of development, housing will not become affordable and green spaces will be lost.

[REDACTED]

From: Patrick <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 10:55 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: I SUPPORT Missing Middle Public Hearing

Hello Council,

We need options between government-subsidized housing and market, single-family housing and condos. We need more options between condos and single-family houses. This is the space for innovation and where there is a real opportunity for change. I am confident in saying that it needs to take place within the neighbourhood currently zoned for single-family houses. There is just no other option.

Great opportunities crystalize cultural tensions and react with logic to them. This is a defining moment in our history and I SUPPORT the decision to proceed with Missing Middle Housing.

Cheers,
Patrick

--
Patrick Conn | Victoria + [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 11:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Sept 1, 2022 - Missing Middle Bylaw Changes
Attachments: Missing Middle - Response Aug 3, 2022.pdf

I was planning to submit another response to the proposed mass zoning changes in Victoria, however upon review of my Aug 3 submission I find that I captured all of the key elements describing the opposition to this development bonanza and disastrous initiative.

Please read if you have not already done so.

Regards,
R Steven Jones
1541 Rockland Ave
Victoria BC

From: steve.jones@telus.net [REDACTED]
Sent: August 3, 2022 5:41 PM
To: 'publichearings@victoria.ca' <publichearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: August 4, 2022 - Missing Middle Bylaw Changes

Please find attached my response on this important issue.

Regards,
R Steven Jones
1541 Rockland Ave
Victoria BC

To: City of Victoria Mayor and Council

August 3, 2022

Re: Proposed Missing Middle Zoning Bylaw Changes

No Effective Consultation

The proposed Missing Middle bylaw changes have been developed without valid consultation with a majority of residents in the City of Victoria. The “consultation” timeline referred to in the July 12 video session indicated that the surveys had 1,000 residents respond, 200 in 2020 and 800 in 2021. This represents approximately 1% of City residents at best.

A total of 1000 survey respondents out of 92,000 Victoria residents does not provide council with a large enough response to pass these significant bylaw changes.

This push to re-write the bylaws and neighborhood zoning prior to the October civic election establishes doubt as to the quality of thought that has gone into this initiative and councils perceived level of support by residents of Victoria.

Consultation, “during a global pandemic” to quote Mayor Helps, is not effective consultation.

Official Community Plan & Neighborhood Plans Invalidated

Over the past two terms of this City Council, we have been subjected to the sustained erosion of our City and Neighborhoods by over development.

The Missing Middle bylaw changes invalidate the OCP zoning and neighborhood plans all at once. I am certain that this is preferred by developers and council rather than the annoying public consultations, site by site variances pursued by developers (VRBA and team), and supported by council and the Board of Variance.

No Mandate for this Zoning Change

This council has no mandate to inflict this change on the City of Victoria; particularly councilors who are not residents of Victoria. They will not be subjected to a 10.5M structure built next to their home without having any say in the matter.

Has any consideration has been given to the impact of these zoning changes on our infrastructure, water, sewer, power, roads, solid waste disposal, roads etc.? What is the target population that our existing infrastructure can handle?

Long Term Oversight Doubtful

In the July 12 video presentation, it was stated that the CRD would be responsible for the oversight of the “affordable units” as a result of the bylaw changes. Specifically, “below market value in perpetuity, income testing, units 10% below appraised market value”. I have no confidence the CRD will manage this successfully.

Do Not Approve These Bylaw Changes

This Mayor and Council has continued to pursue an agenda of issues that are clearly outside of their roles and responsibilities in the administration of the City.

This city has and will change over time but it should be evident that Victoria, surrounded by water, has never and will never have enough land to house all of those who desire to live here. The proposed bylaw changes will add to the erosion of what was once a very attractive City. We have seen the impact of over-development evidenced by the general disrepair and disfunction of the downtown core and the un-ending construction and development throughout Victoria.

