

PH-R1

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
09/15/2020	15:39	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	To Whom It May Concern: I live in Yaletown. From my window I can see 3 high condo buildings in the construction stage. Now you wish to add another. Surely there will be families with children living in these spaces. WHERE ARE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?? The only one I know of is Elsie Roy. If I was sending my child to that school, I would take a broom with me. I have called about having the CROSS WALK outside the school to be painted a couple of times - no sign of that. I have observed that workers in this city sit in their trucks on their iphones instead of getting on with their job. I recently had a chat with 4 young mothers each with a young child in George Wainborn Park. I asked where they would send their child to school in the community. That was a concern they had as well as for child care in the area. As one walks in this community there are many parents pushing carriages and strollers. Where are those children going to go to a good school? Next, these 3-4 monster high rises are built right in the area where CARBON DIOXIDE is coming up off the two bridges, Granville and Burrard as well as the Cement Factory. Cement making is one the highest emitters of CARBON DIOXIDE. I am surprised that that cement factory wasn't moved out of the heart of the city long ago. Do you think it is a good idea having little children as well as adults living in an area breathing in Carbon Dioxide?? Another recently completed high condo building in the area has quite a colourful painted pattern on the front high wall. When the sun shines on it the colours are reflected onto windows of three different condo buildings causing 3 windows in each condo from top of the building to the bottom, first, pink at the top then yellow and blue at the bottom. I can't imagine what it is like to look out of those windows on sunny days. I would say, put a HOLD on 601 Beach Crescent until the other condos are completed and you have thought about the Carbon D. situation. Good Luck! A Yaletown resident for 12 years.,	June Webb		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
09/15/2020	15:40	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	I do not support the application and agree with the points set out in the attached pdf file.	Janice MacKenzie		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	Appendix A
09/15/2020	22:07	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	This area is already too congested. This new mega tower will further worsen the issue of traffic congestion and lack of school.	Paul Cheng		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
09/16/2020	10:03	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Hi. I'm opposed to this building because it brings too much density in an area that cannot support it. In particular the stress on Elsie Roy is already extreme, and this huge residential building will greatly add to that. Additionally, the city should be providing more green space for the increasing number of residents it is building for elsewhere downtown. Please vote against this proposal or greatly scale it back.	MARTIN STIBY		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
				Duplicate.					
09/16/2020	14:49	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Dear Mayor and City Councillors, I strongly recommend rejecting the rezoning 601 Beach Crescent. As a resident in Aqua at the Park (s.22(1) Personal and Confidential) I'm quite concerned with the traffic this 55-story with a 450+ car garage would bring to George Wainborn Park. I frequently go to this park and noticed over the years more and more people enjoying this park. Many of them families with kids. If this tower is built along with a fully utilized Vancouver House with all the shops and amenities (which include restaurants and a University), I fear that there is going to be a huge influx of cars which Beach Crescent was originally not designed to handle. What's worse is this increases the risk of public safety getting to and from the park along with the increased pollution. This rezoning for another massive high-rise does not make sense for an area not designed to support its impacts in the first place. It would only ruin an already wonderful neighbourhood and community. And so, I strongly urge to rejected this rezoning proposal for one that would better utilize the lot in a way that preserves the integrity of the neighbourhood while allowing for growth in a sensible manner. Thank you for your time. Respectfully yours, Karl & Pia Villanueva PS. Made correction to a previous comment sent for Case number s.22(1) Personal and Confidential Changed "601 Beach Ave" to "601 Beach Crescent".	Karl Villanueva		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.

[#LiveabilityFirst](#) DENY the 601 BEACH CRESCENT REZONING DUE TO SIGNIFICANT LIVEABILITY ISSUES

GOAL: We urge Council to turn down the rezoning of 601 Beach Ave.,¹ and retain the current zoning for a 17-story social housing development, until new options for the site are identified that prioritize #liveabilityfirst for residents, and visitors that live, work and recreate in and around this iconic Vancouver landscape.

WHY?

1. ***The [Higher Buildings Policy \(HBP\) 1990](#) is outdated and increasingly [controversial](#), especially vis-à-vis [making cities more liveable](#). We urge Council to do a 20 year review of the HBP, with [credible consultation](#), before any more spot rezonings.***



The proposal is being considered under the HBP, adopted in 1990 and revised 5 times (last in 2018), with no public consultation. **But tall towers don't belong a few blocks of the water, where they impact scarce and valued public amenities.** Before 2011, all potential tower sites were in the CBD, where they have less impact on residential and shoreline areas. So-called "Gateway" sites were added on the South of the

downtown peninsula in 2011, with scant public input. **We believe that most Vancouverites see the mountains as our gateway!** From anywhere around False Creek but the bridgehead, buildings like Vancouver House just stick out like sore thumbs (see photo from Broadway).

