[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:49 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Support for Missing Middle Initiative

From: Ash Knightley [redacted]
Sent: July 30, 2022 1:20 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Support for Missing Middle Initiative

Dear Council,

My wife and I are the owners of the property at 1025 Carberry Gardens in Rockland. I wish to indicate my support for the missing middle initiative bylaw changes. I think these changes strike a balance with need for housing versus impact on the community. Many homes such as ours have operated as multi family units for several decades now without issue. These changes would resolve some systemic problems with the zoning of these homes that their homeowners face.

I am not sure the secondary unit requirement is necessary but overall is no reason not to pass these changes.

Sincerely

Ash Knightley

--

Ash Knightley
Partner
Argentis Properties Ltd.

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Brent Carbery [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2022 5:50 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Public Meeting

To whom it may concern

I have recently returned to the municipality of Victoria after living in Oak Bay for 29 years. My wife and I purchased a home on a quiet Fairfield street 17 months ago and are enjoying our new neighbourhood. While I have a number of concerns about the Missing Middle initiative I will comment on only two:

1. Why, after this initiative failed in its first vote before council earlier this year does this council feel it has to try to push it through again 3 months before a municipal election? Why not let the new council deal with this huge change to the municipality? This seems arrogant and less than democratic to me.

2. Who is this going to benefit? With less than a complete knowledge of this proposal, I cannot imagine my own children being able to afford to purchase any of the conversions that I imagine might be built under the proposed rules. I see this as a benefit to developers who have completely changed the feel of our city under the present council.

Thank you

Brent Carbery

1476 Hamley Street

[redacted]

From: Sean McCartney [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2022 2:32 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: MMHI input

To whom it may concern,
Thank you for your time and consideration with the below input and feedback related to the MMHI and the upcoming public hearing on August 4th. I have many concerns with the proposed initiative, accompanying bylaws and OCP amendments, but wish to emphasize two key concerns with this written submission.

My first key concern is the significantly reduced capacity for public consultation. The proposed changes seem to remove individual and neighbourhood ability to express an opinion as to the suitability or desirability of changes in a neighbourhood. What will be the purpose of existing or future neighbourhood plans and how will citizens and taxpayers be able to voice what is suitable or desirable development for their neighbourhoods?

My second key concern is related to corner townhouses and amalgamation of existing lots. There does not appear to be any clear statement about a developer's capacity to amalgamate lots in order to create corner townhouses. This must be clarified prior to approval, and in my opinion, any amalgamation should still require public input and consultation prior to accessing a building permit. Even with the proposed MMHI guidelines, the amalgamation of existing lots without public input and consultation will encourage aggressive development to maximize height, density and profits to their fullest, eroding the character of many existing residential neighbourhoods.

Overall, this initiative still lacks levels of specificity and clarity that is leaving me and many community members frustrated, confused and concerned. The rush to have this completed prior to the election is not in the best interests of Victoria residents, but surely in the best interests of developers. As a voter and taxpayer, I expect that my concerns and those of my neighbours will be heard and used to inform further amendments and updates to this plan prior to its approval.

Kind regards,
Sean McCartney, 350 Robertson St.

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: MMI bylaw

From: Sasha Zhang [redacted]
Sent: July 30, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: MMI bylaw

Dear Council,

I am a home owner residing at 1705 Oak Shade Lane. I oppose the MMI bylaw amendment. My neighborhood, Rockland, is historical and a pride of our city. This bylaw will have a negative impact on the outlooks and character of our neighborhood. Please take this into consideration and perhaps exempt Rockland from this bylaw. Thank you!

Sasha Zhang

Sasha Zhang

OPERATIONS DIRECTOR
[redacted]

[redacted]

RegenClinic.ca

550-2950 Douglas St. Victoria, BC, V8T 4N4

REGENCLINIC
PROVEN REGENERATIVE THERAPY

[redacted]

From: Tom Klavins [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2022 6:59 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle

To Victoria City Council,

I am writing to voice my support of the missing middle initiative. The city is facing a housing crisis and every little step can help. While I don't think the MMHI as it is proposed goes far enough in allowing additional housing forms in enough places, it is certainly a better option than the status quo that has contributed to our housing crisis. Council should vote in favour of the Missing Middle Housing Initiative now!

Sincerely,
Tom Klavins, North Park

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:49 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle

From: Barbara Bowman-Edwards [redacted]
Sent: July 31, 2022 6:53 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle

Dear Honourable Mayor and Council,

The LAP for the Missing Middle is not providing housing for the Missing Middle but Gentrified Housing without safe parking allowed upon Three Chain Length Roads. (Real Estate Investor with 45 years of diversified property investments covering commercial, rental complexes from four to 200 units, Agricultura, Triple Net, Speculative and Distressed Real Estate ownerships through Reits, Joint Venture Partnerships, Corporations and Private and Public Holdings.)

The proposed LAP is for the Gentrified not the Missing Middle and what it will do:

1. It will increase the supply of housing **for those who have** at least $195,000.0 for the proposed downpayment and $4,500.00 per month in discretionary funds for a mortgage, strata fees, utilities and property taxes.

2. It can lower costs for building materials **if current old Stock Homes or Heritage Homes are used.** This option can and does make some units affordable as All New Housing Stock dores increase construction costs with supply chain shortages and demolition costs. .

What it will not do:

3. **It will not create affordable housing for the Missing Middle families.** Developers, have scouts living throughout our areas and are buying up all the affordable homes often before the homes hit the market. Victoria will continue to lose families and lose older affordable Middle Income level homes. **The affordable homes will continue to be lost to Developments' Joint Venturists, who are buying up all the affordable homes**. This is why Victoria has no market for the Missing Middle. (Bait and Switch by pointing out a niche to the City for necessary housing when UBCC purchases the Missing Middle's affordable stock).

4. The new builds **will not provide reasonable pricing for the Missing Middle** due to costs being passed onto the buyers. And by eliminating or Reducing Parking, this will drive costs up upon moving into such a densified areas **due to Higher Insurance rates covering loss of life, longer emergency transport times and increased accidents due to congested streets.**

5. It **will not provide necessary "off street parking"** spots **for all new dwellings** as off street parking allocations will be cut in the proposal. Families with children need vehicles for transportation to and from lessons or activities such as swimming or sports competitions.

6. The City's proposed designation for lots having 12 Townhouses, **has already impacted single family homes by 30% or more in Property Taxes over the past year.** Example:

May Street, on or near Joseph Street's corner, is over taxed as Joseph Street have actually gone down on their tax rolls according to the homeowners in this area.

7. **It is unknown if the City will tax existing residents to provide promised Bus Transportation and Rideshare options** for the benefit of the Missing Middle and **not to other demographics.**

8. There is **no known plan to provide enough Medical Facilities** with shorter wait times, as the population increases up to **eleven times.**

9. **No known plan for providing funding for the necessary infrastructures by the Developers.** Property owners' taxes are exceeding their sustainable levels for increasing the area's infrastructure. We are on an Island with limited resources and emergency facilities to medically handle the proposed density. Transportation corridors are far too small throughout our Local Areas **to safely move critical patients to two emergency room hospitals.**

11. It is unknown if the City will help Heritage Designated homes with their insurance concerns.

Time Proven Proposal for the Missing Middle and Emergency Needs.

11. Keep **Older Less Attractive homes for the Missing Middle and offer Grants** either Federal or Provincial or both to do the necessary repairs and upgrades for the families moving into our city's Bedroom Communities.

12. **Keep providing Underground Parking for the densified new builds (**three plexus, four plexus and definitely 12 plexus need underground parking). Streets will then allow Emergency Vehicles, to move quickly to their emergencies. **No more than 20 minutes** altogether (to an accident and then to an emergency room) for a Trauma Patient to successfully survive.

13. Be teachable by geneational developers and Green developers who have seen **the downfall of quick and dirty developments,** which are not building Sustainably and are pushing off the costs for density's necessary infrastructure upon the residents.

The avoidance of the contractors' responsibility to provide funding for the expanding Fire safety, Educational, Underground electrical and water/sewer/waste needs, continue to negatively impact communities long after the developer has moved on. The City Council is fully responsible for not addressing the required infrastructure growth when expanding communities. The Developers can and should provide the infrastructure as there will still be profits generated by knowledgeable developers.

Unfortunately, investors seek unnecessarily huge profits when smaller profits can satisfy infrastructure needs along with investors profitable needs. Our Corporations. past and present have been providing their Investors with profits for generations by diversifying investments.

Respectfully and Kindest Regards,

Barbara Bowman-Edwaards
Vice CEO of Namwob and Canyon Top Corporations

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Message in support of Missing Middle Housing Initiative - Victoria/Gonzales resident Brian Vatne

---

From: Brian Vatne [redacted]
Sent: July 31, 2022 2:27 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Message in support of Missing Middle Housing Initiative - Victoria/Gonzales resident Brian Vatne

Hello Mayor and Council,

My name is Brian Vatne (Victoria resident in Gonzales) and I am writing in support of the Missing Middle Housing Initiative (MMHI) that you are considering on August 4th, 2022.

We all know there is a housing crisis in Victoria, and I have appreciated the steps that the city has taken so far on increasing housing options in Victoria. I was particularly pleased with the step you have taken to expedite approvals for affordable housing in Victoria. The City has taken some good steps forward, but we also need to do more to provide options for market-rate housing beyond condos and SFHs.

Because of this need, MMHI must go ahead. We risk the future of our community by not taking bold action to increase housing options in Victoria. This council has made some great steps forward, but Victoria needs this piece to be included in this puzzle.

I recognize there are strong feelings for-and-against MMHI in Victoria. But this concept has been thoroughly assessed and designed in a multi-year process, and I understand there will be an opportunity to review MMHI after a couple years.

The dire need for housing options in Victoria will take bold and decisive leadership. Not passing this now will be a failure of leadership, in my mind.

Please pass MMHI!

Thanks for reading this.

Brian Vatne
Victoria resident in Gonzales

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Policy - for public hearing August 4th

---

From: Don Hutton [redacted]
Sent: July 31, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Policy - for public hearing August 4th

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am opposed to the proposed blanket rezoning of Victoria re the Missing Middle Initiative.

This initiative will lead to speculation as witnessed in Vancouver, which will worsen housing affordability. There is nothing in this legislation that addresses the affordability issue.

A developer purchases a house in the middle of a block. They then pressure the homeowner on either side to sell. Pressure tactics are employed - eg. those being used now by Milliken Developments on the homeowners on Ashgrove Street: high pressure bullying tactics mixed with monetary incentives.

Voila, the achieved goal, 3 lots assembled, 3 character homes destroyed, and the rent or purchase price to a prospective renter or purchaser, doubled or more. Developer happy. City has to increase services on its own dime. No development amenities required. Rinse and Repeat.

I find it interesting that every time the question was asked of City staff whether there would be an increase property taxes as a result of this blanket rezoning, the question was dodged. I think the answer is obvious.

Staff also suggests there will be minimal uptake on this initiative by developers. If this is the case, why has so much effort and money been spent on it? And why such a push by Council to rush this through before the November 2022 election when **half the City is away on holiday?**

City residents deserve better engagement on this transformative policy. **There needs to be a question on a referendum ballot at the upcoming election.**

Sincerely,
Don Hutton

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Support for MMHI

From: Gabriel Cayer [redacted]
Sent: July 31, 2022 2:14 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Support for MMHI

Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is Gabriel Cayer, I am a teacher in Greater Victoria and I would like to express my support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

As a disabled person I am unable to drive, and therefore I depend on public infrastructure like buses, bike lanes, and sidewalks for transportation. When I visit cities like Montreal, I'm always shocked to discover that even in residential neighbourhoods a plethora of businesses are within walking distance. It makes for lively neighbourhoods with distinct character that are no less peaceful for it. It also makes life more enjoyable for those of us who cannot get behind a wheel to quickly get to where we want to go.

MMHI is not a radical step, it is a mild correction to the excessive zoning restrictions of the automobile age. It is a way of creating a denser, more sustainable city. And it is a way to provide a better quality of life for children, disabled people, and poorer communities.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read my letter.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Cayer (il/he/him)
Enseignant & Violoniste I Teacher & Violinist
[redacted]

I acknowledge and appreciate the opportunity to work and play on the traditional territories of the Esquimalt and Songhees First Nations.
Je reconnais avec appréciation la possibilité de travailler et de jouer sur le territoire des nations d'Esquimalt et de Songhees.

[redacted]

From: Gillian Ellis [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 9:06 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: The MIssing Middle

Dear councillors of Victoria,
I am writing to you to express my opposition to this proposal.
I have been a resident of this city since 1962 and a resident of this municipality since 1982. I have seen many councils come and go but none as tone deaf as this council. There seems to be no accountability to the ordinary citizen be they renter or homeowner. Developers with deep pockets are transforming our liveable green city into a dense urban jungle where people are afraid to walk among faceless high rise buildings. We are losing the human scale which made Victoria a decent place to live.
I have four main objections to this proposal:
1) construction of these multiplexes will happen with no necessity for notification or input of the community. The council seems to be abdicating their responsibility for oversight of the development process.
2) there is no built in protection for renters.
3) these units can be up to 1 1/2 as high as the existing average height of houses.
4) this proposal accelerates the already steep decline in green space and tree canopy.
I urge you not to approve this proposal.
Yours sincerely,
Gill Ellis
421 Queen Anne Heights V8S4K7

Sent from my iPad

[redacted]

From: Janice [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 6:38 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I can not support your Initiative to push this new bylaw through with out more public and further social engagement. I find it outrageous that you would do this in the middle of summer on the heels of a long weekend. It looks like some of you are desperate to get this through before the next election!
The plan as it stands right now is confusing and disrespectful for all involved, with no thought to the environment (which will get rid of green space and trees and further warm our planet) or the fact that Health Care is on its knees and over 50,000 people are with out a doctor in the greater Victoria area. Right now the only people that will benefit, will be developers and home owners that want to get back at their neighbours. It will certainly not help the missing middle, they will still not be able to afford these town houses. With the current interest rates and a further 3 more proposed rate increases, I would say that these new bylaws to promote building Town Homes for the missing middle will not be relevant. So please do not rush through such a drastic land use change of this nature without a lot more meaningful consultation and planning.

Thank you, Janice Kearley (Tax payer)

Sent from Mail for Windows

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Initiative

From: TAYLOR AND JANE [redacted]
Sent: July 31, 2022 8:30 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative

Dear Mayor and Council,

We live in and own 1250 Dallas Rd a multi unit residence in Victoria.
We support this initiative. We believe in providing housing in Victoria.
This will benefit the City. We believe in providing housing that will also help in the fight against Climate Change. There are too many large homes in Victoria occupied by one or two people!
This is not energy efficient, friendly to the climate or a good use of land.

There are many in our neighbour hood spreading false information regarding this initiative as it seems they do not understand the criteria that would still be required to be met ex size of lot for building, set backs etc..
can the City explain this more explicitly for the “average” person ?

Again we support this initiative!

Jane Leece
James Colebourn

[redacted]

From: Jim Masterton [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 12:37 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing - OCP amendment bylaw (No 42)-22-044 and associated zoning bylaw amendments.

I am a retired city planner of many years experience in zoning and long range planning and I am extremely opposed to the proposed changes to the OCP to allow multi family housing throughout the current low density areas of Victoria. Why, you ask?
Reason 1. This amendment will accelerate demolitions of older and smaller single family homes if favour of 4 plexes and town housing on an indiscriminate basis throughout Victoria. There is absolutely no growth management here, it's open season for redevelopment of our single family areas without any planning direction . Traditionally, planning has sensibly directed growth to areas that had better proximity to shopping facilities, parks , transit , schools. This amendment throws that tradition of careful growth management out of the window. Why, and why now in the peak summer months hold a public hearing on such a major change to the way that Victoria has conducted its growth management?
2. There had been insufficient thought as to how these amendments will affect land values, what amount of housing will be the result, what type of housing will be created, where most of this new housing will be located how this might affect the rentals market.
3. A recent report by Patrick Condon, an urban expert from UBC, concluded that higher density does not necessarily lower the price of housing, that was certainly Vancouver's experience.
4. The amendments will bring great instability and concern to single family areas. It undermines the security of the zoning in that a home owner might suddenly have a 4plex sprouting up on both sides of his home with little ability to contest these staff decisions.