The real need is for reform of the Local Government Act to reduce council terms, mandate residency in the city mayor and council officials represent, push for GVRD amalgamation, and clearly define the specific roles and responsibilities of city council. For example, efficient approval of housing within the OCP zoning rules and neighborhood plans, preserving the character of Victoria and restoring our dilapidated streets and infrastructure.

Enjoy your September trip to the UBCM conference in Whistler.

October can't come soon enough.

Regards,

R Steven Jones

1541 Rockland Ave

Victoria BC

[REDACTED]

From: Ryan Nelson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: SUPPORT Missing Middle Public Hearing

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing with regards to my support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

As a homeowner with a young family and as an architect, I believe it is critical to our community that municipalities, districts, and the Province work together in order to expedite and fund new housing projects that seek to provide opportunities for affordable ownership and rentals while increasing density.

The current housing crisis has university students living in vehicles, families condensed into single bedroom apartments, and home-ownership no longer being a viable option even for moderate income earners. This is not entirely a market-driven problem that will resolve itself and does indeed require proactive action from Authorities Having Jurisdiction to collaborate with development companies to provide for their communities.

Regards,

Ryan Nelson.

--

Ryan Nelson
[Mirage Studios](#)

[REDACTED]

From: sheena bellingham <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 10:28 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative September 1 2022 public hearing

Hello Mayor and Council,

I strongly oppose a policy directed to supply middle to upper income housing be passed without major changes that include policies for addressing homelessness and tackling housing affordability.

Professor Penny Gurstein of the Housing Research Collaborative, and professor emeritus and former Director of the School of Community and Regional Planning, appeared on an episode of BC Today on August 23rd to discuss the housing crisis.

Professor Gurstein: "You have to be very cautious around supply. You need to be talking about the right supply. Building supply will not get us out of this housing crisis. Housing has to be affordable and suitable for people. I cannot see the private sector being able to address that situation."

In Canada only 5% of housing is supported by government. We are one of the lowest in terms of governmental supports in the world. In Europe it's 20%; Singapore it's 80%. We need to have effective government policies and funding in place. And we need to think about the land. It is the land values that is creating the escalation in housing prices. We need to think about community land trusts and land in perpetuity. Governments do have land available. And we need to use this land in more effective ways than just "highest and best use".

This City's Missing Middle Initiative is going to exponentially increase land values within Victoria. Private builders are motivated by profit, not social welfare. The MMI policy will encourage more and wealthier people from outside Victoria to move here. Our health and social services have already stretched past the capacity of our current population.

We need City Council to come up with a solution to the housing crisis which does as Professor Gurstein advocates: We need to find permanent housing with supports in place. Increasing supply for middle-class to wealthy people will not fix the housing crisis.

Today is September 1st. Many residents of Victoria are not tuned in today to civic engagement but rather enjoying their last summer long weekend. This is a very important and potentially city-altering policy that should not be left to a Council in the last throes of their mandate.

I believe the MMI Initiative is a mistake.

Sincerely,

Sheena Bellingham

From: Steffani Cameron <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 7:57 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: In favour of the Missing Middle

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Smaller apartment buildings have been my favourite places to live. They're tiny communities that add a lot to an area.

Victoria is stunning. We need to preserve as much wild land as we can, but we need more homes, more spaces, better cost of living.

At 48, a single writer who works at home, I'm on the cusp of being unable to afford to remain in Victoria.

I have friends who have all scattered across the country, others who are questioning if they can stay. There's so little vacancy. If I were to lose this apartment tomorrow, I don't know what my option would be.

This demented idea that families and couples only live in homes is a spoiled North American's attitude that needs to end.

Around the world, families live perfectly happily in small apartments, but we don't have enough 2-3 bedroom spaces for families, nor do we have enough family-friendly buildings.

We need to improve density without it always being highrises. We can make neighbourhoods more fun and more fulfilling to live in if we have more multiplexes and small apartment buildings.

I support this forward-thinking initiative.

And here's the thing:

If we don't do it now, it'll happen in 10 years anyhow. And over than 10 years, you'll have employment-fulfilment issues, families that give up and leave forever, and an ever-angrier populace who keep feeling their chances of sage housing slipping away.

