

Walter, Penny

Subject: FW: Email - Communication - Lisa Schira - Housing Accelerator Fund - Permitting Up to Four Units in all Residential Zoning Districts – CK 4350-63 x 750-1
Attachments: HAF Letter (2) (1).pdf

From: Web NoReply <web-noreply@Saskatoon.ca>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 2:07 PM

To: City Council <City.Council@Saskatoon.ca>

Subject: Email - Communication - Lisa Schira - Housing Accelerator Fund - Permitting Up to Four Units in all Residential Zoning Districts – CK 4350-63 x 750-1

--- Replies to this email will go to [REDACTED] ---

Submitted on Tuesday, May 21, 2024 - 13:48

Submitted by user: [REDACTED]

Submitted values are:

I have read and understand the above statements.: Yes

I do not want my comments placed on a public agenda. They will be shared with members of Council through their online repository.: No

I only want my comments shared with the Mayor or my Ward Councillor.: No

Date: Tuesday, May 21, 2024

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: Schira

Phonetic spelling of first and/or last name: [REDACTED]

Phone Number : [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

I live outside of Saskatoon: No

Saskatoon Address and Ward:

Address: [REDACTED] Munroe Avenue South

Ward: Ward 6

What do you wish to do ?: Submit Comments

What meeting do you wish to speak/submit comments ? (if known):: Municipal Planning Commission Meeting
Wednesday May 28, 2024

What agenda item do you wish to comment on ?: HAF and de zoning

Comments:

We would like to submit these comments and concerns regarding the HAF and the conditions the federal government require the city of Saskatoon need to comply with.

Will you be submitting a video to be vetted prior to council meeting?: No

To: His Worship the Mayor of Saskatoon and Members of City Council

Date: May 28, 2024

We are writing in response to the proposed Housing Accelerator Fund. As homeowners in areas that may be affected by this initiative we have the following concerns:

- The availability of single-owner family dwellings will *decrease*
- The availability of rental properties will *increase*
- The number of infills is already increasing. These bring increased density, higher price tags (ie less affordable), less restrictions regarding overall land usage, and the possibility of increased on-street parking
- Decreased property values. Research indicates that “regardless of the type of rental, adding an additional rental unit to the neighborhood or increasing its neighborhood share at the expense of single-family owner-occupied homes, lowers home values, especially if the rental unit is of lower quality.”¹ “Affordable” can be interpreted as “lower quality”.
- If this initiative were to go ahead, selling existing owner-occupied properties may be valued only on the worth of the property with the homes and outbuildings seen as teardowns ultimately ending up in the city dump.
- The number of potential buyers of properties for sale in the de-zoned “corridors” will most likely decrease or change from buyers wanting a family home in a quiet mature neighborhood to developers wanting a parcel of land. As a person’s home is one of their largest investments, this will severely handicap and disadvantage existing homeowners in the proposed “corridors”.
- With the proposed addition of structures that currently would exceed height limits, there would be decreased privacy, and would negatively impact the continued enjoyment of a person’s home and garden.
- A personal, but not an atypical example, if a 4 storey apartment building or a 4-plex with 10 m side wall was built on a property immediately adjacent to my home over 20 years of landscaping, time, and money would be wasted due to the lack of sun reaching my gardens.
- We are already seeing increased street parking with infills and basement suites. Traffic becomes one-way when cars are parked on both sides of the street. Munroe Avenue is a perfect example of this congestion. We can expect to see increased street parking if there are more rental units available. Since the current HAF ²proposal states that there would be no requirement for off-street parking, we can expect to experience increased on-street congestion contributing to unsafe roadways for pedestrians, young children, and cyclists.

¹ Ihlanfeldt, K. (2019). Not In My Neighborhood: The Effects of Residential Rentals on Single-Family Home Values.

² Not to be confused with a HAF-baked proposal.