In conclusion, I believe the proposed amendment to be hastily constructed with lack of knowledge on its consequences on great swarths of Victoria. And by a Council with only 2 months left of a 4year mandate. Why and what is the urgency??

Respectfully submitted, James Masterton, homeowner in Fairfield

[redacted]
Sent from my iPad

[redacted]

From: Maery Callaghan [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 10:39 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Susanne Rautio
Subject: missing middle

Dear Mayor & Council
I find it very shocking that you would contemplate depriving me & all the citizens of Victoria of our right to have imput into serious housing issues that ultimately affect us all. I believe city hall is for the citizens and not the other way around!
I will be watching the upcoming vote carefully to see who will be protecting democracy and who will be kowtowing to the developers. I will cast my vote accordingly.
Respectively,
MAERY CALLAGHAN

324 RICHMOND AVE.
VICTORIA, B.C.

Sent from Mail for Windows

[redacted]

From: Margaret Eckenfelder [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 12:29 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Margaret Eckenfelder
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative - Input to Public Hearing, August 4, 2022

Dear Mayor and Council,

We reside at 1709 Oak Shade Lane and have direct experience with highly disruptive and controversial development happening within the framework of existing zoning and no opportunity for public input (or for City staff to require modifications to make the development suit the site). We live above former 1745 Oak Shade Lane and have seen most of the mature garry oaks and other significant trees for the neigbouhood (e.g. a century old chestnut tree) disappear. Most of these trees were in good condition and did not sit within the building envelope of the houses. However, since owners are maximizing their build size (in one case in excess of 6000 square feet) and there is no maximum house size in the R1-A (unlike other residential zones) no review or consideration of the impact on neighbours, the environment (one owner spent nearly 4 months blasting an entire hillside to rubble), or the trees. The tree protection bylaw applied, but it was no match for the house size allowed under the zoning bylaw and mature trees have given way to a replacement requirement (small trees that will take years to grow on site or a payment to avoid having to plant on site at all). This has taken a parklike setting and made it into a concrete parking lot. There is very little green space left - at a time when climate change clearly supports preservation of urban forest at all costs. We were hopeful that development would be sensitive to the trees and landscape and houses would be designed accordingly - perhaps sacrificing some square footage to maintain the parklike setting. Sadly, this was not to be. Since all has so far complied with the zoning, city staff have had no choice but to approve.

With this experience as background, we are extremely concerned that the Missing Middle Initiative (MMI), while perhaps motivated by the right reasons will have negative results for us all - without delivering affordable housing or delivering a few units at an extreme cost to the City as a whole. The city of Victoria has been well renowned for its healthy tree cover. We are afraid that this is being eroded as land values go up and the desire to maximize building size goes with it. In the case of the MMI as proposed, there will be no opportunity for any neighbourhood review and comment on proposals that will potentially have significant negative effects on them. If the proposal meets the zoning requirements, city staff will have no choice but to approve it. This is wrong. As experience shows, zoning bylaws are generic and do not take into consideration specific settings. This is why there is a Board of Variance to review exceptions to the rules. In this case, a very permissive bylaw will apply across all single-family neighbourhoods and we expect that very few exceptions will be considered by the Board of Variance (the only apparent source of public review).

We agree with concerns that have been expressed about the speed at which this bylaw amendment is moving, and the timing of this public hearing. It appears that Council is not really interested in receiving public feedback, given the date, August 4, and time allocated. This is very disappointing.

In short, we strongly oppose proceeding with the proposed bylaw amendment at this time. We agree that much more internal consideration and public consultation is required to review and understand the details and the impact of the proposed change on our neighbourhoods. There must be some mechanism for neighbours to review and comment on any MMI proposal and an opportunity for city staff to refuse to permit a development that does not have community support or will result in significant damage to the environment, especially the elimination of green space and mature trees.

Best regards,

Margaret Eckenfelder and JIm Burns
1709 Oak Shade Lane

[redacted]

From: Watson, Matthew D. [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 6:02 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: missing middle housing comments

Hello, I wanted to briefly provide comments around the proposed missing middle housing strategy. I am a nurse within island health and have been for some time. In recent years I hear more and more from colleagues both Nursing professionals, Hospital Support staff, and even some physicians that Victoria is becoming less desirable as a place to stay in. We have lost 4 younger nurses on our unit alone in the last few months because they have come to realize that even with two professional incomes at home, they are unable to save for a home purchase here in Victoria, or if they are able to save, the time period is so long because of our cost of housing that they are not willing to wait and therefore leaving town. This is especially true for those wanting to have children soon and therefore be on mat leave. It is just unaffordable to do so in this town. Similarly there have been other hospital support staff I know (including nurses) leave because the cost of rents are so high, they have very little spending money left over for enjoyment on their days off. This indirectly contributes to some of the burnout we're seeing at the hospitals in my opinion. If the current situation with housing in this city goes on or gets worse, I'm not sure how the city will continue to function smoothly.

I recognize that there is no easy answer. I do however support any measures that will help. I feel the missing middle housing will offer families smaller units suitable for raising children in. Granted at current market rates it will still be expensive, but being smaller in size, will likely be affordable for some. This will in turn free up apartment rentals and increase our housing stock. With less demand, prices fall. This seems to be basic economics. I also support any measure that will limit the number of reasonably scaled houses being torn down so that a large, unattractive (subjective I know) monster house can be built in its place. These new builds are incredibly expensive for all but the rich. I feel the missing middle "upzoning" proposed will give some better options to builders for increased density and they can still make all their money ☺. I am not opposed to greater density like some. There is Nimbyism out there for sure. I hear it all the time, especially from affluent people that bought property long ago so it is "not their problem". I feel this is unfair. Unfair to young people, unfair to those earning less, and unfair to the planet ultimately as we spread out with urban sprawl. I hope we do not listen to them and make decisions based on their opinions. I worry that they will be the loudest voice in all this. We shall see.

Finally, I'd appreciate remaining anonymous around these comments if they happen to be shared to the public.

Thank you so much,

Matthew Watson.

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Initiative (August 4th hearing)

From: sheena bellingham [redacted]
Sent: July 31, 2022 11:53 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: NJNA Community <njnacommunity@gmail.com>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthornton-joe@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative (August 4th hearing)

Dear Mayor and Council,

Missing Middle development should be consistent in scale with the surrounding neighbourhood into which it will be placed. The 3-storey dwellings being proposed by the blanket re-zoning do not fit with the generally 1 and 2-storey surroundings in NJ, SJ, Fernwood, Oaklands and other communities. The imposition of this type of massing and these streetscape "eyesores" will affect morale within the community.

Affordability must be demanded of developers by municipal and other types of government. City staff are saying they are not tackling affordability with this policy. Then why are we doing it? Developers are opportunistic and will develop as market forces enable them to. You have given them the keys to the till by removing obstacles. Affordability will not improve under the illusive and wrong-headed assumption of the trickle-down theory. For a Council that prides themselves on supposedly progressive policies, I see this as an attempt to reconcile poor policy with the goal of placating developers.

Renovictions are a real and consistent problem. Tenants are currently being forced out into a market where the competition for rentals can be 80 applications to one unit. This new policy worsens that problem.

Property taxes will go up. No word from City staff on the subject. Presumably that means everyone's taxes will rise in accordance with being forcibly re-zoned as multiplex.

Finally, any owner of any home in Victoria will now be living in fear, waiting for the next for-sale sign to go up down the street or next door. Is this the kind of socially-challenged, chaotic society you want to create in "Liveable Walkable Victoria" - more of "us against them"??

This kind of transformative change deserves proper engagement. Sliding this public hearing through over the August long weekend, while most of the City is sunbathing elsewhere, is stealthy and undemocratic. A referendum should be held at the next election. Only then, once voters fully understand the extent of this change and agree or disagree to it, should a decision be made.

Thank you,
Sheena Bellingham

[redacted]

From: Homes For Living [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 12:46 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Public Hearings
Subject: Homes for Living - Support Letter for "MMHI"
Attachments: HFL - MMHI Support Letter - 08.2022.pdf

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please find attached HFL's support letter for the upcoming public hearing regarding the Missing Middle Housing Initiative. Best of luck as you weigh this important decision. If you have any questions feel free to contact us directly.

Sincerely,

The Homes for Living Team

Homes for Living Supports the Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Homes for Living supports the Missing Middle Housing Initiative (MMHI). The City of Victoria faces an acute housing affordability and availability crisis. By approving the MMHI council will empower builders to do something other than rip down old single-family homes and replace them with mansions. This policy is an important part of the housing solution; especially when considered alongside the recently passed Rapid Deployment of Affordable Housing and the updated Village & Corridor Plans.

Victoria lacks housing diversity and many buyers must choose between single-family homes or condos. The Victoria Real Estate Board's June 2022 report stated the average condo sold for approximately $640K, while the average single-family home cost $1.36 million. A $720K jump in value is too steep for most households. By contrast, MM housing types, like townhomes, sold for an average price of $930K. Moving from a condo to townhome is more manageable and will therefore help young families, working professionals, and move up buyers.

By retaining younger people, the city will further its economic prosperity and address the labour shortage. Victoria needs more doctors, nurses, daycare staff, emergency service personnel, and a host of other workers, but without the MM, Victoria will continue to struggle filling these roles.

The policy will also benefit seniors who are taking on debt to help adult children purchase a house. Adding leverage during retirement is dangerous but it may be preferable to children leaving the CRD and aging alone. The MM will help when downsizing too and comes with an accessibility requirement. Instead of moving to a condo downtown, those looking to downsize will be able to stay in their own neighbourhood. This will allow seniors to retain their friend circles and daily routines.

There are other winners too. The policy includes some tenant assistance and displacement assistance which will help renters and reduce renoviction risks. Moreover, the renoviction issue will diminish over time as the city's housing stock grows. Taxpayers will also gain, because the denser a city becomes, the lower the cost of infrastructure and services paid per household. Approving the MM may put Victoria first in line to access the Fed's $4 billion "Housing Accelerator Fund" as well. Action on MM will align with climate action too as it will take pressure off urban sprawl in Langford, decrease commuting into the city from the West Shore, and make Victoria more pedestrian and cycling friendly.

In summary, the MMHI will benefit nearly all Victorians. Instead of maintaining the status quo whereby old single-family homes are replaced with mansions, the MM will empower new building types to house people along the age and income spectrum. It will decrease Victoria's labour crunch, diminish climate impacts, cut taxes paid per capita, and reduce eviction risks. Thank you for bringing this policy forward to public hearing. We hope council will unanimously approve the MMHI.

About Homes for Living:

We are a community housing advocacy group, made up of local volunteers impacted by and concerned about the growing housing crisis. Homes for Living is advocating for more homes to make Victoria more affordable for people across the income and housing needs spectrum. We believe reforms at the local and provincial government level are crucial to accomplishing these goals. For more information, click here: https://www.homesforliving.ca/about-us

Homes For Living Contact Information:

Hello@homesforliving.ca

[redacted]

From: Amanda Harby [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:35 AM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Gonzales Neighbourhood Association
Subject: Missing Middle meeting - August 4th

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

We have read the Missing Middle information sent by the Gonzales Neighbourhood Association. We strongly recommend two points for your consideration:

1. That the Missing Middle discussion and decision-making process be deferred until the new Council is in place in November 2022. Many residents have been or are away during the summer months. We have worked hard at our community plans over the past 30+ years and it is appropriate that the residents and neighbourhood associations have adequate input.

2. As residents, we have worked very hard at developing, stewarding and providing input into the City's Tree Plan, parks, and green space plan(s). We want to save trees and not devote our remaining green space to 4–6 parking spaces for multiplexes. The bike lanes now provide the infrastructure for those that are able cycle. Yes, we are faced with a housing crises and pressure from the Provincial Government but I think it is time to start linking these ideas in real ways that promote active transportation and not cars on residential lots. We need to reduce carbon and promote a green living space. This will take some thinking outside the existing by-law structure for parked vehicles. And, those ideas will only be provided by some brainstorming at the City with residents.

Thank you

Amanda Harby and Manu Ronse
920 Wilmer Street
Victoria, BC. V8S 4B7

[redacted]

From: Alan Mallett [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 3:00 PM
To: Public Hearings; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); NJNA
Subject: Missing Middle Strategy comments

Missing Middle Strategy - Comments to Victoria City Council

From Alan Mallett

As a long time resident of the North Jubilee Neighbourhood, I would like to say how pleased and excited I am regarding the ongoing evolution of the Missing Middle strategy. I see lots of opportunities here within a few blocks radius of my vicinity where there are many old houses past their prime, and front yards ignored and not mainteined . A renewal of the neighbourhood with selective insertion of well designed multi-unit homes and a more efficient use of the available land area would be a very welcome improvement. It would have the effect of strengthening our neighbourhood without overwhelming it with traditional and very imposing apartment blocks, and I believe it would have negligible effect on increased vehicle traffic.

Please accept my vote in being in favour of the Missing Middle concept.

Thanks for the opportunity, Alan Mallett, 110-1655 Begbie Street, Victoria BC

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:47 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Ratifying Local Area Plan to accommodate Missing Middle Housing

From: Barbara Bowman-Edwards [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 7:51 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Ratifying Local Area Plan to accommodate Missing Middle Housing

Dear Honourable Mayor and Council,

It is my belief from working in the Construction and Real Estate Investment Business for 45 years, the Missing Middle Proposal is a wonderful idea but your LAP inclusive is still not practical. It can be but in a "Perfect World" there are still flaws due to Investment returns requiring profitability for the Joint Venturists.

A. The current Proposal for the Missing Middle will not provide reasonable house pricing In the city's bedroom communities.

— New Builds will not be **affordable** housing due to demolition and ground up costs, which are increasing due to supply and demand.

—It will not provide enough off-street parking spots for new dwellings. **Units are targeting families with children, who use vehicle transportation** too and from lessons such as swimming or sports competitions per etc.

—Taxation has skyrocketed upon the **potential for our lots in the proposed LAP. which is making properties less affordable for the Missing Middle**.
Example the City's proposed designation for lots to have 12 Townhouses, has impacted a single family homes by increasing their property taxes by 30% or more over the past year. 1351 May Street, on the corner of Joseph Street where the property values and taxes have gone down on the tax rolls, according to the homeowner's research. Nor is this an isolated example.

—It is unknown if the City will add taxation to the existing residents when offering to provide Bus Transportation or affordable ride share options for the benefit of the Missing Middle. Many believe they will be paying for your offers and incentives with their property taxes.

—There is no known plan to provide enough Medical Facilities with shorter wait times as the population's needs are planned to increase up to twelve or six times.

—There is no known plan for providing funding for the necessary infrastructures through the Developers. Property owners taxes are exceeding their sustainable levels for increasing our area's infrastructure. We are on an Island with limited resources without enough emergency facilities to medically handle the current and proposed density.

Transportation corridors are far too small throughout our Local Areas to safely move critical patients to our two emergency room hospitals.

—-It is unknown if the City will help Heritage Designated homes with their insurance concerns.

Instead adding housing to Victoria's Missing Middle, this plan will continue to loose families and loose older affordable Middle
Income level homes. The affordable homes will continue to be lost to Development's Joint Venturists, who have scouts
throughout our areas buying up all the affordable homes often before the homes hit the market.

_____-

What the current Plan will do:

--The Plan will increase the supply housing for those who have at least $195,000.00 for a down payment along with discretionary money in excess of $4,500.00 per month for a mortgage, strata fees, utilities and property taxes. **It will provide retirees with housing as they moving from colder climates to Victoria.**

— If the current plan **used only old Housing Stock** or Heritage Housing **then the Missing Middle will have affordable Housing Stock..**

--Economics 101 has always confirmed that Old Stock is affordable if it has not been renovated. There are Young couples starting families with the old stock housing in Victoria as we speak.