This movement is all about whether you have the courage as council to take the INEVITABLE STEP of RETURNING to what was SMART HOUSING for decades. We used to do this! But then we got stupid and focused on single-family homes.

Communities fall apart with single family homes in the modern era. Multi-families build communities and create support systems within buildings.

Do the right thing. Save Victoria. Bring back the missing middle.

Steffani Cameron
205-660 Niagara Street
Victoria, V8V 1J2

--

Please note that I'm self-employed & keep odd hours. I've sent this from my phone at my leisure, but please don't feel a speedy reply is necessary. When you're ready. Thanks!

[REDACTED]

From: Engagement-External
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 12:22 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Malcolm Maclean
Subject: FW: MMH

FYI

From: Scott G <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 1, 2022 11:52 AM
To: Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: MMH

Missing Middle Housing Initiative

I've done some research on MMHI that has been implemented in other areas. I'm more confused now than I was before I started reading. As I understand it, MMHI houses are behemoth and are simply designed to provide shelter for individuals. There is absolutely no requirement for MMHI to fit into the overall design of the neighbourhood, such as lower Fairfield near Beacon Hill Park. Will MMHI houses allow, if wanted, a garden, greenhouse, etc.? If, let's say, a house in my neighbourhood is sold, and the house/lot is bought by a developer. The MMHI does not permit neighbours to have a say/input not the design/lot coverage, etc.?


Neighbours are basically unable to any possible easements, etc., correct, if MMHI goes in beside them? If there was a small house beside them, a developer purchased the house, tore it down and put up a MMH mansion that infringed on the neighbour's use and enjoyment of their house, yard & greenhouse, they would have no recourse. Correct?

This is completely INSANE timing!

This MUST NOT GO THROUGH at this time. We need to be able to study the issues!

Sincerely,

Scott Goddard



Gonzales Neighbourhood Association (GNA)

September 1, 2022

Dear Mayor and Council,

The Gonzales Neighbourhood Association (GNA) conducted a community mapping exercise over the past 3 plus years and as part of this exercise gathered input from community members on proposed density targets for the neighbourhood. These density targets specified the size of lots that would be suitable for duplexes, townhouses and houseplexes.

This information can be found on our website <https://www.gonzalesna.ca/copy-of-documents-5> along with a description of our support for house conversions to allow for duplexes, triplexes or more as well as the building of Coop Housing and Seniors Housing. The desire is to encourage creative development proposals that can be accommodated on large lots as long as sufficient green space is maintained.

The feedback we received on our density targets is as you would expect; some people said they were too much whereas others said they were not enough. The end result is a compromise; the density targets offer the right balance of increased density without losing green space and trees.

The MMHI is not a compromise; it is an outright inducement to developers to build large properties on small lots. MMHI will result in the loss of too many trees and green space. It will also cause the loss of affordable housing, loss of heritage housing and loss of parking spaces which others have covered off in some detail.

The proposed regulations require 6.5% of site space (or a minimum of 35 square metres) to be free of pavement or above/below ground structures. This corresponds to ensuring space for the roots of one large canopy tree. Allowing only 16 by 23 feet green space for one large tree is unacceptable, or would only be acceptable if green space and trees **are added to the city's park system nearby**. However, when asked if the city intended to buy land for parks to compensate for

the loss of trees and green space in people's backyards Mayor Helps replied there are no plans to do so.

The Gonzales neighbourhood has three small parks, and many other neighbourhoods similarly have too few and too small parks such as North Park, Burnside, Fernwood, South Jubilee and North Jubilee. A neighbourhood that has virtually no parks is Rockland and yet houses the highest number of trees in Victoria. As these trees are almost all found on private land, MMHI has the potential to radically change the look of this neighbourhood.

