



Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners' Association

www.shpoa.ca

桑拿斯業主會

The SHPOA Board of Directors has become increasingly concerned about the erosion of homeowner property rights in Vancouver. Of particular concern is the City's Character Home Zoning Review which looks at options for the retention of character homes in single-family (RS) zoning districts everywhere in Vancouver.

At the last of the four open houses, which the City hosted, SHPOA was prevented from handing out an information sheet outlining the issues as we perceive them. The information is as follows:

The City of Vancouver is considering re-zoning properties in the following areas: **West Point Grey/Upper Kitsilano, Dunbar/Kerrisdale/Second Shaughnessy/Third Shaughnessy and parts of Arbutus Ridge, parts of Riley Park/Cambie Village/Kensington, Hastings, and part of Grandview**. The City's plan seems to be that, in these areas, there will be penalties attached to building new houses, in the form of square footage, such as reducing the current zoning's 0.7 FSR to 0.4 FSR (for lot size > 8,000. Sf) and 0.5 FSR (for lot size < 8,000. Sf). This applies to **both** pre- and post-1940 houses, namely **ALL** new construction in these areas. Incentives, in the form of increased square footage, allowances for a Multiple Conversion Dwelling (MCD), laneway house or infill, will be offered for the renovation of pre-1940 homes; however, these are very costly to build in Vancouver.

This re-zoning may:

- Result in a significant devaluation of your property;
- Result in single-family neighbourhoods becoming a mix of dwelling types;
- Place severe constraints on the rights of property owners to modify their property; and
- Grant the City extraordinary powers of intrusion and discretionary authority over property maintenance.

PROPERTY OWNERS ARE BEING FORCED TO SUBSIDIZE THE CITY'S HOUSING AGENDA

- The City's premise that there are architectural features of existing pre-1940's homes that cannot be reproduced with new construction is simply not true. Zoning already exists in some areas to ensure the architectural context of the communities is preserved through design guidelines; and
- The City is claiming that a buyer will be able to purchase a pre-1940's home and renovate it to the City's standards for less than the cost of building new. This is simply not true; renovation in Vancouver is extraordinarily costly and building infill or laneway housing is also very expensive.

THE CITY IS ONLY PRESENTING ONE SIDE OF THIS ISSUE AND IS SUPPRESSING THE VIEWS OF PROPERTY OWNERS

- The City is more attuned to the demands of non-resident, non-owners of pre-1940's homes (who have no financial stake, thus nothing to lose) than it is to the resident owners who will be left footing the bill;
- The City is, in fact, expropriating a portion of the value of pre-1940's homeowners equity in its bid to satisfy the preservation element.

THE CITY IS "MANUFACTURING" PUBLIC SUPPORT VIA A METHODOLOGICALLY FLAWED ONLINE SURVEY

The online survey, to solicit opinions for the Character Home Re-zoning Review, is fundamentally flawed:

- Designed to sway results to what the client (the City) wants;
- Lacks validation, is anonymous, and can be completed multiple times by anyone, anywhere. Simply by looking up a postal code, a responder can pretend to be a Westside homeowner; and
- Will be used by the City to "manufacture" the guise of public support.

PLEASE CHALLENGE THE CITY'S OFFICIALS - YOU ARE PAYING THEIR SALARIES

Remember, they are public servants in an elected municipal government and can be contacted by phone or email mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca and **Elizabeth Ball**, our community liaison councillor eballcoordinator@gmail.com

Some suggested questions to ask regarding the Character Home Re-zoning Review:

- What evidence do they have to support their claims?
- What is the impact on property values?
- What impact will re-zoning have on property rights?
- Why does the City weigh the opinions of non-property owners and lobby groups as much as property owners?
- Will there be compensation for property devaluation resulting from zoning changes?
- Will bylaws force compliance with character requirements for renovations?
- Will the City have powers of intrusion to ensure character homes are appropriately maintained?

YOU HAVE TO FIGHT IF YOU WANT TO RETAIN YOUR PROPERTY RIGHTS

If you are sceptical about our information please refer to the latest Coriolis Consulting Group report:

<http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/Summary-of-Economic-Analysis-of-Possible-RS-Zoning-Changes-to-Encourage-Character-Home-Retention.pdf>

Join SHPOA or renew your membership at: http://www.shpoa.ca/pdf/Membership_Renewal.pdf

桑拿斯業主會

桑拿斯業主會(SHPOA)董事會越來越關注業主物業權在溫哥華受到侵犯的問題. 尤其是關注市政府的特色房屋分區審核, 當中討論了在溫哥華各地區獨立屋 (RS) Zoning 分區區域中尋找方法保留這些特色房屋的選擇.