A logical conclusion as to why each lot is to becomes 6 or 12 units, having been an investor in Developments for 45 years.

--- Limited Partners can and do advise General Partners of opportunities to increase the financial yields in a Real Estate Development or Project.
----Councilmen and Councilwoman can be Limited Partners in Real Estate Developments, as individuals, investing capital in any Development. FOI on personal investment funds have exceptions. .
— The initial capital ,as a Limited Partner, is limited to the Initial Capital. The Capital can grow or not. Plus once the Development has sold out, the proceeds from their Capital Investment can be rolled over into another Real Estate Development.
—When old housing stock is removed for New Density Developments, only the Investors profit, in our Bedroom Communities. Profitablity alone signal the strategically placed purchasing scouts to buy up the low costing Missing Middle
housing for Developments. Knowing councils are passing profitable rezoning for profitable returns, the misnomer is affordable
Missing Middle Housing. New Housing Stock is always for wealthier buyers.

_____

Proposal for the Missing Middle Housing, (if you are actual serious and care about this demographic) should should always. be to keep older, less attractive homes for the Missing Middle and to offer Grants, Federal or Provincial or both, to do the necessary repairs and upgrades for the families moving into our city's old stock housing.

Necessities are needed for emergency safety in the transit corridors, which is to continue to provide underground parking for two
three, four and definitely 12 plexus. Negligence costs to cover accidents or death should be each council member personal responsibility, when they pass insufficient parking on Three Chain Length, Roads.

Passing personal transportation costs, such as Bus Passes or Car Sharing Costs onto the tax payers is not possible without the residents informed consent. You can ask each Property Owner to approve this cost to each respective residents upon their personal Property Tax Bill. Approval must be signed for , by a written yes for each year the
resident needs a Bus Pass or car rental..

Respectfully to all and thank you for your hard time consuming work.
Barbara Ann

[redacted]

From: Brianne Czypyha [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:39 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Yes to MMHI

As a resident, property owner and tax payer, I am writing to ask for council to vote yes on the MMHI.

I am 100% in support of moving this forward, as proposed, with a review period in 2 years. This is one of many policies in the toolbox to fix our housing challenges, and should not be looked at in isolation. I know it won't provide affordable housing, but it will give options for families to stay in the city.

Please do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. The status quo is only widening the gap between condos and sfd, and so many dual income professionals are being priced out of the city and contributing to the west shore sprawl. This project will help to achieve climate, transportation and livability priorities for Victoria, and increase housing choices.

Please vote yes, complete this strategic plan priority, and bring our zoning in line with the OCP. We have already done almost a decade of engagement, please follow through!

B. Czypyha

[redacted]

From: David Helm [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 4:43 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council

My name is David Helm. I live on Toronto Street and have lived and worked in Victoria for over 55 years.

I have seen a lot of development changes over that period of time. Some good, some bad, . . . some . . . just goofy. I do not support the "Missing Middle" initiative. After careful study, I believe it is bad for the existing residents of the city.

My observation, is that Victoria has never been a cheap place to live and often incomes are less than what could be attained in other cities in B.C and in other parts of our country. . . HOWEVER, . . . there have always been people who choose to move to Greater Victoria and be willing to possibly accept a lessor standard of living in order to enjoy the ambiance our area provides.

The "Missing Middle" proposal is an attempt to satisfy people who want to become residents, at the expense of the existing residents of our wonderful city.

This amendment to the Community Plan is not about affordability of housing but it is about the forced increase in density in our neighbourhoods.

Will having bigger buildings with more people in most places make Victorian's happier? Life better? Will the city remain high in the world's rank of best places to live?
I don't think so. The benefits of density will hit a turning point where it has a detrimental effect on quality of life. More traffic, more waste, more noise . . . it goes on and on.

I think the electorate as a whole should have a say at election time on this "Missing Middle" proposal. October 15th would be a great opportunity to give the residents a say in the development future of their city.

After the election, when a new Mayor and Council is elected and if they support the "Missing Middle" proposal, then "so be it." The people will then have spoken.

I ask this Mayor and Council to table this legislation and leave it to the new Mayor and Council to be elected on October 15th, 2022.

Thank you.

David Helm

[redacted]

From: Debbie [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 2:14 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Missing Middle

Dear Council members,

I ask that you delay the decision on the Missing Middle initiative to allow more time for consideration of the impacts and more consultation. I attended the virtual session that was set up in July, and that was all about explanation, not consultation.

I am concerned about the impact on land values, and the impact that will have on affordability for people who live here already and want to buy. I am also concerned that despite the effort in the proposed MMI policy to retain green space and the urban forest, a lot of green space and urban forest will be lost as a result of housing with bigger footprints. Will the green space that is supposed to be preserved end up being paved over for parking after the project has been approved, because people still drive cars despite wishful thinking?

Regarding affordability and land values, please consider the following recent real estate listings, both listed way above their market value in my opinion, and resting on the fact that MMI will allow redevelopment:

Example 1:

223 Government Street, listed for $1,800,000. Assessed value: $1,431,000. The real estate market is no longer as hot as it was and listings are not selling for $400,000 above their assessed values. Description: "… The rectangular lot zoned R-2(duplex) is approximately 9,240 sq.ft. (60'x154') and has a great potential for redevelopment. Rezoning through the city could allow for townhomes, duplexes or two single family homes to be built."

Example 2:

557 Simcoe Street, listed for $1,999,000 for an empty lot that has been cleared by a developer. Assessed value: $1,276,000. $700,000 above assessed value. Description: "HERE IS A RARE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY! This large, vacant lot is available in the heart of James Bay. aT approximately 60' x 164', this rectangular lot is 9633 SQFT. The lot enters off Simcoe St between St Turner and Clarance St and is R2 zoned - Multi Family, allowing the construction of a duplex or Single Family. The building of townhomes, duplex's or two homes on this lot is a true possibility via rezoning through the city."

James Bay is already zoned for duplexes and has a good mix of housing including "missing middle". It seems to me that official community plans should outline where more density should happen, and absolutely, that density should include "missing middle". Rezoning the entire city does not make sense to me and may only serve to make housing less affordable.

Sincerely,

Deb Hull

On May 11, 2022, at 7:18 AM, Debbie [redacted] wrote:

Dear Council members,

What is being proposed for the Missing Middle in terms of rezoning the whole city and delegating all decisions to staff is a huge policy shift that I think needs more time for real consultation, including with neighbourhood associations. I appreciate that some consultation was done, but it was done in the midst of a pandemic and consisted primarily of a survey that was short on details on what the policy would look like.

It's clear that the Missing Middle Housing policy won't provide affordable housing, with units ranging from $600K for under 1000 square feet to $1.7M for larger units. I am concerned about displacement of existing renters.

In my neighbourhood (James Bay), a lot of people from Alberta, the prairies, and Ontario are moving here to retire. Two homes have been sold in my immediate neighbourhood recently — one of them has vehicles with Alberta parking plates, and the other has vehicles with Ontario parking plates. Victoria has always been a retirement destination but with the baby boomers retiring there is an almost endless supply of people who want to move here.

After reviewing the documents, I think that City staff have done a great job of balancing all the interests. In particular, I appreciate the focus on protecting green back yards and the urban forest. I am concerned about parking. It is not realistic to think that people buying these homes won't have vehicles. There is already a shortage of on-street parking in James Bay, as many of the older homes only have room for one parking spot, there are secondary suites in many homes, and every home/unit seems to have at least one vehicle.

I do not have the time or the knowledge to study these documents in detail and understand the full implications.

Please direct staff to consult with residents and neighbourhood associations on the draft policy before it is considered by Council for adoption. I would like to know what my neighbourhood association thinks about the policy, as I understand that the James Bay neighbourhood plan was hard fought for back in the day. I would like to retain as much as possible of what I love about this neighbourhood, including the diversity of people who live here, the trees, and all the heritage homes.

Thank you,

Deb Hull

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:47 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing MIddle -- POSTPONE the vote!!!

From: Gretchen Karlebach [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing MIddle -- POSTPONE the vote!!!

Mayor and Council,

What is the rush?

Why are you pushing this so hard?

The demand for, & inability to find, skilled & unskilled labour, means that lots of approved building is not yet happening due to lack of labour.
This simply looks like a grab for a "legacy" that could prove harmful to our future.

STOP!

Give the citizens of this world renowned city an opportunity to learn more and understand better what is being proposed. This is our city -- where we live, raise families, work, retire, die -- we deserve a chance to speak to this proposal of dramatic change, before implementation.

thank you,
sincerely,
Gretchen & D.G. Karlebach

[redacted]

From: Emma McWalter [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:22 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Public Hearings
Subject: Opposed: Public Hearing Missing Middle Proposal Aug 4

Hello,

I am writing to register my **opposition** for the **Missing Middle rezoning proposal**.
While I appreciate the current housing crisis, this proposal will forever change the form and character of the City of Victoria neighbourhoods and make the City less appealing to live in. Although a mixture of higher density living makes a lot of sense, it doesn't make any sense to allow blanket approval to create multiplexes on every single residential lot in Victoria. This move would have at least the following negative consequences:

1. **Drive up the cost of housing even further** as developers move in to purchase single family dwellings to build multiplexes,
2. **Drastically compromise the privacy of single family dwelling lots** that would be stared down upon from neighbouring multi story developments, and
3. **Cause undue stress for homeowners** fearing dramatic changes could come to their neighbours properties.

I appreciate the effort to create higher density and simplify the time and effort for developers to get new housing supply on the market - this, is not the solution. Please consider restricting densification to main corridors and centred around Villages.

Respectfully,
Emma McWalter
Lyman Duff Lane

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Initiative Should not be Rushed

From: lohan [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 6:45 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: Missing Middle Initiative Should not be Rushed

Dear Mayor & Council,

I am strongly against the missing middle Initiative as it is written. The taxpayers are not really aware that this is even happening, because of the way that it has been presented. Of course we need to plan for more housing in the future, but change the zoning to 6 units in one move, because the major is leaving, NO WAY, Too much too fast.

***Change the zoning to duplex, of even triplex if the lot is larger, this makes more sense.

***This mayor & council has seriously crippled the traffic flow in our city. With all the bike lanes, and narrowing, or even blocking off many flow streets. Only god & the mayor knows why….The people are going to be able to afford to purchase these new missing middle units, are all going to have CARS. Not only are the roads much to narrow, but there is NO PARKING now. Come on councillors, open your eyes to what is really happening here.

The present major is really pushing this missing middle hard, because she has nothing to lose and will not have to answer to anyone, because she is leaving. The only persons that I see who will benefit from the missing middle is the developers…

But, anyone of you councillors who wishes to continue with a political career, should have a long hard look at this, and delay the decision until more study can be done on how this is really going to affect all the taxpaying voters…When things start to happen, and the public really starts feel what this missing middle is actually going to do to their life style, the politicians that are still there are going to have to answer for all the hassles that this is going to cause, not the ex-mayor.

***Please delay this vote, until the public can be properly alerted to this new idea, thank you.

Sincerely,
George Anderson
1028 Summit Avenue

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:47 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: missing middle

From: Gretchen Karlebach [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 12:57 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: missing middle

Mayor and Council,

Will any of the Missing Middle proposal actually address the question of **affordable family housing?

Cost of supplies & labour are not decreasing. Pushing through housing without appropriate steps, may increase the number of dwellings.... eventually..., but will **NOT** answer our need for affordability

Will any of the Missing Middle proposal **protect our urban forests?

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 urban forest & our neighbourhoods?

Victoria wins accolades & awards for being the lovely city it is today. That includes the natural environment & gardens, as well as the historical structures, & the growing city. It appears that Council is willing to ignore the importance of what draws people to the city. The ambiance of our city will change if developers are free to build whatever and wherever with the only focus on financial gains, rather than respecting & blending into a neighbourhood.

Although the current process is onerous at times, sometimes frustrating, there is no need, nor any responsible reason, to be rushing into a decision that will affect the city forever. Change takes time. We are asking that the Council take the time to reform the process, but PLEASE DO NOT throw out everything the city has been doing without further consideration from the citizens who live & work here.

sincerely,
Victoria residents & home owners,
gretchen & geoffrey karlebach

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:36 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative Feedback

The City has presented lots of glossy renditions of what new housing will look like under the Missing Middle Initiative debate. It all looks very nice, with pretty buildings and lots of trees. It looks like a marketing glossy. I have no professional expertise to enable feedback to you, other than to point out that your maps used to identify areas of the city that will be rezoned contains two separate areas, each represented by a different shade of yellow. The Legend labels only one shade of yellow. I found that confusing.

However I do have significant feedback for you on the subject of what happens to properties that come up for redevelopment after the Missing Middle Initiative has been approved, if that should happen. This is based on my personal experience of dealing with the City during the Rhodo project saga.

As with many residents I was NOT against densification, but rather against excessive-densification.

When I first learned of the proposal, the City had already agreed to a number of exemptions to the current guidelines, none of which, in my view, were to the benefit of the community. And there was no trade-off offered by the developer. There were no reasons given for this.

The "battle" then started, between the local residents and the City/developer. This was a long, acrimonious process, which actually ended with no adjustments being made to the proposal to address the concerns of residents. This included setbacks all round the property and insufficient parking spaces, based on the community guidelines supposedly in place. There was uproar from numerous residents about the number of trees to be cut down. Residents pointed out that the City had recently asked City Council to approve a motion that any subsequent new development immediately adjacent to a City park must have a "transition" such that the development does not dominate the public park.

The end result? One single tree was designated as protected. This tree, together with a handful of small trees, all within two metres of the northern property boundary, were the ONLY trees left on the entire lot. The "transition" directive was IGNORED. Neither of these two decisions were communicated by the City to residents.

So, after this long background story, I must say that I have no confidence in the City handling new development applications from a developer, should the Missing Middle Initiative be approved.

I foresee developers and property speculators applying significant pressure to the City to go beyond any new guidelines, and there will be NO opportunity for residents to raise concerns, as the process will effectively be "behind closed doors".

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, a vast edifice dominates the area, and gives very little back to the neighbourhood. The City's documentation of the Missing Middle Initiative contains a section on maintaining and promoting the tree canopy. Take a look at the Rhodo site, and search for trees. Rhodo makes a mockery of the development process.

Therefore, I am completely against the Missing Middle Initiative.

Graham Whitehead

1689 Earle Street, Victoria, BC, V8S1N4

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:34 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative - Citizen Feedback

Mayor and Council,

I have tried very hard in recent weeks to fully understand the detail of the Missing Middle Initiative, what the implications are, and what the measurable impact on the housing supply might be.

I am concerned also that the city will lose whatever control it currently has with respect to development, resulting in a process that is conducted “behind closed doors” as far as City citizens are concerned. This process needs to be much more open, and much more clearly communicated and understood.

The City appears to be rushing this through during the summer vacation season, and at a time when a municipal election is looming. I feel that the facts and substance of the proposed solution, together with implications, roles and responsibilities, should be presented so that the public can understand, and assess the approaches of election candidates prior to the election being conducted. In particular, citizens should be able to fully understand the impact of the new process and responsibilities on the affordable housing supply, and determine if there are indeed net benefits towards achieving an understandable goal. It would also enable the new City Council to address concerns prior to finalizing and implementing the desired solution.

The “problem” that has resulted in the MMI proposal must be clearly articulated, and the proposed solution should be clear to citizens, and that it indeed addresses the problem. I have not seen such a rationale presented.

I seem to remember reading that the end result may not have a significant impact on the underlying issues. If this is indeed the case, then why are even considering such a radical solution that places all the power in the hands of developers, with citizens being completely excluded from the process, but rather simply learning the detailed plans and impact after the entire process has been completed, and shovels are ready to start?

This is not the way to engage the citizens of Victoria.

The proposed approach needs to be properly communicated, and citizen engagement needs to be a positive, informed, and constructive process.

Please include this proposal along with the municipal election material. In that way, citizens can elect Councillors with a clear and understandable mandate. Property developers have a role to play in development activities, and that MUST NOT be as the principal, driving force with no accountability.