According to the 2017 Parks Masterplan the city would *"need to acquire 53 hectares of parkland over the next 25 years, approximately 2 hectares per year, to maintain the current per-capita park land provision"*. This is **before** MMHI was even considered. If approved, Missing Middle will require a significant increase per capita of parkland to be purchased, which apparently there is no money to do so.

For the reasons given, GNA cannot support the MMHI in its current form. We respectfully request that councillors vote no to the current version and instead ask staff to go back and create a policy that is more inline with what would be acceptable to the majority of Victorians. The existing Fairfield neighbourhood plan approved in the last two years is a good example of a compromise between adding gentle density while still maintaining neighbourhood character and green space,

Thank you for your consideration

Susanne Rautio, President

[REDACTED]

From: Syreeta Wootton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 6:13 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Stephen Andrew (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); letters@timescolonist.com; localnews@timescolonist.com; Public Hearings; Public Hearings
Subject: Opposition to missing middle initiative
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

My name is Syreeta Wootton, I am currently staying with my mom on Lillian Rd in Fairfield while I look for a house to purchase or a rental in the area.

I speaking in opposition to this ill thought out, completely rushed initiative proposed by a council on their way out, when it should be an election issue for the future council. For context, I am the missing middle. I grew up in Fairfield and while I have come and gone over the years when I decided to move home I found myself thea position, I can't actually afford to buy in the city I grew up in. So, I will continue to save and I will wait. There is no guarantee that I will ever be able to buy, it is not a given, it is not a right as some speaking might have you believe. The entitlement of some is shocking to me.

Also shocking is the belief that this initiative will solve the housing crisis. This initiative will only push out current homeowners because their taxes will increase, I have heard nothing from council to put in place an initiative to protect current and future homeowners from this disaster.

I also wonder what council is proposing to keep rental properties. What I currently see is AirB&B taking up a huge portion of rental units, and It is worth noting that council grandfathered in airB&B units in recent rebuilds of the Janion and other rebuilt buildings downtown, I ask council to please explain how that helps our rental market?! I also find it disingenuous of developers like Aryze and Abstract to claim that they aren't concerned or fussed with this initiative as its not 'big' enough for them. I have seen and continue to see land assemblies where current renters are unceremoniously displaced. The developers ignore setbacks, protected trees, the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and concerns of the neighbours many who have lived in the area for 20plus years, who knows the needs of a neighborhood better than the neighbours? The most recent monstrosity on Fairfield Rd is not affordable housing, in Rhodo for example, a 1000sq foot condo was listed at \$779,000 and a 1700sq foot space listed at \$1 599,000 (plus strata fees), neither affordable for the average person or family. This is what will be created, more unaffordable housing, their agenda is money, nothing else, please don't kid yourself. No young family or young single person will be able to buy one of these places, and it is naive to think anything else will be built.

I am not asking for non densification, I am asking that communities be consulted, risks be assessed, and developers and builders be held accountable for pulling down perfectly wonderful character homes that currently have no environmental impact and are rentals or currently house several families. I am also asking why for a council that seems so environmentally focused that you are allowing these houses to be torn down and unceremoniously thrown into the dump, it is disgraceful.

Without regulations and consult from communities you are creating an even bigger disaster that will destroy the integrity of the neighbourhoods, result in overpriced condo's, push out current homeowners and destroy the city we all love and want to protect, in case anyone has forgotten, Victoria is known as The Garden City.

I wish I had an answer to the issue of a lack of affordable housing but I don't believe council has the answer either. This missing middle initiative is not it. I believe this should be taken back to the drawing board and re-evaluated.

[REDACTED]

From: Engagement-External
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 1:27 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

FYI

From: Victor V. Ramraj <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 1, 2022 1:26 PM
To: Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Dear City Council,

I am a resident of Victoria and I'm afraid I am not able to attend today's council meeting, but I wanted to express my strong **support** for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

This is an important and long overdue policy, very much needed to address Victoria's housing crisis. I would urge City Council to approve it.

Many thanks,
Victor V. Ramraj
1940 Runnymede Avenue
Victoria, BC V8S 2V4
[REDACTED]