

## Walter, Penny

---

**From:** City Council  
**Subject:** FW: Email - Communication - Neil Crocker - Housing Accelerator Fund - CK 750-1  
**Attachments:** City re HAF.docx

---

**From:** Web NoReply <web-noreply@Saskatoon.ca>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 18, 2024 11:17 PM  
**To:** City Council <City.Council@Saskatoon.ca>  
**Subject:** Email - Communication - Neil Crocker - Housing Accelerator Fund - CK 750-1

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

Submitted on Tuesday, June 18, 2024 - 23:08

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, June 18, 2024

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

**Pronouns:** He/him/his

**First Name:** Neil

**Last Name:** Crocker

**Phone Number :** [REDACTED]

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**I live outside of Saskatoon:** No

**Saskatoon Address and Ward:**

**Address:** [REDACTED] Kirk Cres

**Ward:** Ward 8

**What do you wish to do ?:** Submit Comments

**What meeting do you wish to speak/submit comments ? (if known)::** unknown

**What agenda item do you wish to comment on ?:** Housing Accelerator fund

**Comments:**

attached please find my comments and concerns with the planned zoning changes resulting from the Housing Accelerator fund.

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

TO: City Councillors

Re: Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) and Removal of Requirement to Provide Parking Spaces for Housing

FROM: Neil Crocker

DATE: June 7, 2024

I attended the Information session provided by the City at the Field House. I have discussed the HAF with friends and neighbours who reside in the affected areas and have heard serious concerns about the consequences of this initiative. No public consultations were held concerning HAF before the City created the flawed plan and I believe that public input was required from the outset.

My concerns with the HAF initiative are:

1. **Parking.** This plan is a better fit for cities like Toronto and Vancouver where cars are not the main means of transport. I live on Kirk Cr and already there is a lot of on street parking. It is a terrible plan to remove the requirement for parking spaces. The most likely place for a 6 story apartment is along Preston and I back onto the Preston houses. It is only a short walk for the apartment dwellers to park on Kirk and use the walkthrough.

I ask you to vote against this removal of parking space restrictions.

2. **Four dwelling per site.** This is an acceptable option as long as the height does not exceed 10m and parking spaces are required.

I ask you to vote for this component.

3. **Four storey residential development** is utterly unacceptable as a 15m building would create a 50' wall beside and in front of existing houses which are mainly bungalows. The character of the neighbourhood would be destroyed along with peaceful atmosphere, amount of natural light, birds, trees and green space.

I ask you to vote against this component.

4. **Permitting Semi-detached and 2 unit dwellings per site.** I have no objections to this type of development as this accommodation already exists in most duplexes.

I ask you to vote for this component.

I asked three City reps at the information session to explain how the plan would expand the stock of affordable housing and have the following comments:

1. I heard that funds would be given to existing housing entities such as CRESS, CUMFI, others? to expand their stock but not to renovate existing housing units. I suspect that there may be a stock of dwellings requiring repair in the City. For example, an article in the Star Phoenix awhile ago stated that there were over 1000 SHA units in the province that are uninhabited because of required repairs. This is existing housing that needs short-term fixes to be habitable yet I was told these federal funds must be used for new housing. Illogical and unrealistic requirement.
2. The logical recipient of this type of funding is Sask Housing which is an experienced, credible organization. Cannot the City enter into partnership with them and build on vacant City land such as the Taylor Street Firehall and other properties? There are likely suitable properties near parks, libraries, churches etc that could be developed with minimal impact on few adjacent residents. I know that the City has been reluctant to

enter into the housing business but given current problems, that decision needs to be reconsidered.

3. There was a lot of amorphous talk about how the City would incentivize developers to provide affordable housing and monitor the results etc which I believe to be completely unrealistic. The City has been very lax in instituting any bylaws with penalties to curb rampant abuses of existing residents by developers. Their goals are to generate profits not to be in the affordable rental business with very long investment payback timeframes. I dislike this option as doubt if the City has the will to institute clear bylaws with mandated monitoring (and associated manpower) and serious penalties for violations.

Finally, I would say that the city's belief that my house will not suffer from a decrease in property value is spurious as it depends on what gets built around and behind me on Preston. Can the city seriously claim that a 6 story apartment behind me won't decrease the value of my property.

In conclusion, I would like the City to negotiate better, more realistic terms with the Feds that will actually increase the stock of affordable housing. If this is not an option, then only implement the options that are acceptable to the residents of the affected areas and slowdown this process by implementing the acceptable options in staged phases with bylaws with serious penalties for violations..

Yours sincerely

Neil Crocker  
53 Kirk Cr  
306-260-3155