Graham Whitehead

1689 Earle Street, Victoria, BC, V8S1N4

[redacted]

From: Heather Keenan [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:45 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle

Dear Mayor and Council,

This huge proposal should be an election issue and discussed in the fall when most residents of Victoria are back from summer holidays.

Sincerely,

Heather Keenan

[redacted]

From: Joanna Betts [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:34 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Missing Middle Aug 4

I want to make sure this email is submitted for the Aug 4 public hearing for the MMI.

Sincerely,
Joanna and Paul Betts
Residents of Victoria
334 Robertson Street
>
> Dear Council,
>
> The Missing Middle needs to be put on hold. It is obvious that there are many areas with this initiative that need further research and development.
>
> Why are you in such a rush to push this through? Why not wait until provincial guidelines have be clearly identified.
>
> There is No affordability aspect included, no protection of green space, trees - key components in combating climate change - so many holes in the current policy.
>
> I tend to see it quite simply:
> IF DEVELOPERS RESPECTED CITY GUIDELINES AND COMMUNITY PLANS THERE WOULD BE LESS PUSH BACK FROM TAXPAYING RESIDENTS and then their projects would proceed much faster. But they insist and pushing their developments to new size, heights, densities - stating without these variances they can't afford to build. We as tax paying residents have a right to be included in this process.
>
> By pushing the MMI through you are effectively disregarding the citizens of Victoria by silencing us and giving developers the opportunity to build what THEY want. And sure as shooting, they will push the boundaries within the MMI - just as they push boundaries now. Do you really think this will change with the MMI? Where is the democratic process in this? What other initiatives will you remove our voices from?
>
> Sadly, I will not attend the public hearing as I have been targeted by a "local developer" and trolled by their following for stating my opinion on the MMI . The developer would also like us silenced.
>
> Sincerely,
> Joanna Betts
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone with my "iThumbs" so please excuse typos!

[redacted]

From: J. Malo-Roper [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:31 PM
To: Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

As a lifelong resident of Victoria, I express my wholehearted **support** for the MMHI. Allowing for more diversity in housing, including increased-density housing, will bring more choice and therefore more freedom to the residents of the city. My grandfather built dozens of homes in this city with his own hands; homes which his grandchildren cannot afford to live in, and could never even *imagine* owning. The allowing of higher-density developments will bring homeownership back within reach of the young workers who keep this city running.

I would also like to voice my concerns about some of the oppositions to the MMHI that I have heard so far, as they seem grounded not in legitimate policy concerns, but in post-hoc rationalization for a pre-existing distaste for Mayor Helps and any policy she throws her weight behind.

More mid-density housing is not a silver bullet, but it *is* still a bullet. While I would like to see further steps taken, including caps on rent in MM housing, mandatory affordable units in new MM developments, and tax breaks for purpose-built rentals, the MMHI is a necessary first step in that process. The city will not even be able to begin tackling these issues unless Missing Middle Housing becomes legal to build.

Please, vote in the way that the working youth are begging you to. Take the word of the renters -- those who actually *suffer* from inflated land value -- over the word of the septuagenarian homeowners whose mouths water at the thought of selling their homes for ten times what they paid for them in 1982.

[redacted]

From: JC Scott [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:52 PM
To: David Helm
Cc: Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Totally agree, what is going on here?

JC Scott
JC Scott eco Design Associates Inc.
www.jcscott.com
291 Kerwood Street - (home office)
Victoria BC V9B 1A2
[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 1, 2022, at 4:43 PM, David Helm [redacted] wrote:

Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council

My name is David Helm. I live on Toronto Street and have lived and worked in Victoria for over 55 years.

I have seen a lot of development changes over that period of time. Some good, some bad, . . . some . . . just goofy. I do not support the "Missing Middle" initiative. After careful study, I believe it is bad for the existing residents of the city.

My observation, is that Victoria has never been a cheap place to live and often incomes are less than what could be attained in other cities in B.C and in other parts of our country. . . HOWEVER, . . . there have always been people who choose to move to Greater Victoria and be willing to possibly accept a lessor standard of living in order to enjoy the ambiance our area provides.

The "Missing Middle" proposal is an attempt to satisfy people who want to become residents, at the expense of the existing residents of our wonderful city.

This amendment to the Community Plan is not about affordability of housing but it is about the forced increase in density in our neighbourhoods.

Will having bigger buildings with more people in most places make Victorian's happier? Life better? Will the city remain high in the world's rank of best places to live?
I don't think so. The benefits of density will hit a turning point where it has a detrimental effect on quality of life. More traffic, more waste, more noise . . . it goes on and on.

I think the electorate as a whole should have a say at election time on this "Missing Middle" proposal. October 15th would be a great opportunity to give the residents a say in the development future of their city.

After the election, when a new Mayor and Council is elected and if they support the "Missing Middle" proposal, then "so be it." The people will then have spoken.

I ask this Mayor and Council to table this legislation and leave it to the new Mayor and Council to be elected on October 15th, 2022.

Thank you.

David Helm

[redacted]

From: Janice Williams [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:35 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative - Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council -

I write both as a resident of Victoria and as a person who intends on running for council this fall. I have serious concerns about the Missing Middle Housing Initiative and feel that the city would be better served not proceeding with this initiative in its current form at this time.

As I understand it, the Missing Middle Housing initiative would apply to 80% of parcels in the City of Victoria, increase maximum building height by 10 feet, and increase maximum building size by 66%. Providing, "as right" the ability to build up to six units of housing on a lot currently zoned as single family. This is a significant departure from current policy and is "out of step" with the policies in place in our adjoining municipalities (Esquimalt, Oak Bay, Saanich). It would remove the need for those redeveloping their properties to engage and consult with their neighbours about the project and its impacts and would delegate approval of these projects to staff. It is further my understanding, that this policy would be unlikely to result in any family suitable (1,000 sq ft, 2 or 3+ bedrooms) units becoming available under a price point of $800,000. It is also my understanding that there are few if any safeguards (aside from the residential tenancy act) to protect existing tenants from being evicted to make way for these projects. It is further my understanding that the policy as proposed would substantially reduce the amount of greenspace that is required for buildings and also reduces the requirement to provide parking for residents of these buildings. Lastly, I do not believe any measures have been put in place to ensure this housing is available in priority to those who are currently resident in Victoria and seeking a primary residence that they own, nor are there any measures in place to ensure that if it is used as rental housing that it is provided in a way that serves the need for locally attainable housing (ie: no transient rentals permitted, capped rental rates).

I further understand that local trades are operating near capacity as is with many facing chronic labour shortages, and that this initiative may drive competition for both land and labour, making both more expensive rather than less expensive.

I do believe that Missing Middle developments are appropriate in a variety of circumstances. Specifically, when adjoining neighbours have been consulted and when their concerns about a project have been addressed. When existing tenants who are paying affordable rents are either not displaced or when an appropriate plan is in place to ensure they have housing that meets their needs. When the housing that is being demolished is at the end of its serviceable life. When there are reasonable covenants on how the redeveloped property can be used.

Lastly, I have concerns with respect to the public engagement that has taken place in light of the MNP governance review and feel that the city needs to do a better job of ensuring the public feels that they can engage with the city in genuine ways without fear of their information being used inappropriately by others. Specifically, I feel that individuals should be required to submit to the city their names and addresses, and whether or not they have a vested interest in the policy and what it is - however, I also feel that home addresses should be redacted from publicly available documents, and that names should be redacted to be first initial last name, with at most an indication of whether or not they are a current resident of the City of Victoria. I would further argue that public submissions should not be publicly available until the date of the hearing and after the date which submissions are closed as doing otherwise opens the process to abuse.

Thank you for your consideration,

Janice Williams
(Victoria Resident, Candidate Victoria City Council)

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Support for Missing Middle Housing Initiative

From: Katy DeCoste [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 5:19 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Support for Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Dear Mayor Helps and Council Members:

My name is Katy. I'm 24 years old and moved to Victoria for graduate school. I now work for UVic. I'm writing to you today to voice my unwavering support for MMHI.

As an early-career young adult, housing is my biggest expense. If I were to leave my current apartment - secured before the explosion of Victoria's rental prices - I would have to leave the city. In Victoria, I cannot afford to live without a roommate. I cannot afford a simple studio apartment. All this while working a secure, comfortable and salaried desk job at a university. Imagine how much more difficult this housing market is for my peers who work low-paying service jobs without cushy benefits!

Our city depends on tourism. But the workers who make that industry possible can no longer afford housing in our city. Our city is in the middle of a drug poisoning and homelessness emergency. Meanwhile, luxury apartments and mansions are easily approved for building, while infill housing and other density-increasing projects meet obstacle after obstacle.

Missing Middle is not only crucial to help end Victoria's housing emergency. It is also an important tool in our fight against climate change. Greater density encourages the public to use transit and reduces our reliance on cars. Density means we devote less land to destructive, invasive monoculture lawns and more land to public spaces like parks. Density allows us to live close to our jobs. Density allows us to live multi-generationally. Denser, smaller multiplexes decrease our individual carbon footprints.

With the municipal election coming up this fall, I and my peers know that any councillor who opposes MMHI cannot be trusted with our future in this city as young people. We know that we need councillors who will fiercely advocate to create a denser city, with more diverse housing types. Density will help address Victoria's low vacancy rates and cool the rental market. This is desperately needed for the thousands of young people who are hoping to make their lives in this city, but fear that we will soon not be able to afford it.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Katy DeCoste
(they/them)

[redacted]

From: Karl Maier [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:36 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

Dear Victoria Mayor and Council,

I write to express my support for the full implementation of the missing middle housing initiative. The experience of the last five years shows that the housing market, as it has been regulated in the past, is not up to the task of the present moment, or what the future is likely to bring.

In brief, it is time for heritage and private green space to give way to liveability, affordability, and public green space. In this way, Victoria will become more like European cities which had to face this dilemma long ago, and are proof that this kind of solution is effective, or even desirable.

Thank you for bringing this initiative to this point, and for your future work in putting it into practice.

Sincerely,

Karl Maier
1468 Stroud Road
Victoria, BC V8T 2K9
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Lorraine Liwiski [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:08 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Aug 4th, 630 pm , public hearing- missing middle

Dear Council

It is extremely sad and disheartening, that the beauty and character of the city, in particular the residential areas are going to be destroyed forever to make the city even more of a generic concrete jungle that it has become. Even more maddening is that it will all be rubber stamped by city staff without the public being aware, or allowed to comment. The tree line will become extinct, there will be no greenery, just ugliness. I am sure, by now, that you must know the benefit of trees and nature.

Lorraine Liwiski
21 Cahilty Lane

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Vote against Missing Middle Initiative

From: Marilyn Drews [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 1:28 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Vote against Missing Middle Initiative

Please accept this letter as a vote against the Missing Middle Initiative.

I live in Fernwood and our neighborhood is already high density. Green space has been lost to new developments such as the project behind Victoria High School. New multi-level projects have been pushed to the property line which again reduces or eliminates any green space on the property such as the project at Johnson and Chambers and the project at Cook and Fort.

The fast tracked project on View street up the street from Cook is about 10 stories tall and towers over the remainder of the houses and the 3 -4 story apartment buildings in the area. The project at Cook and View is 10 stories tall and is on the East side of Cook Street. How did a 10 story building get approved outside the central core.

The Missing Middle is touted to increase density and possibly decrease costs. Other than low cost housing projects, I do not see a reduction in the price of any of this housing. I see it as additional housing in the highly marketable Victoria City area. I suspect a 1000-1400 Square foot property will be sold close to a million dollars. The is based on the Chard units where two bedrooms (1000 sq feet) are starting at mid 700,000's without tax. This corner that housed a mall and parking will not be a 10 story building built to the curb.

And need I say anything about the high rises on View street (around London Drugs). Each block has the equivalent of 4 high units with minimum space between each tower.

The maximum use of space for each building site eliminates green space and sun shine and the ability to do sustainable gardening. The limited existing green spaces (parks) are full of tents and are very uncomfortable to spend any time. They are also not maintained and have no amenities other than very old bathrooms and some recreation facilities such as tennis.

The other issue will be the lack of parking for visitors to downtown and area and also within the units. It is proposed to have 1 car for every three units. I live one block off cook and Johnson. The street is a combination of single family and duplex, many of the units have suites or rent a room. Parking is impossible.

If the initiative is to attract more families, at least one car per unit will be the norm. If a family has children, they often go to different schools or have different after school care schedules. Fernwood/North Park has one French Immersion school which would require a car trip for anyone

who lives more than a few blocks from the school, especially is another sibling goes to a different school.

The last point, is initiatives like this need to be considered on a region wide basis. This needs to be discussed with the other municipalities as housing is not merely a Victoria issue.

Please register my vote as a no.

Kind regards

Marilyn Drews
1337 Rudlin Street

[redacted]

From: Marc-Antoine Dufault [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:16 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Public hearing - Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Dear City Council and Mayor,

I am writing to you today to express my support to the Missing Middle Housing Initiative. This policy has been carefully crafted by city staff over the last few years.

As a homeowner of a heritage-designated house in Fernwood, I would like to see the supply of housing increase in my neighbourhood and in the limits of our small city. I am in my early thirties and very fortunate to own a house in this city.

However, I know that owning a single-family dwelling is not an attainable dream for most people my age. By increasing supply, it would potentially give a broad spectrum of people the option to buy or rent a home in one of our residential neighbourhoods. We need more homes to welcome new doctors, nurses, engineers, emergency responders and workers from various backgrounds.

Diversity can only improve the character of our city. We can already observe a few examples of missing-middle housing in the oldest parts of our neighbourhoods. Prior to April 1982, diverse types of housing were allowed in the residential neighbourhoods of Victoria. Exclusionary zoning is not the heart of our city, let's move forward by allowing more people to live in our beautiful city. We can't afford to continue the status quo and see single-family bungalows demolished to be replaced exclusively by single-family mansions.

The MMHI is only one piece of the puzzle to improve the current situation in regards to the housing shortage in the city of Victoria. It won't resolve the current housing crisis but it is step in the right direction by allowing gentle density in our neighbourhoods.

The population has been more than adequately consulted over the past two years and the current council must move this matter forward. There is a housing crisis and we need to act now. Every small action counts, this is why I approve this initiative.

Best regards,

Marc-Antoine Dufault
Fernwood

[redacted]

From: Mark Edwardson [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:06 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Stephen Andrew (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Public Hearings; Geoff Young (Councillor)
Subject: Support MMHI

Dear council,
Please support the Missing Middle Housing Initiative. A few points:

1. **Building more units, of any kind, is badly needed. Our rental vacancy rate is under 1%.** Every new home you allow to be built makes a small difference. S*omething* is better than nothing, and in many neighborhoods – particularly wealthy neighborhoods traditionally hostile to new residents etc. – the city has so far been doing *nothing*.

2. **Expanding density through the MMHI will reduce the pressure to democvict existing affordable, higher density buildings that current exist in Victoria.** It is important that we build new homes in existing quiet, low-density, wealthy neighborhoods, not concentrating them in a few locations that you deem "appropriate" apartment buildings. The MMHI is a first step in achieving this, by opening up high-end, wealthy suburbs to higher density and more affordable options. If anything, the initiative needs to go further, not be scaled down. **The MMHI initiative is a start, not a silver bullet, but still badly needed.**

3. **The supported density as part of the Missing Middle imitative should be higher.** The fewer existing low-density suburbs get upzoned, the more likely existing buildings on busy roads will be demolished to make way for new condos. Killing the MMHI will make the situation much worse. Expanding the scope and height of buildings permitted to mid-rise apartments (5-6 stories, which is the optimal height for affordability) should a priority for future improvement.

4. More broadly, **city planning processes need to shift away from restrictions on building form, style, height, and other aesthetic complaints that are typically debated at public hearings, to one that expedites developments that provide needed housing at an acceptable price without displacing existing residents.** The current system does not do that. It is frustrating to watch perfectly acceptable rental developments (that I could plausibly live in, if I leave my parents' house!) be bogged down in multi-year rezoning processes and public hearings, and it is frankly exhausting that pro-housing people and groups need to mass organize for individual hearings to support projects that should be a no-brainer for council.

