Walter, Penny

From: City Council

Subject: FW: Email - Communication - Elisabeth Snead - Housing Accelerator Fund - Permitting Up to Four

Units in all Residential Zoning Districts – CK 750-1

Attachments: NewzoningbylawsprotestSnead.docx

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

Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 12:40 PM **To:** City Council < City.Council@Saskatoon.ca>

Subject: Email - Communication - Elisabeth Snead - Housing Accelerator Fund - Permitting Up to Four Units in all

Residential Zoning Districts – CK 750-1

--- Replies to this email will go to

Submitted on Monday, May 27, 2024 - 12:36

Submitted by user:



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: Monday, May 27, 2024

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

First Name: Elisabeth

Last Name: Snead

Phone Number : 306

Email:

I live outside of Saskatoon: No

Saskatoon Address and Ward:
Address: Smoothstone Court

Ward: Ward 9

What do you wish to do ?: Submit Comments

Comments:

Unfortunately I cannot attend this meeting due to work obligations but there needs to be much more opportunity for

education of the public and this should go to a plebiscite. Develop new areas and do not compromise the equity existing homeowners have in their homes by such a reckless decision.

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

Liz Snead and Jonathon Bowser
302 Smoothstone Court
Saskatoon, SK, S7J 4R1

May 27, 2024

Dear Members of the Municipal Planning Commission, Mayor Clark and City Councillors:

A friend of mine recently brought my attention to this proposed wholesale re-Zoning of our residential neighbourhoods and I was shocked and must make my opposition known. Neither my husband nor I nor anyone we know had heard anything about any of this. We vehemently oppose these Corridor Growth Boundary Amendments and the Housing Accelerator Fund Amendments on a number of grounds. As well, the speed at which they are being pushed, and the total lack of any consultation or consideration of those us who will be forever negatively affected are unacceptable.

There is no reason why these Amendments and their re-zoning should be approved, and a host of reasons why this Commission should vote against them both. I see that the City has already approved a big increase in density in existing neighbourhoods with the increases in secondary suites and that should be enough to satisfy the Federal Government if the goal of all of this is the \$41 MM they are offering Saskatoon.

There is no need to re-zone the whole City in order to see additional housing quickly built in Saskatoon. There is plenty of empty already-Zoned land in the new neighbourhoods where large numbers of new housing units can be quickly added without saddling the City with unaddressed costs to upgrade infrastructure in existing neighbourhoods. There are large areas of the City that have always been Zoned for 4 storey apartments but that have not been built up to that capacity as well. Tearing down existing homes one by one to build 4 plex apartments will decrease the number of homes for rent or purchase, and will make them more expensive and even harder for people to afford.

And there is absolutely no need to take away our residential zoning protections, which are so very important to all of us. We chose our homes and our neighbourhoods specifically because of the zoning protections they have. (We will move out of Saskatoon if 4 plexes and 4 storey buildings are allowed in our R2 zoning. — if you want to add that). You cannot simply take our Zoning protections away from us, especially given the deplorable process. For most Canadians their home is their biggest investment and their nest egg. It is not appropriate for the city council to jeopardize the value of investment people have made in their homes by changing the zoning bylaws like this without a serious information campaign or without allowing for serious debate on the pros and cons. Many of us would not have brought our home where we did if we

had known that our property value was at such risk. This matter should really go to a plebiscite for all members of the public to get an opportunity to view in and not be the prevue of just a handful of city councillors.

There should be full reporting on the costs the City will be committing to in order to upgrade existing water, sewer and utilities, as well as full studies, costs and plans to pay for all of it and whatever else will be required for existing neighbourhoods to accommodate the 4 units and 4 storey unlimited units in many neighbourhood that these Amendments would allow. All of this should be presented for all of us to see before any of it is recommended for a vote, let alone approved.

Parking congestion is already a major issue in our neighbourhood and the increase in units and cars that will result from the already enacted increases in secondary suites will make that exponentially worse. It is unimaginable that the City is proposing 4 units or even worse 4 storey unlimited units on top of that.

And for what? If the Federal Government decides that what Saskatoon has already done to increase housing density is not enough then we are better off without that money than we would be re-zoning the entire City, forever changing our beloved neighbourhoods, and committing us all to hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure upgrades that haven't been addressed.

And it was never understood that our bus system would require a complete re-zoning of all our residential neighbourhoods. That whole proposal must also provide full transparent reports as to all costs of the current bus system, the costs of whatever is planned, and the future costs to operate before any re-zoning based upon it could possibly be considered.

Please do the right thing and vote AGAINST these Amendments. The public has not been consulted about any of them, there has been no consideration of the real consequences, no transparency about any of the associated costs, and until all shortcomings have been fully addressed and subject to extensive real consultation, they cannot be recommended.

Thank you,

Liz Snead and Jonathon Bowser