在市政府舉辦的四次房屋開放展示的最後一次中, 桑拿斯業主會被阻止派發資料頁, 裡面概述了我們所察覺的問題. 其內容如下:

溫哥華市政府正在考慮在以下地區對物業進行重新區域劃分: 西格雷岬(West Point Grey) / 上基斯蘭奴, 登巴 (Upper Kitsilano, Dunbar) / 克里斯戴爾 (Kerrisdale) / 第二桑拿斯 (Second Shaughnessy) / 第三桑拿斯 (Third Shaughnessy) 和阿標特斯嶺 (Arbutus Ridge) 部分地區, 瑞麗公園 (Riley Park) 部分地區 / 甘比村 (Cambie Village) / 肯辛頓 (Kensington), 喜士定 (Hastings) 和格蘭德維尤 (Grandview) 部分地區. 市政府似乎計劃在這些地區, 以平方英尺的形式, 對興建新房屋的業主進行處罰, 例如將現時這區原有的 0.7 可建的建築面積比率 (FSR) 減少到 0.4 FSR (如果你的土地面積大過 8,000 平方英尺) 或新建房屋的可建面積減少到 0.5 FSR (如果你的土地面積小於 8,000 平方英尺. 該計劃均適用於 1940 年之前或之後興建的新房屋, 換句話說就是這些地區的所有新建房屋均受影響而地價下跌.

市政府打算以增加平方英尺為形式的激勵, 如果你將這些 1940 年前興建的古老房屋保存下來用於修葺, 市政府會批准你在後花園興建一分租單位或後巷屋. 但是現今在溫哥華興建這些住房是非常之昂貴的.

很可惜另外一個大問題是後園空間將會縮細很多及各出租單位帶來的噪音將會改變了整個社區原本的幽靜及優雅特色.

這種重新區域劃分可能會:

- 導致您的物業有大幅度貶值;
- 導致獨立屋住宅區變成混合住宅類型, 傳統社區風貌受到干擾及混雜了;
- 嚴重限制業主對其物業進行更改的權利; 並且
- 授予市政府侵入房屋的特別權力, 和對您物業維護的自由裁決權.

業主正在被迫補貼市政府的可負擔房屋議程

- 市政府假設現有的 1940 年前興建房屋所具有的建築特色是不能通過現今科技新建工程來重現, 這是完全不真實的. 在一些地區已經存在區域劃分, 通過設計準則已經確保了社區的建築文脈得以保留; 並且
- 市政府聲稱買家會有能力購買 1940 年前興建的古老房屋, 並用低於興建新房屋的成本, 將其修葺至市政府的標準. 這是完全不真實的; 在溫哥華進行修葺工程是非常之昂貴, 而興建這些後巷住房也同樣非常昂貴及現今十分難聘請工人而工程又十分費時才能完成.

市政府只是呈現了這個問題的一面, 並不斷壓制業主的觀點

- 市政府更傾向於迎合 1940 年前興建之房屋的非居民和非業主(他們不存在經濟利益關係, 因此不會有任何損失)的需求, 多於迎合我們要支付市政府地稅及其它費用的真正業主的需求; 事實上, 市政府正在剝奪 1940 年前興建房屋之業主的部分權益, 以滿足對特色房屋元素的保留.

市政府正在通過一個方法上有缺陷及有偏見的網上調查來“製造”公眾支持

此次網上調查, 就特色房屋重新分區審核一事徵詢意見, 存在著方法及原則上的錯誤:

- 其設計是為了影響調查結果, 達到其客戶(市政府)想要的目的; 缺乏驗證, 匿名參與, 並可以由任何人, 在任何地方多次填寫. 只需要簡單地通過查找郵政編碼, 參與調查者完全可以假裝成西區的業主; 並且
- 將會被市政府偽裝用來“製造”成公眾支持的幌子.

要敢於挑戰政府官員 - 因為他們的薪金是由我們納稅人支付的

要記住, 他們是當選之市政府的公務員, 您可以打電話或發送電子郵件至

mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca 聯繫他們, 您還可以發郵件至我們的社區聯絡委員 Elizabeth Ball, 電子郵箱: eballcoordinator@gmail.com 進行聯繫.

以下是一些關於特色房屋重新分區審查需要詢問的問題建議:

- 他們有什麼證據來支持他們的觀點?
- 對物業價值會造成什麼影響?
- 重新區域劃分對業權有何影響?
- 為什麼市政府對非業主和遊說團體的意見之重視等同於對我們業主意見的重視?
- 由於分區變化而導致的物業貶值會有補償嗎?
- 將來的章程是否強制遵守特色屋設計修葺的特性要求?
- 市政府是否擁有入侵的權力來確保特色房屋得到適當的維護?

如果您想要保障您的物業權, 您必須要作出抗爭

如果您對我們的信息持有懷疑態度, 請參考最新的 Coriolis 諮詢小組報告.