   Stop wasting time with rezoning hearings for townhouses and instead develop and enforce stronger rent control provisions, right of first refusal provisions, etc. to protect existing tenants, and not let the rezoning process be used to stall housing construction. The recent rent-subsidy program recently proposed by the mayor and some councilors seems like a positive step in this direction.

Please support this initiative.

Cheers,

Mark Edwardson
2nd year civil engineering student, University of Victoria

[redacted]

From: Mackenzie Farmer [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:07 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: In support of the missing middle

Dear Victoria City Council,

I'm writing in support of the missing middle housing initiative. We are in dire need of more housing and more housing diversity. This is a crisis and we need to act. We've done the studies, the engagement surveys, the open houses and the vast majority of Victoria residents are in favour (homeowners AND renters) of more housing diversity. The provincial government is behind us.

The average single family home in Victoria is now 1.36 million. Today, we could only replace one of these homes with an even more expensive single family house. Keeping the status quo is not an option. Keep the status quo is voting no to welcoming young families. It's saying no to doctors and nurses being able to afford living here. It's saying no to my family members moving their families back home.

I loath hearing fellow Victorians claiming it goes against the character of our city. It is the original character of our city. Early Victoria is filled with beautiful examples of housing diversity. Just take a look at 340 Linden for an example of our city's diverse housing heritage.

I beg council to act and approve missing middle housing. It is only a piece of the puzzle, but it is a start. We don't have time to wait. This is a crisis.

Sincerely,
Mackenzie Farmer
Homeowner in Fernwood

[redacted]

From: MEI-CHING TSOI [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:59 PM
To: Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: August 4 Hearing - Missing Middle Housing Policy - Opposition

Hello City of Victoria,

My name is Mei-Ching Tsoi and have been a long time resident of City of Victoria for 50 years, of which 30 years as a home owner where I work and raised my wonderful family.
As long time resident, I DO NOT SUPPORT the Missing Middle Housing Initiative for the following reasons:

- Increased heights and reduced setbacks changes privacy of existing residential properties by increasing shadowing and/or overlooking into existing traditional residential properties.

- Disrespecting existing property owner's right to provide input/feedback during re-zoning application stage prior to approval. Regulation would remove rezoning application therefore no opportunity for consultation or consideration.

- Ignores the Official Community Plan (OCP) that was based on well-organized, fulsome and meaningful engagement which provided guidance on where densification should occur. This Missing Middle initiative seems to be rushed, is short on public consultation and flies against the concept of OCP which guides where building development should occur. Why not use the OCP process to introduce this initiative than by-passing it.

In general, I am frustrated about this approach:

- Type and timing of consultation is lacking. A pamphlet and one information session for something so broad is inadequate given that this regulation may be applied to any traditional residential proprieties in the City.

- - Information session and council reading and voting during peak summer months during "post" COVID is disrespectful. It does not provide equal opportunity for meaningful engagement. I know many residents are focusing on their holidays versus. council meetings and their initiatives right now.

Suggestions would be to:

- - Encourage 3 bedroom units for large scale high density development (condos). This would be concentration of density where expected. More leverage can be exerted for commercial residential developments to promote these initiatives.

- If the City wants to pursue this policy, put this to a vote in this Fall's Election as a plebiscite. For that matter, this should be the case for any large scale decision that is wide-sweeping (eg. bike lanes such was never voted on, but the entire community inherited and now has to endure and pay for). Alternatively, have this as the an item for consideration for the next OCP cycle.

Sincerely,

Mei-Ching Tsoi

[redacted]

From: Engagement-External
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:10 AM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Malcolm Maclean; Engagement-External
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Housing

FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael van der Kamp [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 10:21 PM
To: Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

Hello,

I am absolutely thrilled to hear that Victoria is considering opening up for development of missing middle housing! The only way to truly tackle the housing problem is to start significantly increasing supply. To do so with urban infill instead of suburban expansion is a financially and environmentally responsible approach. Easing up zoning restrictions in this manner is definitely a step in the right direction for Victoria!

In the future, I would also love to see zoning restrictions further eased up to ensure that we not only get higher density, but more mixed-used housing as well, so that small local shops have places to exist and so that our local walkable communities can thrive!

Cheers,
Michael van der Kamp

[redacted]

From: Nancy Gow [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:13 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING - Comment from Victoria citizen RE Aug 4 Meeting

Hello:

I would like to voice my disapproval of current MMHI plans and would like to see **voting on the plan reserved for the next council** - in other words, **a postponement of this very important vote**.

My concerns are:

1) No affordability for the working class

2) It will destroy affordable stock and contribute to gentrification

3) It will contribute to displacement

4) Replacement units will cost more than teardowns

These are just a few of my concerns.

I am a citizen of Victoria, residing in Fairfield at 1030 Pendergast St.

Thank you.

Nancy Gow

[redacted]

From: Harbar [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 3:11 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: MMI

I would like to express my opinion on the decision for Missing Middle Initiative. I feel this is a Major undertaking and that it should be left for the Incoming Council (after next election) to pass. There needs to be more than one consultation with the General Public to have all areas fully thought through and concerns addressed.

We are in August 2022 and I feel this existing Council cannot give the necessary attention to all details to the satisfaction of the public in the 2 months remaining till our next election.

I also feel this is a bad time to hold a public consultation as it is summer, many people are on vacation. Better to have it in the fall when you can have a full compliment of the general public.

Mike & Pat Harbar

[redacted]

From: Philip MacKellar [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Public Hearings
Subject: I support the Missing Middle

Dear Mayor, Council, and City Staff,

I am writing to voice my support for the "Missing Middle". The City of Victoria is facing a significant housing affordability and availability challenge. By extension, housing is by far the biggest issue facing my family. Not only that, but it is the biggest issue facing many friends and extended family members. So many people face persistent renoviction risks, are being forced to leave the city, or are taking on massive mortgages because our rental vacancy rate is the lowest in the country and our single detached home prices remain well over $1 million.

The current zoning rules actively hurt most Victorians. Instead of creating middle class housing, the status quo incentivizes the creation of mansions for the very rich. Often, when an old single-family home is purchased, it is ripped down and replaced with a mansion which could easily sell for over $2 million. It does nothing for the city.

Passing the Missing Middle would help address this housing challenge, as it would allow builders to create housing options more people could afford. Moreover, the Missing Middle would work well alongside the "Rapid Deployment of Affordable Housing" and "Village and Corridor Plan" which you have recently passed. None of these measures on their own will solve our problem but all of them together stand a good chance, and this is why it is so important to pass the Missing Middle.

Thank you for your time and for reading my thoughts on this matter.

Best regards,

Philip MacKellar

2530 Cedar Hill Rd

[redacted]

From: Ruby Galanida [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:58 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle housing initiative

Hello Mayor and Council,

I am writing to support the Missing Middle Housing Initiative to enable more homes to be built within our city. Single family housing is luxury housing. We are in an unprecedented housing crisis. We don't need more suburban sprawl for inefficient single family homes. We need more multiplexes so more people can live in our city.

Thank you,

Ruby Galanida
1237 Rudlin St
Victoria, BC

Sent from my iPhone

[redacted]

From: GORDON PERSSON [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 4:05 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: gonzalesneighbours@gmail.com; jbna@jbna.0rg
Subject: Missing Middle Public Hearing

Mayor & Council,
City of Victoria

One thing that is not missing from this outrageous proposal to fundamentally change the democratic way in which zoning is determined in the city, is the Middle Finger. Scheduling a public hearing after a long weekend and during a time when a large number of people are on holiday may seem like brilliant trickery to the organizers but believe me when I say they are the only ones being fooled.

I cannot claim to be an authority on zoning, or duplexes, or corner lots but I do have a good eye for attempts to erode the democratic rights of tax paying citizens and this communist style proposal of giving bureaucrats and developers such an unbelievable level of anonymous, unchecked autonomy is dizzying in its arrogance. It is the very sort of idea that has turned so many Victorians against the ideological mind set of this Mayor and Council and the reason that so many are determined to cleanse Council Chambers in the upcoming election.

While the Mayor can comfortably push such an insane objective because she will not be around after the election, I predict that anyone supporting the proposal and who plans to run, will find it to be a major election issue.

Respectfully submitted,

R. G. Persson
101-20 Douglas St
Victoria, BC V8V 2N6

[redacted]

From: RAYMOND ST ARNAUD [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:46 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: missing middle time frame

I don't know how you can have this meeting at the height of the summer holiday season.
This is such an overwhelming concept that it deserves public debate.

Instead of this approach, why not leave it as a proposal and leave the decision to the next council.
This concept would be a topic for debate during the next election and the citizens could express their opinion by their vote.

To otherwise would be an expression of distrust of the Victoria citizenry.

Raymond St Arnaud
1752 Davie Street

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Zoning Change- thumbs up!

From: Grace Draper [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 11:08 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Zoning Change- thumbs up!

Hello,

I have thought for years that the housing crisis in most of our towns and cities could be alleviated if the zoning everywhere was 3-5 stories, as is the case in many European cities. Condo towers are not the answer, especially in a world facing climate chaos and power outages on a more regular basis. For too long, councils have protected the single family home, believing it to be sacrosanct. The goal of owning one's own single detached house with a good sized back yard was the dream of my parents in the 1950's but this dream has had unintended consequences. It's complicated and I won't go into all the reasons why this expectation has created problems for us, but living on an island, we should at the very least understand that we can't keep sprawling forever. Nor can we keep building housing that only meets the needs of some. More diverse housing solutions are needed; it's time we started building those options. This kind of zoning will make it easier for builders to respond to needs in a timely manner which is why I support it.
This change does not mean that all the other values/policies that make Victoria a much sought after city to live in will be thrown out the window, as some have suggested. **I urge the Mayor and Council members to work hard to alleviate the fears that this proposal has generated:**
1) Fears that there will be no consultation with neighbourhoods about proposals
2) Fears around parking on neighbourhood streets
3) Fears about the loss of green space and large trees
4) Fears about increased property taxes
5) Fears about lack of affordability
etc.
We are living in a time of unprecedented change and this is yet another one. Change is hard for many and sometimes the only way some will come around is to push forward. Reality is a good teacher.

Thank you for everything you are doing to provide more housing for everyone in this city. Housing is a human right and not just a privilege for those who can afford it. Every night I look at the people camping in Irving Park and I say a prayer to the universe that one day, they too, will have homes where they can sleep in their own beds, safe and sound.

Susan Grace Draper
#211- 225 Menzies St
Victoria, BC
V8V 2G6

[redacted]

From: Stacey Fitzsimmons [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 2:31 PM
To: Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Support for missing middle initiative on Thurs Aug 4th

Dear Mayor, Council and public hearings,

Please, I'd like to encourage you to support the missing middle housing proposal. I've included details from our personal story in the video found here to illustrate why: https://photos.app.goo.gl/sYeoemSHGkYDCCQD9 . I can't attend in person, so please include this 2-minute video in the set of feedback in this Thursday's meeting.

I understand that people are worried about their neighborhoods changing with more people moving in. We've lived in both single family homes and in townhomes. We much prefer townhome living for the sense of community they offer; we share food, swap babysitting, and spend time outdoors with our neighbours. In contrast, we barely knew our neighbours when we lived in a single family home. There's no need to be afraid of houseplexes or townhomes in family-oriented neighbourhoods. In fact, I think many people will find they're a net positive addition to neighborhood character, especially for neighbourhoods that may be losing families and children over time as they become increasingly unaffordable for most.

Warmly,
Stacey Fitzsimmons
Washington Ave, Victoria BC

[redacted]

From: Suzanne Hamilton [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:43 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: The Missing Middle Initiative

Dear Mayor and Council

I am deeply troubled by the proposal for the Missing Middle. While I support the need for diverse housing options in Victoria and appreciate the efforts of the council and city staff to address this, I feel this initiative has several issues that have not been adequately considered.

If passed, this proposed bylaw may accelerate the decrease 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 principals, lacking details regarding height, site coverage, and setback requirements.

As the details of this bylaw have only recently emerged and made public, it has not allowed enough time for people in these neighbourhoods to address these concerns, and during that time they have continued to change. One example is the change regarding height restrictions. Initially, City staff advised that corner townhomes could be build up to 10.5 meters, while house plexes in the middle of blocs would be limited to 8 meters. A fact sheet posted by the City in July 2022 states that a house plex 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 house plex and a 10.5-meter-high house plex is massive, especially in the middle of a residential block of single-story houses, sitting just 1.5 meters from it's neighbours' property lines. such drastic change deserves meaningful consultation based on facts.

Even well-intentioned political land use decisions can result in undesirable societal outcomes. One day of public hearings, right after a long weekend when many are away on vacation, cannot be considered meaningful consultation to formulate a vison for long-term spatial planning.

I urge you to hold more extensive public hearings and consultations based on the details of the proposed bylaws and fact sheet, which have only recently been made Public. September would allow Victoria residents the time to return from summer vacation and to consider the proposal in more details. This monumental decision related to land use is a critical issue and should not be forced through due to an upcoming election. We deserve a voice on our living spaces and the time in which to do it. Neighbourhoods are part of what make Victoria the wonderful place it is to live. Allowing us time to provide meaningful, considered and engaged feedback would result in a bylaw that truly has the capacity to enhance a neighbourhood for all to enjoy.

Thank you for your consideration

Suzanne Hamilton

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Resident letter in support of MMHI

From: sarah petrescu [redacted]
Sent: August 1, 2022 2:25 PM
To: Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>; Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Resident letter in support of MMHI

Hello,

We are residents of Fairfield writing in support of the Missing Middle Housing Initiative, as part of the City's wider housing and infrastructure planning, but would also like to share a few concerns.

We support the MMHI because we want to remain in Fairfield, a community where we work, volunteer, have friends, have childcare and where our daughter goes to school. However, we would like to someday have a larger dwelling but cannot afford to buy a house in Fairfield or anywhere in Victoria. We own a larger condo, affordable for middle income families. We don't feel secure entering the rental market, which has become volatile and more expensive than owning our condo (for us, in our area). Ideally, we could buy a townhouse or larger unit in a multiplex but there are so few around. If we were able to move, that would free our home up for another family to enter the market well within the first-time homeowners threshold.

We do have some concerns about the MMHI, namely:

- Parking requirement reductions: While it may be easier to develop with less parking, our experience that many Fairfield residents (including those in multi-unit buildings and walkable areas) still drive and a good number own multiple vehicles. This requires building parking and takes up street parking. Neighbourhood business hubs will also require more parking. And the cost of driving/parking has led to downtown workers parking in free residential areas. Increased parking and traffic in our neighbourhood has made it unpleasant and dangerous for kids, seniors and especially people who walk and roll. Invest in a better transit plan and parking control measures to genuinely reduce car reliance BEFORE imposing a new policy that displaces parking pressures onto the community.
- Tree cover: Retaining trees and greenery is a hugely important aspect to maintaining the health and character of our neighbourhood. Trees provide shade, oxygen, cooling and flooding protection as well as a barrier from traffic. There are numerous studies about the impacts of traffic and a lack of greenery on people, and children, in dense, urban environments, namely in lower income areas. Maintaining tree cover should be viewed as an equity policy.

Thank you for your considerations and good luck with this initiative.

Sarah Petrescu and Ashley Fernandes

[redacted]

From: Barb Hall [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:25 AM
To: Public Hearings

this is a terrible idea victoria will look like the ghettos in detroit i am a single family home owner and are areas should be kept this way if space has run out it has run out we the people who have lived here should not be forced with no say into what happens in our neiborhood thomas hall

[redacted]

From: Brent johnston [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 8:29 AM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: David Helm
Subject: Re: Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

I send this email in support of David Helm's message and ask that Council give it very close consideration. I am a condo owner in James Bay on South Turner and have been a long time Victoria resident….currently 67 years of age. During an election this is a perfect topic to be profiled, discussed, debated et al. It is far too significant a decision to be handled in any other fashion.