- In 1926, a Supreme Court’s landmark ruling³ established the basis for single-family zoning in America. The judge stated the following in his final ruling: “... *very often the apartment house is a mere parasite, constructed in order to take advantage of the open spaces and attractive surroundings created by the residential character of the district. Moreover, the coming of one apartment house is followed by others, interfering by their height and bulk with the free circulation of air and monopolizing the rays of the sun which otherwise would fall upon the smaller homes, and bringing, as their necessary accompaniments, the disturbing noises incident to increased traffic and business, and the occupation, by means of moving and parked automobiles, of larger portions of the streets, thus detracting from their safety and depriving children of the privilege of quiet and open spaces for play, enjoyed by those in more favored localities — until, finally, the residential character of the neighborhood and its desirability as a place of detached residences are utterly destroyed.*”
- In the stated case for adding new “missing middle housing”⁴ “[m]edium-density housing is characterized by a range of multi-family or clustered housing types that are still compatible in scale and heights with single-family or transitional neighborhoods.”⁵ For example, three and four story buildings are not compatible with existing structures in the Haultain area. They are, in fact, currently not allowed.
- Michael Andersen, a senior housing researcher at the non-profit Sightline Institute in Portland, states that, “Middle housing is not a silver bullet. Anybody who claims that two, three, fourplexes are enough to bring housing costs down and house everyone who needs it ... is mistaken.”⁶
- [Adding Density Destroys Neighborhoods One House at a Time](#) (2014) states the following in the opening paragraph: “*Density is the Holy Grail of New Urbanism, from creating new zoning for granny flats, rooming houses, townhouses, duplexes, fourplexes and backyard two-story rental houses in established neighborhoods to encouraging dense mixed use development on undeveloped or redeveloped land. The advantage of urban density and the idyllic effect of density has been the battle cry of urbanists and city planners for decades. However, very little has been said about the destructive force of density. For this reason I have made a list of two dozen ways adding density to a neighborhood diminishes and ultimately destroys a neighborhood one house at a time. Hopefully, if our City Council, planners and thought leaders are aware of the potential destructive force of density, they will pull back from the current call to blanket every neighborhood with more density.*”
- Meaghan Dalton, in her working paper *Density and Housing Affordability*⁷, states that (1) “*Interviews with ninety-two practicing planners and twenty-four relevant planning documents reveal a heavily entrenched discourse and faith that densification is the best form of urban design for environmental, economic, and social reasons. The arguments in the interview transcripts and the planning documents are not grounded in critical*

³ [Is it time to end single-family zoning?](#)

⁴ [Putting the Housing Accelerator Fund into Action for Saskatoon](#)

⁵ Parolek, Daniel (2020). *Missing Middle Housing: Thinking Big and Building Small to Respond to Today's Housing Crisis*. Washington DC: Island Press. p. 15.

⁶ [Why some B.C. municipalities are split over proposal to end single-family zoning](#)

⁷ [Density and Housing Affordability](#)

evidence, but are often anecdotal. And (2) “The fetish of density may be due to the pervasive forces of neoliberalism and may be the one tool planners feel they can cling on to for potential positive impacts. In a climate where governments have rolled back support for public housing, planners may feel they have no direction to turn except for the contested economic argument that greater density (thus more supply of housing) will lead to more affordable housing prices.”

Perhaps city-owned and vacant properties could be developed first. For example, Taylor St and Broadway Ave; 8th Street and Broadway Ave have been vacant for several years and would be ideal for rental units. Or areas already zoned for multiple units such as 7th Street (East of Cumberland along 8th Street or Main St). Keeping multiple unit dwellings within a block of major bus routes could be developed first to see if this addresses the shortage of reasonably-priced rental units.

We recognize that increasing the density in our neighborhood will be advantageous for developers and will increase the potential revenue through taxes collected by The City, but at what cost to the citizens who pay these taxes? In conclusion, we recognize that we have made the assumption, and come from the perspective, that home ownership is preferable to rental and that low density is preferable to high density. Even given this bias, it is heart-wrenching to see that with the proposed changes in zoning and the lifting of restrictions, our quiet well-established neighborhood will see tremendous and irreversible decline should the allowance increase go forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa Schira [REDACTED] Munroe Ave. S. [REDACTED]
Mike Meriam [REDACTED] Munroe Ave. S., [REDACTED]
Sheryl Mills [REDACTED] Cairns Avenue [REDACTED]
Ella Mae Stowasser [REDACTED] Munroe Ave. S. [REDACTED]
Jurgen Stowasser [REDACTED] Munroe Ave. S. [REDACTED]
Allison Currie [REDACTED] 10th St E [REDACTED]
Laurie Currie [REDACTED] 10th St E [REDACTED]