<http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/Summary-of-Economic-Analysis-of-Possible-RS-Zoning-Changes-to-Encourage-Character-Home-Retention.pdf>

- 參加成為我們的會員吧! http://www.shpoa.ca/pdf/Membership_Renewal.pdf

Character house plan penalizes future by trying to preserve past

By Ian Robertson | Jan. 5, 2017, 3:49 p.m.



The City of Vancouver's character house zoning review proposes changes to policy which, under guise of character retention, will force homeowners to build in a way that is out of synch with their neighbourhood, the goals of density, affordability, inclusiveness, accessibility, life-safety, sustainability and energy conservation. It needs to be reconsidered before creating yet another barrier to needed new construction in Vancouver.

The changes would allow a character house (defined as built prior to 1940 with most historic features remaining) to grow a modest 7% larger than currently allowed, but would shrink the size of any new houses by 29%. The reasons given for this change are to stop the demolition of older houses, to stop the construction of "monster" houses and to address the disparity between an un-renovated character house and current construction.

But there are better ways to do this than to require that all buildings in character zones wear the same character's kabuki mask.

Giving an incentive to keep existing construction is a worthy goal, because there are many ways in which the greenest building is the one that already exists. However, the proposed rules mean that a renovated existing house could soon be 1.5 times larger than a new house, which would in itself create a large disparity between existing and new construction.

A recent tour by the Abundant Housing Vancouver group visited several buildings that are up to three times the currently allowed size, more than four times larger than the new house limit, precisely the sort

of difference being highlighted as a problem.

Zoning bylaws have been updated to allow both secondary suites and laneway houses. However, the new rules mean that new houses will no longer support both three-quarter bedrooms and a basement suite. This will lead to many basement suites going unbuilt, causing an overall loss of density over much of the city, at a time when affordable and family-appropriate housing demands are greater than ever.

The city's goals to increase affordability and density are thus held hostage by the weight of "fitting in" to the neighbourhood.

New houses have to be built to current seismic and fire codes, whereas a renovated house can often skip these requirements. Despite the phrase "they don't build them like they used to," many older houses were built poorly, by unskilled labour, with little structural integrity. A survey of the most restrictive type of character retention in Vancouver – those that are done through a heritage revitalization agreement (HRA) and become listed historic houses – shows that many get stripped down to their core and rebuilt almost totally. This brings up the question: what character is being preserved anyway?

Historic Places Canada's *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* manual makes clear that the goal of a sensitive historic conservation is to preserve – to keep existing elements, not to replace with something that looks plausibly old. The guidelines state that when material must be replaced, it should be clearly distinguishable from existing material. The city's zoning review promotes neither of these principles. It favours the retention of a look, without requiring the retention of substance; further encouraged is new construction, which looks old – even if this look is inevitably achieved with vinyl and painted foam.

In 2010, Vancouver declared itself to be the greenest city, and in 2016 released the zero emissions building plan. Prioritizing existing inefficient buildings over new ones fights emissions reduction capability and the city's stated sustainable goals.

Vancouver's properties generally align north-south. Because a character house's roof peak generally follows the longest axis of the house, most roofs in Vancouver face east and west. For most of the day, the sun is generally to the south, so if one were to install solar panels on a character house, half or more would tend to face the wrong direction.

When considering cars, it makes more of a difference to make a Hummer twice as efficient, as it does to do so for a Civic. Similarly, for housing, by not substantially upgrading existing buildings, we bake in large inefficiencies for another lifetime.

Character buildings tend to be poorly insulated even after renovation, because by very definition, they must have retained at least 50% of their original windows. Often, character houses also have non-conforming grandfathered projections into required yards. The only way to upgrade insulation is to add it to the interior, which means spaces shrink, further penalizing a poor existing layout, and even a heavily

renovated older house will use far more than new, and far-far more than “good” new.

The retention of character merit is placed in direct opposition to the creation of sustainable construction. There have been projects explicitly discouraged from seeking passive house status in favour of keeping character. There have been projects where, once the house was deemed to have character merit, a planned passive houses retrofit has been cancelled because the existing houses could not be altered to admit sufficient light and heat.

Having to choose between preserving the past and ensuring the future puts homeowners between a rock and a hard place. If we are going to propose keeping existing buildings, there need to be real standards for conservation, otherwise we end up living in a Potemkin village, built to deceive the eye rather than retain history.

There are innumerable examples worldwide of new construction fitting in and even enhancing old, but without some acknowledgement of this fact, we forever cast neighbourhoods in amber fixing flaws alongside gems. There has to be some room in the argument for intelligence and outstanding design merit, especially if those traits are vital to the creation of the energy-efficient buildings that the future demands of us. The character house discussion currently seems to begin and end with the statement “make Vancouver [look] great again,” which is a poor argument no matter the subject. •

Ian Robertson (ianwilliamrobertson@gmail.com) is a senior designer at Abbarch Architecture Inc.