Brent Johnston

On Aug 1, 2022, at 4:42 PM, David Helm [redacted] > wrote:

Missing Middle Initiative, August 4th Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council

My name is David Helm. I live on Toronto Street and have lived and worked in Victoria for over 55 years.

I have seen a lot of development changes over that period of time. Some good, some bad, . . . some . . . just goofy. I do not support the "Missing Middle" initiative. After careful study, I believe it is bad for the existing residents of the city.

My observation, is that Victoria has never been a cheap place to live and often incomes are less than what could be attained in other cities in B.C and in other parts of our country. . . HOWEVER, . . . there have always been people who choose to move to Greater Victoria and be willing to possibly accept a lessor standard of living in order to enjoy the ambiance our area provides.

The "Missing Middle" proposal is an attempt to satisfy people who want to become residents, at the expense of the existing residents of our wonderful city.

This amendment to the Community Plan is not about affordability of housing but it is about the forced increase in density in our neighbourhoods.

Will having bigger buildings with more people in most places make Victorian's happier? Life better? Will the city remain high in the world's rank of best places to live?

I don't think so. The benefits of density will hit a turning point where it has a detrimental effect on quality of life. More traffic, more waste, more noise . . . it goes on and on.

I think the electorate as a whole should have a say at election time on this "Missing Middle" proposal. October 15th would be a great opportunity to give the residents a say in the development future of their city.

After the election, when a new Mayor and Council is elected and if they support the "Missing Middle" proposal, then "so be it." The people will then have spoken.

I ask this Mayor and Council to table this legislation and leave it to the new Mayor and Council to be elected on October 15th, 2022.

Thank you.

David Helm

Missing Middle Questions – Public Hearing at Council Aug. 4/22.

1. Can you not simply convert the ownership type to the envisaged concepts and keep with zoning details of single family lots in place? What analysis was done to preclude this approach?

2. What specific analysis was done in the architectural testing that precludes 3/4/5/6 unit houseplex's from being affordable/attainable builds?

3. How will the scope of variances be controlled?

4. What will maintain the integrity of Development Services and prevent project creep and bureaucratic capture?

5. What criteria will be used for the two year MM review and how would success be measured?

6. How would the public be involved in the 2 year review?

7. What, if any, was the consultation process with Traditional Neighborhoods when the decision was made to increase the mid-block height to up to 10.5 m.?

8. If there was no organized consultation, why not?

9. How does the engagement align with IAP2 standards, other civic engagements the city spokesperson spoke of in the July 4.

10. According to the Directors report this increase was a direct result of consultation with the Accessibility and developer communities only. Do I understand this correctly?

11. Is the mid-block height increase is to increase accessibility why is it not a requirement to build accessible units, only adaptable accessible units?

12. How much will it cost to convert an adaptable unit to a fully accessible unit?

13. Is there funding available for conversion?

14. What plan is in place to protect significant trees on lot lines? Boulevard trees?

15. Will you rebrand Victoria from Garden City to Surrey by the Sea?

Bob June
1310 Manor Road

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:42 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: my missing middle concerns

-----Original Message-----
From: Betsy Nuse [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 12:45 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: my missing middle concerns

Dear folks

As I read about and understand the proposed strategy, it is lacking two important elements:

* That availability of truly affordable housing is not built into this plan: as proposed, it just restructures and fast-tracks standard development proposals. Surely we (council and citizens of Victoria) could require that not everything be built for the affluent few.

* That Victoria's barely adequate urban forest is endangered by the lot crowding opportunities this new zoning if offering.

I am uneasy that staff (not council) will have the power to approve proposals directly.

I endorse the principle of increasing multi-family housing options in more of Victoria's neighbourhoods. However, in my opinion, the existing proposal leaves too much room for developer-driven construction that could leave residents with only modest means - as well as non-human life - in the dust.

respectfully

Betsy Nuse

This submission is for the Missing Middle public hearing.

My name is Dr. Bridget Ryan, I live in the Rockland neighbourhood at 1075 Verrinder, and I **strongly support the missing middle housing initiative**. My reasons for this are twofold. First, the restrictive and exclusionary zoning that we have implemented here is harming our community and environment. Expanding the types of housing that can be built in areas zoned exclusively for single family housing is a recommended, low-hanging fruit solution to begin addressing these harms. Second, I actively desire missing middle housing types and want to live in a way that reduces my environmental impact, by living car-free in multi-family housing within walking and cycling distance of employment and amenities. The lack of available housing choice is harming me and my family, and making it extremely challenging to live in accordance with my values.

The harms imposed by zoning

Though I'm trained as a neuroscientist, over the past several years I've become increasingly interested in urban design and planning, initially motivated by deep concerns about climate change. Walking through Victoria's neighbourhoods, I can see that many people here are also concerned about important issues. I often notice signs imploring us to "protect the trees", that "black and indigenous lives matter", and that "everyone deserves a family doctor". Something I have found really disheartening to learn about are the ways in which restrictive zoning has contributed to many of these crises we are currently facing.

A recently published book, called "Arbitrary Lines" by M. Nolan Grey, does a fantastic job detailing the harms imposed by restrictive and exclusive zoning. Zoning harms our community by:

1. Contributing broadly to housing unaffordability, both for buyers and renters, by making it prohibitively difficult to build a diversity of housing supply in places where there is high demand.
2. Contributing to a loss of economic productivity, by making it challenging for people with in-demand skills to live in places where their skills are needed. As a salient example from my own life, the facility that I work in is currently short staffed and struggling to hire skilled people. One of the main reasons for this: candidates are not willing to relocate here because of a lack of housing.
3. Institutionalizing racism and economic segregation. To quote M. Nolan Grey, "Zoning maintains a kind of technocratic apartheid, preserving those areas most suitable to housing for the wealthy while locking less privileged into neglected areas far from good jobs and quality public services".
4. Serving as a major driver of the climate crisis and ecosystem loss, by pushing us into sprawling patterns of development and automobile dependence. Zoning has effectively made it illegal to build more environmentally sustainable forms of urban growth, such as compact walkable neighbourhoods. Sprawl is eating away at our forests and farmlands, during a critical time when we are feeling the consequences of species diversity loss and lack of food security
5. Depriving the city of revenue needed for maintenance and public services. By forcing us into sprawl, zoning has saddled cities with infrastructure burdens they cannot afford to maintain with spread out tax bases.

One of the recommended solutions to begin addressing these problems is to legalize incremental development in the city's neighbourhoods zoned exclusively for single family detached houses to allow more diverse housing types to be built, exactly what this initiative seeks to achieve.

My desire for Missing Middle housing

I currently live in the Rockland neighbourhood, in an area zoned exclusively for single family houses. My home is a heritage house that was converted to a multifamily dwelling, it houses my household and three others. It is a wonderful home that has served me and my husband well, during the years I was a PhD student at UVic and during the years we have been developing our careers. Our unit has a private porch and entrance, it is surrounded by mature Garry oak trees and has provided us with space to tend a garden. It has allowed us to forgo vehicle ownership, saving us thousands of dollars a year, since we can walk, bike, bus and car share for all of our daily needs. We have connected with caring neighbours, some of whom have watered our garden for us when we have been away on holiday or picked up groceries for us when we were housebound with COVID. It is owned by a local couple, who care about their tenants and their community. It would currently be illegal to build in most of Victoria's neighbourhoods without lengthy and uncertain rezoning. It represents exactly the type of housing the Missing Middle initiative would allow more of in the city. Given my lived experience with Missing Middle housing, I think this would be a good thing.

One of the major challenges I now face is that my husband and I would like to start a family while continuing to live and work car-free. Our current home is far too small to accommodate a growing family. We would need to move into a larger home, of which there are few options in the city. I would like the choice of a two-bedroom unit in a houseplex, that prioritizes usable outdoor space, bike parking and car share over onsite personal vehicle storage, that allows me to remain in a place where I have employment and an established social support network.

I am also witnessing the housing struggles of my neighbours, coworkers, and friends. Some of whom are also delaying starting families due to concerns about housing while others live with the worry that they and their children will have no options for places to go if they need to move. Others have already been pushed out of the city and are saddled with escalating vehicle costs in order to commute in for work. Many of us, working professionals in our mid-thirties, are continuing to occupy housing that would be better suited for lower income folks, like students or recent grads, because we have limited options for other housing in the city we could move up into. Missing middle housing could provide us with options to raise families in the city, live close to where we work and free up smaller, older units for folks who are a step behind us in their life journey.

Closing Thoughts

Counterintuitively, if we want the demographics of our city to remain stable and healthy, we need to allow the built form to change over time, to meet the evolving needs of the people who live here. Do we not want neuroscientists, like myself, students, teachers, nurses, trades people, and doctors to be able to live and raise families here, contribute their skills to the community and their wealth to Victoria's economy? The needs of people living in Victoria now

are not the same as they were in 1981, before I was born, when Victoria's zoning regulation bylaw was put in place.

I understand that some may prefer living in neighbourhoods composed exclusively of single family detached houses and may be concerned about the way this initiative could change the neighbourhood they live in. However, I do not think we should legally enshrine this preference at the expense of other more important considerations, like housing diversity and broad affordability, economic productivity, equitability, and environmental sustainability. I think Victoria would benefit greatly from following the lead of numerous other places around the world, by allowing more diverse housing forms to be built in existing neighbourhoods.

[redacted]

From: Deborah Biddlecombe [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:02 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing August 4 public hearing 2022 Victoria BC

Dear Mayor and Council,

The definition of Missing Middle Housing as explained in Wikipedia provide interesting details.

We are a third generational family living in James Bay.
Our family was raised here, schooled here, and resides here.
We have seen many changes in James Bay over the years.

The biggest ones that concern us currently is having the supporting infrastructure to maintain these proposed changes.

Long-Improvements to infrastructure must be in place prior to any approval of the Missing Middle Housing proposal.

Concerns regarding access of emergency vehicles, ability of caregivers to provide services to their clients in an already congested area are paramount. Business owners are also being greatly affected.

Parking is currently nonexistent and the removal of further parking would be catastrophic.

Attempting to complete renovations or improvements to our own existing structures in James Bay is extremely challenging.

Contractors and businesses cannot find parking to enable completion of services.

Many visitors come to Victoria with the intent of visiting Dallas Road and the James Bay area.

I cannot see these folks coming in by bus or walking. The tourist season of buses, horse drawn carriages, kabuki cabs, have long proposed a challenge to manage safety and use of space.

Council is aware of the congestion issues, but do not appear to have a valid long-term plan to address further congestion and lack of parking which will come with further growth.

Walkable neighborhoods must include large sections of green space, and trees for natures air conditioning.

I do not support the Missing Middle Housing proposal as presented at this time and would suggest further consultation to the community with meetings within the neighborhood to address concerns of all.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Deborah Biddlecombe,
404–420 Parry St., Victoria BC
V8V 2H7

[redacted]

From: mail.victoriastamp.com [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:26 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative Public Hearing on August 4, 2022

. DNNDIB!. D?? @!*IDD<DQ@!1P=GD>!) @<MDIB

In the middle of the summer, after a long weekend, after two years of relative isolation, of having lived through the Covid-19 pandemic when everyone is longing to get-away, to socialize, to live again, to have time off during a warm summer, the City Council is considering a public hearing on a momentous policy, that, whatever its merits, is complex, far-reaching, and will forever change the neighbourhoods that comprise this City.

I have little faith that the Missing Middle Initiative is good policy. I believe that it is ill-conceived, poorly designed, overly complex, and, that it will not achieve its stated goals.

Here is the financial analysis done by the City's own advisors, Coriolis Consulting. Based on the 'hope' that this up-zoning will not increase the value of all the properties affected, the success of this initiative is 'marginal'.

Where are the extra parks, the public squares, the larger schools, the villages along the corridors, the better transportation networks? Well, here again, Coriolis suggests that there is simply not enough to provide much in public amenities. So much 'quid' for the developers, so little 'quo' for Victoria.

We need a better plan. Good policy takes time; while bad policy is always rushed, especially when a time is chosen to make a decision when fewer people will be paying attention. This policy is flawed, will achieve little of its aspirations, and the social consequences of it are unknown.

One of Shakespeare's greatest tragedies captured this dilemma of "bold action in the dark" in Macbeth's famous soliloquy as he considers the assassination of his guest, his King - a vile act breaking all societal norms. It underlines the speed that precedes his disgraceful act - and how thoroughly things go wrong. This famous phrase springs to mind whenever something important or controversial is done with too much haste, and, in this instance, with as little public attention as possible.

"If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well / It were done quickly."

I encourage you to NOT go forward with the Missing Middle Initiative.

Don Cal

1059 Pentrelew Place

Victoria, B.C.

[redacted]

From: mail.victoriastamp.com [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:32 PM
To: Public Hearings; Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: The Missing Middle Initiative - Contradictory Goals.

The Missing Middle Initiative - Contradictory Goals.

I've often wondered how I could possibly change someone's mind about their worldview. How do I break the cognitive dissonance that compels people to persist in their beliefs when their beliefs are not based on fact, nor evidence? What compels people to believe that by simply building more housing of any type, affordable housing will be created? Somehow, families of all types will find housing that is accessible, possibly affordable, as if by magic.

This is the theory of supply and demand. Increase supply and prices will fall. Sadly, our housing supply is not a simple consumer good like widgets or pins. Housing cannot be mass produced in an assembly line and exported to a wider and wider market, lessening the cost of production per unit and creating more profit. Then, flood the market of competitors to drive them out of business, eventually creating a monopoly, or a multi-opoly, where only a few large suppliers control the market and the prices. But, that's the mobile phone network in Canada, or the Baby formula market in the USA, isn't it?

The Missing Middle Initiative is based on the simple assumption that if we make it easier for the building industry to build more, by eliminating one step in the process, then, miraculously, housing of all types will become affordable, well, more accessible, at least. Housing will no longer be a financial asset class controlled by single-housing investors who already control 33 1/3% of all housing in Canada. It will not be over-priced by luxury additions, multiple bathrooms, granite countertops, walk-in closets, exotic flooring, state-of-the-art appliances, high-tech enhancements, etc. That 7.25% of housing in Victoria will not remain officially 'vacant' according to StatsCan. That all will be well. Who could possibly believe that large corporations would buy older stock multiple-unit housing, renovate and raise the rents? (Sorry, I'm getting carried away, again.)

In my search for solving the cognitive dissonance dilemma, I started to read Milton Friedman, a renowned economist, a Nobel Prize winner. To quote Milton Freidman, "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits…**a company has no social responsibility to the public or society; its only responsibility is to its shareholders**."

Could this underlying purpose of business possibly convince enough councilors to understand what the Missing Middle Initiative will really accomplish? To a builder, building housing is a profitable enterprise. The MMI will provide business with more profit. Eliminating the rezoning requirements will save time as well as lessening their costs. Lessening the requirements like parking, community amenities, will also lessen costs, and by consequence, increase profits. Of course, nothing says that they will not ask for more up-zoning to increase its profits. This is suggested in the financial analysis of the MMI. The experts hint at the possibility that the incentive to participate may not be enough to make the policy successful; that more (up-zoning) will be needed.

By contrast, creating housing of all types, for all families, that is financial accessible (let's dare say, affordable), is a social need. We have increasingly relied on the private sector to provide housing for us, at their own risk. Government has largely abandoned its previous strong presence as an active participant in the housing sector over the last 30 years. (Read the Union of B.C. Municipalities report for 2018 [redacted]

It is easy to see that the goals of the private housing sector and the local government are at odds with each other. One might say, contradictory. Yet, we continue to follow the private sector's requests in the belief that like widgets, increasing supply will lessen prices. And, despite our best wishes, housing continues to be unattainable for an increasing number of our citizens. What is wrong? In our partnership with the private housing sector, the facts continue to contradict our hopes. Why do we continue down this path?

The market is filled with investors and financial corporations that take advantage of our willful blindness in creating public policy that caters to their requests. We know that their goals are contradictory to ours. We also know their expertise is available at a market price. Just like the UBCM advises, the government, at all levels, should get back into the business of building affordable housing in a demonstrable way. Build a lot of it. Continue to re-invest the proceeds in more affordable housing. Let the private sector compete with itself in the luxury sector at their own risk, or work on contracts to build more real affordable housing.

