**From:** Dylon Martin
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 15, 2021 2:27 PM
**To:** CLK-CityClerks <CityClerks@winnipeg.ca>
**Cc:** MayorBowman <mayorbowman@winnipeg.ca>
**Subject:** Submission for the June 16, 2021 EPC Committee on Agenda Item No.

Hello City Clerk's Office,

I would like to submit the following for Agenda Item No. 8: Residential Infill Strategy - Small-Scale and Low-Rise Residential Development Guidelines for Mature Communities for the June 16, 2021 Executive Policy Committee meeting.

To the Executive Policy Committee,

Small-scale, middle density infill is important to Winnipeg and we need good guidelines that facilitate more infill homes. I would also like to voice my support for the amendments made by the Property & Development Committee on June 8, 2021, which were good and took out some of the more onerous restrictions. The EPC and Council ***should not add any onerous restrictions through amendments*** to these guidelines.

I live in a mature community that will be covered by these Infill Guidelines and see the important role middle density housing options like tall houses, duplexes, triplexes, granny suites, townhouses, and small apartments can play in facilitating a mixed income neighbourhood where people can walk, bus, or bike for many of their everyday needs.

Granny suites are one of the housing types I would like to touch on. They're important for multigenerational households. I have relatives who live in that arrangement, a mother with kids in the main dwelling and an older relative in the secondary suite. It's a good arrangement for keeping families connected, preventing senior loneliness, and having someone who can help look after the kids nearby.

I also know of a person, a service worker who's moved out of their parents' place within the last couple of years, renting a granny suite in South Osborne. They love the area but would not otherwise be able to afford to live there. These are the types of opportunities middle density infill homes can offer to people.

This is why I'm supportive of the P&D Committee amendments. To elaborate:

**1) The Local Block Quotas:** Before amended by the P&D Committee, the guidelines limited infill builds to two per local street block per year. This would have been a significant problem on blocks with many aging, deteriorating homes. As well, affordable builders that specialize in building many homes on a given block would have been negatively affected. It was, therefore, good to remove the local block quota.

**2) Gravel back lanes:** The Infill Guidelines, before the P&D Committee's amendments, discouraged subdivisions on streets with gravel back lanes. This could have hindered new builds in parts of east as well as NORTH Winnipeg. Furthermore, affordable builders who specialize in constructing multiple single family homes on a given street would have been negatively affected. It was, therefore, good of the P&D Committee to remove this.

**3) Parking:** The draft guidelines, prior to amendments, proposed capping surface parking at 25 per cent of the lot. This may have sounded good, in isolation, given how unsightly surface parking can be. HOWEVER, the guidelines

didn't drastically reduce existing costly parking mandates. This means that to meet the cap, builders of some small apartments would have had to institute more costly options like underground garages which will result in higher rents for tenants. Another scenario, depending on the economics of the project, could be that the apartment just doesn't get built. With today's parking mandate, the historic, moderate rent brick apartment I live in wouldn't be allowed today without major variances. I appreciate that the P&D Committee removed this surface parking cap but would prefer a general reduction or elimination of parking mandates for apartments.I understand, however, that this is something which needs to be addressed at the bylaw level.

There are two topics I, at this late stage, think the guidelines could be improved by with further amendments, however.

**1) Side yard setbacks:** Currently at 3 feet on one sideyard and four feet on another, this limits space for the home and granny suites. This should be simplified to 3 feet on both sides.

**2) Height:** Currently height limits are set at 28 feet. This should be raised two feet, to 30 feet. These small changes would allow more space for the home and granny suites.

As a general point, other cities in North America have moved in a forward looking direction, eliminating parking minimums and ending single-family-only zoning. The P&D Committee's modest tweaks plus the two I have suggested to the guidelines make a world of difference in facilitating small-scale, middle density infill homes. This will help Winnipeg with affordability, climate mitigation, and sustaining our City finances and public services.

Best regards,

Dylon Martin