I will use Milton Friedman's dictum for business and apply it to government. **A government has social responsibility for its citizens, not to business. Its only responsibility is to its citizens. Good policy benefits all its citizens, not just one sector. Govern well.**

I ask you to NOT go forward with the Missing Middle Initiative.

Don Cal

1059 Pentrelew Place.

Victoria, B.C.

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:37 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Initiative August 4th, 2022

From: mail.victoriastamp.com [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:16 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative August 4th, 2022

The Irony of the Missing Middle Initiative

The Missing Middle Initiative is focused on the wrong problem. Builders are not in financial distress. They do not need more government assistance in boosting their profits. The MMI does not compel builders to lessen prices, to build modest units or buildings to a high standard without luxury additions. It does not limit buyers to only those people who will actually live in the housing units created. It does not compel investors, who already own one third of all single-housing in Canada, to stop bidding on MMI-built housing. Nor, does it compel these investors to lessen the 7.25% of all housing that is vacant in Victoria. (That's 3,850 housing units, according to StatsCan.)

What this Initiative is Missing is a plan that will actually work, has worked in the past, and will continue to work in the future. Build housing for all family types using a public Housing Investment Fund from direct government money and private investment in housing bonds. Hire developers and contractors to build exactly what is needed: modest, affordable housing for all family types including condominiums, townhouses, quadplexes, etc.

To lower the cost for the owners or occupants still further, the government could continue to own the land on a 99-year lease. This in lieu of a down-payment.

Divest ownership to a housing co-op for multi-unit housing, or direct sale on a thirty-year mortgage at market rates. Use the mortgage income and the early-sale tax to invest in yet more properties.

Here are some ideas to consider for this housing program:

- Only people who will live in the housing will qualify.

- Do not allow rentals of any kind.
- Maintain ownership of the mortgage, just like a bank,
- And take a good percentage of any profit in value over the rate of inflation on a sliding scale, (let's call it an early-sale tax), on any property sold before the 30 years is up in lieu of down-payment.
- The longer the owner holds the property, the less early-sale tax payable, reaching zero at the end of the 30 years.
- Once someone has sold their interest in this type of housing they will not be able to buy this type of housing again. However, they will be able to transfer their equity to another location, if they do not take it in cash.

This will become a ladder for people to build their wealth. Equity can be built over time, without real-estate flipping. As with any mortgage holder, the Building Fund will use due care and caution to ensure that properties are maintained and rent or mortgage payments made.

Getting back into the business of building affordable housing of all types after a 30-year hiatus will have a demonstrably positive effect on the housing market. It will counter the escaling price spiral caused by investors who control an unbelievable 33 1/3% market share of the single-housing market, according to StatsCan. It is one step in steadily eroding housing and financial inequity.

Relying on the private sector to satisfy our social needs was a bad policy some thirty years ago. It remains a bad policy. It will always be a bad policy.

To quote Milton Freidman, "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits…**a company has no social responsibility to the public or society; its only responsibility is to its shareholders**."

The Missing Middle Initiative seeks to up-scale the zoning throughout Victoria's residential areas in an effort to encourage business to build more housing of all types at an accessible price. One of the greatest ironies of this policy will be that those who already own houses will become wealthier, while those who do not own houses will become poorer. The result of the MMI policy will be to make housing even less accessible and less affordable. Trust me, the building sector will prosper.

I encourage you to NOT go forward with the Missing Middle Initiative.

Don Cal

1059 Pentrelew Place

Victoria, B.C.

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Initiative Public Hearing on August 4, 2022

From: mail.victoriastamp.com [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 1:16 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative Public Hearing on August 4, 2022

Missing Middle Initiative Public Hearing

In the middle of the summer, after a long weekend, after two years of relative isolation, of having lived through the Covid-19 pandemic when everyone is longing to get-away, to socialize, to live again, to have time off during a warm summer, the City Council is considering a public hearing on a momentous policy, that, whatever its merits, is complex, far-reaching, and will forever change the neighbourhoods that comprise this City.

I have little faith that the Missing Middle Initiative is good policy. I believe that it is ill-conceived, poorly designed, overly complex, and, that it will not achieve its stated goals.

Here is the financial analysis done by the City's own advisors, Coriolis Consulting. Based on the 'hope' that this up-zoning will not increase the value of all the properties affected, the success of this initiative is 'marginal'.

Where are the extra parks, the public squares, the larger schools, the villages along the corridors, the better transportation networks? Well, here again, Coriolis suggests that there is simply not enough to provide much in public amenities. So much 'quid' for the developers, so little 'quo' for Victoria.

We need a better plan. Good policy takes time; while bad policy is always rushed, especially when a time is chosen to make a decision when fewer people will be paying attention. This policy is flawed, will achieve little of its aspirations, and the social consequences of it are unknown.

One of Shakespeare's greatest tragedies captured this dilemma of "bold action in the dark" in Macbeth's famous soliloquy as he considers the assassination of his guest, his King - a vile act breaking all societal norms. It underlines the speed that precedes his disgraceful act - and how thoroughly things go wrong. This famous phrase springs to mind whenever something important

or controversial is done with too much haste, and, in this instance, with as little public attention as possible.

“If it were done when ‘tis done, then ‘twere well / It were done quickly.”

I encourage you to NOT go forward with the Missing Middle Initiative.

Don Cal

1059 Pentrelew Place

Victoria, B.C.

[redacted]

From: Dave Davies [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 12:00 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: "Missing Middle" Housing

What the city is calling "missing middle" housing is far from it.

I challenge the mayor and council to pull up a mortgage calculator and a decent house in one of the regions. I live in Fairfield, so let's use that.

As of this writing there's a 3 bed, 2 bath, 2 kitchen, 2,058 sq ft home at 660 Richardson on the market for $1,249,000. Let's even set aside that 2 groups couple live in it, and settle on it being a good fit for a family that needs a 2 bedroom and a 1 bedroom. Maybe they have a 20 year old who can't afford to move out because rents are crazy-high in victoria despite the growing number of condos and the ejecting of vacation rentals (who could have seen this coming right?)

At any rate, if you put 10% down ($125k) at 5% interest you'd be looking at monthly payments of $6,543 plus $415 for taxes for a total of $6,958/mth.

Remember, 3 bed, 2 bath and 2 kitchens - with a yard for the kids to play in.

Now, let's look at one of these so-called "missing middle" homes. Let's take the unity at 118-1720 Fairfield (so on a busy street, but next to a park so a trade) which went for $1,199,000 and is a 3 bed, 3 bath, 1732 sq ft without a yard.

Assuming the person also puts down 10% (120k) at 5%, their monthly is $6,275 plus about the same in taxes I'm sure (a bit cheaper so let's call is $400) and then we get to add on a $528 strata fee.

So here's now "missing middle" work out:

What we have now all-in: $6,958.
What you are proposing all-in: $7,203.

SO not only do these new homes cost more, there's no room for the actual middle to put in any improvements over time to increase the value.

It's just a bad bad bad idea.

I think you know that too.

Dave Davies

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:30 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Written comment in support of MMHI

As a young resident of subsidized housing, I have had a comfortable life under my parents roof. Yet for the next stage in our lives to begin, we must throw ourselves into an unaffordable hellscape, where you have the choice of either debt or zero free time. To those who are not aware of this reality: $1000 for a bedroom is now an acceptable market rate. I have already accepted the fact I cannot enter the housing market in this city.

Although townhouses and houseplex units may not be affordable to my demographic, I support this initiative because the housing market is an ecosystem. Some of the families in our subsidized complex could afford market housing, but prefer to stay in a townhouse because there's virtually no choice in the market. Missing Middle housing means more comfortable, accessible, versatile homes that are attainable to many in the city. They're attainable to people who currently take up more affordable rentals, freeing these up for people lower down, all the way down the ladder. The effect of "filtering" is a statistically proven phenomenon that has an immediate impact on markets.

In plain english, more market housing means more affordable housing. Opposing new housing seals our fate as a stagnating retirement city with no opportunities for the next generation. Even many of our retirees not blessed with land struggle to pay their increasing rent on a fixed income.

The MMHI is about fairness. 70% of our land should not be reserved for the wealthy. Those who are not personally impacted by this crisis should not gatekeep the city from those who are. Let us in, or continue paying higher property taxes to police away those of us who end up on the streets.

[redacted]

From: Gloria Back [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:26 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Initiative August 4 Council Agenda Item

Mayor and Council,

The Missing Middle Initiative is too big and too important to go a public hearing in the middle of summer and 2 months before a municipal election. This is disrespectful to residents. While consultations have been ongoing for many months, the proposed initiative has changed significantly since it was originally introduced to the public; what was proposed last year is not what is being proposed now.

Furthermore, I recommend that the project, if and when it is approved, should be rolled out incrementally, perhaps in one neighbourhood first, and then evaluated before full implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria Back
1005 Joan Crescent

Submission to Public Hearing — August 4, 2022 — Missing Middle

Irwin Henderson — 158 Medana Street

I would like to focus on 3 brief points, followed by a 5-point Action Plan.

1. MM is market-driven and market-priced, and will not provide realistic housing options for our necessary health, fire, and other workers as desired.

Fairfield, Rockland, and James Bay are the target neighbourhoods.

But take a look at the market in action right now:

- rental unit in a 2018 4-plex in Fairfield — $4500 month
- brand-new townhouse, Rockland —sold for $2 million
- a tear-down on a large Fairfield lot, replaced within existing zoning with one of the most expensive houses in the city.

I ask you: how many nurses (at $38 per hour base-rate) will be attracted to the city by these prices? Or the fire-fighters we want to recruit?

***Bottom Line*. Affordability needs to be built in to any future MM to be successful.**

2. **Who just said this?** ***". . . investors buying up low-end-of-market buildings should be setting off alarm bells. . . . . that's a very quick and easy way to erode naturally occurring affordability,"*** Any guesses? Step forward, Mayor Helps!

I live in James Bay, on a street of 18 houses. All would be eligible for MM. Nine of them have rental suites; 4 are multi-generational family-occupied.

You can easily imagine the impact of replacing these houses with new-built "plexes" — forcing existing tenants into one of the most expensive rental markets in the country.

***Bottom Line*: Include suites in existing houses as a key part of the Housing Strategy — they should be recognised and fostered for what they do — bringing Density, Affordability and Diversity without Destruction.**

3. Missing Middle Initiative has been overtaken by events:

The big social divide now is between people who already own a home and the rest who don't. Housing became a target for investors, who see their role as "getting the maximum value from land."

Starting with the rise in interest rates and the cooling of the market, we are in the process of rapidly changing our thinking from "the market will provide," to protecting more people from the market and to providing non-market solutions for many more people than before.

You on council have been active in recognising this shift, especially with the Housing Report just in:

- Cllrs Dubow and Isitt propose to meet with Murray Rankin
- Cll Isitt proposes reducing the incentive for McMansions by adjusting the residential zoning entitlement
- Cllr Loveday wants to explore the regulatory possibilities to control REITS (who will be behind MM townhouses)
- Mayor Helps strongly endorsed Min Eby's push to develop the Douglas Corridor for more housing
- Cllr Loveday urges pushing senior governments to help municipalities protect existing rental stock.

My recommended 5-point Action Plan:

1. Recognise that the housing climate has changed dramatically.

2. Learn from all the input at today's public hearings.

3. Rationalise and integrate MM with the variety of other housing objectives, programs and actions to update the Housing Strategy. Include suites in existing houses.

4. Set up a Housing Dash-board of key indicators so that you (and the public) can follow all the moving parts month-by-month.

5. *Bottom Line:* If you want to take immediate action, DON'T approve the Missing Middle Initiative in its present form.

Thank you very much for your consideration of these points.

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing middle

From: Janet Borlase [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 8:53 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing middle

Dear Mayor and Council...

Do you seek a bit of refuge, in this warmer weather, from the shade of trees? As you walk along our city sidewalks, perhaps you enjoy the cooling effect? I sure do!

I appreciate our city trees even more now. It's hard to see so many stumps these days as I walk by construction sites.

Sure we need more housing, but existing healthy trees are important, too.

Sincerely,
Janet Borlase
James Bay resident since 1998

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:40 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Housing

From: goodlight shawca [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 12:04 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Stephen Andrew (Councillor) <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

Hello Mayor and Councillors

How do you plan to limit the purchases to Victorians only?

Those missing middle housing you plan on building will be filled with people from Alberta, Ontario and the other provinces.....guaranteed.

For about 10 years the constant cry from City Hall has been to Build Build Build and yet we are in worst shape in all regards!

You can not build your way out of a problem.....building more will ALWAYS lead to NEEDING more.

Regards,
Jean Siemens

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:38 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle

-----Original Message-----
From: Kate Lawes [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle

Hello,

I want to voice my support for the Missing Middle Housing plan. I have watched as you have respectfully looked at what it takes to make this happen for our City. I appreciate that you are taking the environment into account with these new designs keeping green spaces and trees where ever possible.
This new policy 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.

Thank you,

Kate Lawes
1112 Reno Street
Victoria, BC
V9A 4B6

[redacted]

From: KAREN LEDGER [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:04 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: TREES

Hello Mayor and Council
I am aghast to learn that you are considering removing more trees from properties, to cram housing onto lots in Victoria. Given the ongoing promise to PLANT MORE TREEs and the knowledge that the tree canopy can reduce heat in the city by many degrees, there MUST be more focus on planting. For multi-plexes this may mean underground parking or LESS Units or smaller footprint on the lot to allow for Trees.

Thank you for including this Urgent Message in your Council discussion.
As you know we have had a number of unprecedented heat domes and hot days and are told this will only increase!
TREES Save Lives!

Respectfully,
Karen E Ledger
1756 Gonzales Avenue

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:41 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Re missing middle public hearing.

-----Original Message-----
From: Katrina Madsen [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:48 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re missing middle public hearing.

Dear,
Mayor Lisa Helps and Members of Council

I am very concerned that on our push for housing in Victoria we are forgetting about the importance of our wildlife and climate.

It is very important that we begin to think slow to no growth or we will end up like other cities (hot and barren and overcrowded) As it is we cannot support our population right now- doctors housing etc.

I have seen many wildlife corridors lost and green spaces that help cool the city. We need to think differently and include vacant lots that contain vegetation as an important protection for wildlife and our own health as well. If we want to develop then do it in an already cemented area like a parking lot we can not remove any more green spaces. That includes vacant lots

Recent loss of green space and increased development is beginning to look like the route Vancouver took years ago but that city is now correcting it and returning land back to nature. We can add housing without the traditional methods of ripping apart green space (vacant lots that have been reclaimed) or cementing an entire lot.

We need to think tree corridors, wildlife corridors. How does a raccoon navigate the space around this development does it have a safe place to rest. If we think this way we will also help each other to live in a healthier city.
Please do not give the decisions to the developers. Do not make decisions because of finance. Make decisions for our future.
Thanks for all that you do

Katrina Madsen

1018 Clare st
Victoria, BC
[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Mayor and Council - August 4, 2022

My name is Lisa Hebb, my current address is 3-977 Convent Place (on the Downtown and Fairfield border), and over the last 40 years, I have resided, worked, and raised a family in the Victoria area. I send this letter with a multitude of thoughts running through my mind about our city, from density and livability, to affordability and diversity, to our carbon footprint, to how lucky we are to live here. Over the last few years, I have been following the many Development issues before the Victoria City Council and I must say this has been an immense challenge for Council and a time of rapid change in Victoria.

The Missing Middle Housing Initiative (MMHI) is a complex issue. As an inner city townhouse owner, I have been pleased over the past year or so to see the MMHI enter the housing conversation. We love our community of 10 townhouses, and I have been encouraged over the last little while to see new builds like the 6 unit 'Shafer' on Southgate, and the new fourplexes at 2212 Cook and 247 Government. More of this would be great if we must replace the older, affordable rentals and homes we are losing in Victoria. On our street, Convent Place, where zoning is for up to 6 storeys, we would welcome a MMHI build where two single family homes will soon go. And maybe such a move would be a middle ground on this whole MMHI issue. But Developers say Middle Missing Housing is not financially feasible.

We are all aware Victoria has one of the lowest birth rates in Canada, that young families and older, longtime Victoria residents are having to leave the city, that Victoria is growing much, much faster than expected, and that Real Estate Investment Trusts are flooding into Victoria replacing once local owners/corporations. So is the MMHI a solution to maintaining the livability and diversity in our city? I do feel unsettled about rescinding existing Official Community Plans to accommodate the MMHI. Yes, less red tape like Victoria now has for non-profit housing projects would speed MMHI developments along. And yes the MMHI would share the pressure for more housing beyond the urban core to the whole community. Do I believe proceeding with the MMHI will address affordability in Victoria? No.

I read somewhere in the public input on this issue of MMHI that 'Victoria can't be everything to everyone.', true, and I personally feel the money coming into this city is doing a lot of the talking. So how do we provide a chance to keep Victorians in Victoria? With reservation, to maintain diversity and livability in this growing city, I vote to take a middle road, that being moving forward with the MMHI.

Thank you for all you do.

[redacted]

From: Miranda Andrews [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:43 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Hello,

I am emailing in favour of the missing middle housing initiative. I am a homeowner living in the Fairfield-Gonzales neighbourhood, with my husband and our young son. We were fortunate to be able to buy in this neighbourhood in late 2016, and have since seen property values escalate beyond what is reasonable with very little in terms of additional housing supply or housing options available.

We live close to the Rhodo development, which has just recently opened for occupancy. Friends of ours were able to buy in the Rhodo and without that development would not be able to afford to live and raise their family in Fairfield. While I know the Missing Middle Initiative isn't focused on housing affordability, there is something to be said for options other than single family housing that is slightly more affordable.

Additionally, we are living in a climate emergency. Single family housing requires way more space and is less environmentally friendly than dense housing options and developments. We need dense, walkable neighbourhoods that are linked to transit and active transportation networks if we wish to support our city through climate change. The current zoning does not support this.

I hope Council approves this Initiative so Victoria residents have more housing options available to them outside of single family homes.

Kind Regards,
Miranda Andrews

[redacted]

From: Mary Davies [redacted] >
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:44 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: CORRECTION!!! - Fwd: Missing Middle Housing Initiative Feedback for public hearing

Hello, please delete the email that I just sent (forwarded below) I had an error in it.

This should be my submission:

My concerns:

The use of the term "Single Family Home" is misleading.

- Do you have the stats on the actual number of families living in a SFH city wide?
- Do you know how many "Single Family Homes" house multiple adults co-living or multi generational families?
- Without these statistics it's very presumptive to assume that a detached home is housing a "single family"

How many rental homes have been lost to densified developments thus far and how many will be?

- Do you have these stats?
- Do you have a prediction of how many renters would be displaced by this initiative?
- Without this information you cannot make an informed decision on this issue.
- Densified developments have displaced multiple "SFH" renters in my neighbourhood already.

Densification does not offer affordability or better economic outcomes.

- The price per sq. ft in these new densified developments are much higher than a "single family home".
- When you consider strata fees the pricing only worsens.
- New builds offer no ability to build sweat equity.
- These new builds do not offer space to house more than one family (they are truly a single family home) and no room for those who work from home to do so.

A bit about me:

I am a long time renter in the Gonzales neighbourhood. I have rented the "single family home" I live in for over a decade and live here as a multi generational family with 3 adults who live here working from home. The "single family home" beside me is also a rental that houses multiple adults. This neighbourhood also houses multiple other family members of mine and has since the 60s.

I see the "Missing Middle Housing" initiative to be a huge threat to affordability city wide and I predict it would hurt renters like myself the most. It threatens co-living homes and multi-generational living homes.

The proposed "missing middle home" is in fact one that is too small for anything more than a single family to live in ... which is what this initiative intends to blanket the city with.

Please consider the harm that this blanket rezoning will do to families like mine and say NO to approving the Missing Middle Housing initiative.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mary Davies
1615 Fairfield Rd.
Victoria, BC

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 2:41 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: missing middle is missing something

To Mayor and Counci,

I am submitting this plea because I am very concerned about the possibility that Missing Middle will remove community input from the development application process. Something is indeed missing from 'missing middle'. Developers do not care about our communities, affordable housing, or the natural environment—those are the "missing" concerns of allowing unfettered development. Communities know their neighbourhood: traffic patterns, valued trees, pedestrian and cyclist experience, etc. and the City should continue to welcome their input.

Developers responsibilities are to create profit and their responsibilities end upon completion of a project. Meanwhile a community is left to deal with the long-term effects of ill-conceived plans, which might include loss of trees, loss of privacy, vehicle congestion, etc.

I trust you will hear from more citizens who share these concerns. Few development proposals are for middle to low-income buyers, so why give developers a leg-up by giving them special treatment, i.e. do not put the fox in charge of the hen house. Let us please hang on to neighbourhood consultation.

Housing is a province-wide concern, so if we want true affordability, we should look to the Province for support, such as the co-op style rental housing we had in the 1970s. That is truly affordable and long-term housing. I would welcome this in my community.

Thank you for listening.

M Genton

[redacted]

From: Mike [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 4:33 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Missing middle

Please register my opposition to this initiative. At the very least it should be postponed until after the civic elections.
Yours Truly
Michael Kynaston

Sent from my iPad

[redacted]

From: Mark Stephenson [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:43 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Public Hearings
Cc: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Stephen Andrew (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor)
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative Public Hearing Feedback

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to show my full support for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative at this weeks public hearing. This will be a huge benefit to the city, it's residents, and as well as future residents who wish to call Victoria home. The housing crisis is something we are all connected to, and this will be an important piece towards helping to solve it. It will help with the city's response to climate change by creating more walkable neighbourhoods, decreasing our reliance on cars, as well as limiting the continued sprawl in the West Shore.

It will be a tremendous benefit to families like ours. My wife and I currently live in a 2 bedroom condo in Fernwood, where we will be expecting our first child next month. At this stage in our life, the condo fits our needs, but we will soon outgrow it. We would love to have a third bedroom to house my wife's parents to help with childcare in the early stages, and we would eventually like to have a second child, but it would be quite tight to house a family of four in a 2 bedroom home. My wife is a nurse at the BC Cancer Agency, and numerous colleagues of hers have moved elsewhere in BC and Canada solely due to the cost of housing in this region. These are exactly the type of people we need to make homes for, and who we need in this city. There are surely many, many families like ours, dual income households and families who are simply shut out of suitable housing in the city.

I was born in the region, and love this city, and desperately want to raise my child here. But even with the two of us working full time, myself at the University of Victoria, and my wife as a nurse, we cannot afford a detached house to raise our family. A townhome or houseplex unit under the Missing Middle Housing Initiative would be perfect – it would provide room for our growing family, and allow us to remain in the city. Otherwise, we will likely have to leave the city as well.

I also wanted to discuss two common reasons I have seen in the community as reasons to not move ahead with this initiative. One of the themes I have seen constantly debated ahead of the public hearing, is that these won't be affordable, so why build them. In 2018, the median income in Victoria for a full time worker was $65,000, and that number is likely closer to $70,000 today. If there is a household comprised of two full time workers, earning only a bit more than the median full time earnings, they would definitely be in a place to afford one of these new homes. These homes aren't exclusively for the wealthy, as some people believe. Additionally, if these families were able to move up the property ladder, there would be less competition at the lower end of the housing bracket, such as 2 bedroom condos, improving housing affordability for many, many other households. Would this be affordable to everyone? No. But there are a lot of households in this region who would benefit.

Lastly, I've seen worries about potential displacement of renters under this new program, which is definitely something to worry about. However, there is nothing preventing displacement under the status quo. If a homeowner decides to sell their rental home right now, and the new buyer constructs a new detached home in its place, those renters are still being displaced. It seems as if everyday I see posts on community Facebook pages from families who are facing eviction under this exact scenario, and begging for help to find new housing. Displacement would likely occur under Missing Middle, but at least there would be a more housing stock to help.

I really appreciate you taking the time to listen to City of Victoria residents, and thank you for including us in this process.

Kind regards,

Mark Stephenson
Victoria BC

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing to you to express my concerns around the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.

I know that some of the council has stated that there has been extensive public consultation, I would disagree, the majority of my neighbourhood knows little to nothing abour what is being proposed. This is a much too important issue to not have the citizens of Victoria informed and knowledgable about what is being proposed.

I would also state that the city of Victoria does not know what the actual results of this initiative will be. While the term Missing Middle is a catchy term it is very ill defined. It is like a huge experiment if being proposed with the citizens of Victoria being the victims if the experiment fails. The city of Victoria has some deep information gaps when it comes to the MMHI.

- The city of Victoria does not know how many single family dwellings house multiple families.
- No information on how many families in Victoria desire homes with more than 2 bedrooms.
- Given the profit margin demanded by developers Missing Middle Town Homes will be too expensive for the average Victoria family. This is exactly what has happened with the Aryze Rhodo over development on Fairfield Road.
- Wealthy out of towners will bid up the price of any new housing, that is how capitalism works.
- Victoria can never build enough housing to satisfy the world wide demand for those wanting to move to Victoria.
- The MMHI will not in any way guarantee that the housing will be affordable for middle income people.
- There is no concrete protection for renters who are renovicted due to this initiative.
- The city of Victoria has no idea on how many townhouses will be built over the

next 5 years what or the cost of those townhouses.

- There will be a significant loss of trees and green spaces under this initiative at a time when we should be expanding our urban forests.

I could keep listing what is not known about the MMHI but I will stop here. Please delay this intiative to give us all more time to more accurately determine what the results will be.

Nic Humphreys, 167 Passmore St., Victoria, BC

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:37 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Keep many trees with Missing Middle

From: Roberta Clair [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Keep many trees with Missing Middle

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please don't forget the trees now standing when you decide about the missing middle, or you could find that what is missing is the cooling, shading, aesthetic, carbon capturing, air purifying and bird singing urban forest.

Please make sure that the housing is truly affordable, we need so much more affordable housing.

Roberta

—
Roberta Clair
[redacted]
Victoria

[redacted]

From: Susan Evans [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:58 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: letter in opposition to currently proposed MMI

I would like to express opposition to the Missing Middle initiative in its current form. I believe there has not been enough public consultation and the consultation that was done was based on a different plan than the one under consideration now. More work needs to be done before changing the face of Victoria.

It is only very recently that new details have emerged and been made public. 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.

It also doesn't appear to address issues around affordability - anything built will sell for $1 million or more, which doesn't fall into the realm of affordability.
and the protection for renters seems sketchy at best.

It seems that this initiative is being pushed through without allowing a thoughtful and consultative approach - why the rush? If it really is right for the city, taking more time to consult with the public and come up with a plan that works for everyone is the right approach.

Susan Evans
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: August 2, 2022 11:37 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Housing

From: SHELBY PARKINSON [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Missing Middle Housing

I am writing to give my support to this proposal and hope that it will pass on Thursday. It is a start but an important start. I live in the North Park area and am fortunate to own a strata. I would welcome more density! Let's be one of the cities in Canada that is proudly trying to get real action on housing for all.

Shelby Parkinson

[redacted]

From: Virginia Erick [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 2:44 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Public Hearings
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am sorry that I am unable to attend the Public Hearing for the Missing Middle Housing Initiative.
I disagree with the initiative primarily because it is incomplete, staff needs more time to answer unresolved issues, including protecting the existing Urban Forest while adding affordable housing for an inclusive city.

Here in the City of Victoria we have essential climate mitigation in place, in the form of a mature tree canopy.
Missing Middle does not protect that existing Urban Forest.

Currently a Protected Garry Oak Tree can be removed from any property development and Missing Middle development will cover more property, removing more trees.

- building envelope, cut down

-property access, cut down

-utilities corridor, cut down

Missing Middle needs to protect bylaw protected trees on private property by asking, Can the building plans be designed with the preservation of trees in mind?

Planting a new tree is not the same as preserving a mature tree.

Thank you for your consideration,
Virginia Errick
615 Foul Bay Rd.
Victoria BC

Sent from my iPad

[redacted]

From: William Owen [redacted]
Sent: August 2, 2022 12:06 PM
To: mayorandcouncillor@cityofvictoria.ca; Public Hearings
Subject: I support the Missing Middle Housing Initiative

Good afternoon,

I am writing to support the missing middle housing initiative. I support it because it will allow people who work at BC's largest employers, namely the public service, Royal Jubilee Hospital, and the University of Victoria, to live near where they work. Currently, housing near these employers is overwhelmingly single family housing, which, at a median price of 1.3 million dollars, is out of reach for people who work near these homes.

Focing three-quarters of the city's housing to be multi-million dollar homes sends the message that Victoria is a place for the idle rich who earn their value by sitting on desirable land and not sharing it, while the people who do all of the actual work to keep the city running are to be bussed in at the start of the work day, then forced back to the suburbs when the workday ends. If they're lucky, these workers can live in a basement where they can pay off the taxes and mortgage of an idle landowner, who will likely find some way to kick them out if they choose to have children.

My partner is a nurse at Royal Jubilee, and I work at the University of Victoria. We currently live in an older duplex in Fernwood, and in the past we have owned a strata in the suburbs. We moved to our current location because we wanted to cut down on our commutes and start a family. This meant that we realistically needed a three bedroom house with some outdoor space. Even then, Victoria's real estate market seemed uniquely unsuited to our needs: the vast majority of real estate was either one or two bedroom condos or multi-million dollar single family homes with more than five bedrooms. We were able to find quite a few houseplexes and townhomes, including newly built ones, which roughly fit our needs, but the number of bidders made securing these homes extremely difficult. Our realtor would often tell us that we had the bad luck to be looking for the kind of home which everyone in the city wanted, but which the city refused to build.

I'm under no illusions that this initiative will solve all of Victoria's housing problems: it will need to be supplemented by social housing and low income housing to deal with the most dire consequence of Victoria's housing shortage, homelessness. But it will allow early to mid-career professionals a chance to live in James Bay, Fairfield, Rocklands, Fernwood, and Oaklands, where they are currently locked out of the market. Closing these neighborhoods to new residents has led to all of the development in the city being concentrated in low income areas like Vic West and Rock Bay, which leads to the majority of the displacement of low-income and disabled renters that has caused homelessness in Victoria.

Allowing whole sections of the city to simply opt out of their responsibility to house new or displaced members of the community has had disastrous consequences for the city as a whole. Missing Middle homes will allow new working professionals to be housed in communities that are currently economically segregated without having to resort to the high-density projects that wealthy landowners and landlords find so objectionable. Perhaps allowing a few new duplexes in the neighborhood will allow them to see that some added density is not bad for their communities, which will temper some of their opposition to the more drastic housing solutions the city and province need to do to end homelessness in our region.

Finally, as a researcher at the University, it's worth pointing out that the vast majority of peer reviewed research has shown that loosening zoning regulations and shortening the length of time it takes to build new housing tempers and lowers the cost of housing. Been et. al.'s "Supply Skepticism: Housing Supply and Affordability" conducts a survey of research on the common objections to using zoning reform to address the housing crisis, and fount the following:

(a) concerns about the higher cost of multi-family land have little impact on the final cost of housing,

(b) inducing demand by building more housing does not counteract the affordability benefits of having more houses on the market,

(c) land zoned for multi-family buildings are no more likely to be used for luxury housing than land zoned for single family homes

(d) new buildings by themselves tend to only increase rent in the short term, but the greater availability of rentals after building is complete tends to counteract this effect

This is over and above the conclusive research that single family homes are environmentally inefficient, induce car dependency, tend to be less accessible to people with disabilities, exacerbates the economic and racial segregation in cities, and reduces economic productivity in employement centres. All of these things run contrary to the values of most Victorians, yet they are the values that govern how we use three quarters of the city's land. That needs to be changed.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Will