The project runs contrary to the (relevant) HBP guidelines (Feb. 2018):

- A 535', 55-story building is proposed, but the HBP says *"The highest buildings (i.e. ~550-700') are located within the CBD. Secondary heights may be considered ... two towers framing the Granville Bridge Gateway (~ 425')*. **UDP members noted the additional height wasn't fully justified.**
- Despite the project scale and significance, and initial public concerns, "special public engagement", allowed for under the HBP to discuss broader urban design issues, wasn't done and **there was minimal outreach to stakeholders outside the immediate area.**
- Vancouver House, approved under the HBP, has had **extensive expert, media and public criticism**, based on urban design, liveability and equity issues, e.g., imposing location, size and massing; privatizing public views; intrusion into a wide swath of public views (see [#LiveabilityFirst](#)); and the proliferation of luxury, investor-owned condo towers downtown.

2. ***Neither the proposal nor the development review have addressed [impacts on/interactions with other major City initiatives in the area](#), including housing and infrastructure projects such as the [Granville Bridge Connector](#), [Granville loops development](#), [Richards Bike Lane](#), [Drake bike lane](#) & network connections, and the [South False Creek Redevelopment](#) directly across from the site.***



¹ Proposed by GBL Architects Ltd. for Pinnacle International

- **Open Space & Views:** The tower will intrude on **views, open space and amenity values** for the huge expected increase in **those who “walk, roll and bike” across Granville bridge**. All users, including vehicles, already encounter a forest of towers and structures at the North End.
- **Congestion:** The City justifies downtown density using sustainable transportation criteria, but **the revised proposal allows for one parking spot for each of 455 units!** The review has not assessed (1) how additional vehicles will affect traffic, bike and pedestrian flows, and (2) how it will contribute to **cumulative negative impacts of current & planned projects** (e.g., Vancouver House, Granville Loops). How will more traffic and bicycles, spilling into an already busy area, affect **congestion, bike lanes, driver/cyclist/pedestrian accidents/safety and air pollution?**

3. Neighbourhood impacts: *The proposal is counter to planning guidelines intended to ensure False Creek North is home to liveable communities, built around the unique amenities of the False Creek Basin. Development in this area been “too much, too fast” for many.*

Inserting a 55-storey tower in a unique shoreline community designed to have primarily tiered 10 – 38 storey buildings runs counter to area policies: *False Creek North ODP 1990, Beach CD-1 Guidelines 2002, Downtown South Goals and Policies & DS Guidelines, CD-1 (366) 500 Pacific Street.* **These policies need review,** as they’ve been undermined by spot zonings, the HBP and significant DT South growth. Issues include:

- Rapid densification:** We aren’t against density, but the pace and scale of development, lately dominated by luxury, [investor-owned condos](#), has resulted in cumulative negative impacts on transportation, infrastructure, schools, quality of life (e.g. congestion, pollution, shading) in the Beach District and adjacent False Creek North neighbourhoods. We urge Council to **safeguard the uniqueness of this inner city urban landscape, providing liveable places for a diverse range of residents, citizens and visitors** to live, work and play within our sea-mountain-sky natural setting.
- Building Height and Form:** [Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines](#) (2002)
 - pg. 3. **High-rise towers are to be 10 – 38 storeys**, based on impacts on public and private views, sunlight and open space. p. 8. Unit counts and floor areas are subject to “(a) *livability for various household types; & (b) compatibility with adjacent development.*” pg. 1. “*Changes to maximum tower heights and floor plates are not anticipated.*” Criteria for change to include relationships to adjacent development: shadowing; public and private views; public and common open space; public realm treatment; submissions from residents. **601 Beach doesn’t conform with Guidelines.**
 - 2. Urban Design Principles: “(a) *respond to the unique characteristics of the waterfront site; (e.) step tower heights down from Pacific Street to the water; (j) create well defined, animated, landscaped streets with lower rise buildings.*” Existing buildings “**step down” to water; 601 wouldn’t.**
- Schools:** **Imagine a town of 18,000 without enough schools and no plans for more.**
 - The City supports a vision of family-friendly communities downtown. 601 Beach would add 455 units to the 100s high-rise condos under construction in the V6Z area, **yet there are no more spaces for elementary students within walking distance of 601 Beach.** New schools planned for Roberts Annex and Coal Harbour are 5-10 years away and not walkable from the V6Z area.
 - Elsie Roy Elementary, the only school in V6Z operates at capacity (410 students and a long wait list). No other downtown public schools are walkable; the West End is too far and too dangerous. **The share of kids and teenagers is higher in V6Z than other areas downtown (outside West End and business district).** In 2016, there were enough 5-14 year olds in the area for a new school with more than 3 classes of 20 students for each of the nine elementary school years.

4. ***Impacts on surrounding neighbourhoods have not, but should be considered, given the location, scale and extreme height of the project. This is in part due to the frequent disconnect between City planning processes and development review processes for large-scale projects.***



All False Creek North projects significantly affect residents and visitors who live in, work, play, shop or commute in/on the Seawall, False Creek North and South, and adjacent neighbourhoods. We think the City needs a holistic vision and plan [for the interrelated neighbourhoods around False Creek](#), but in the meantime, **it should take into account project impacts on these communities.**

- *Beach CD-1 Guidelines*, pg. 2 say that towers should “present their narrowest frontage towards the water to maximize the view for dwelling units and view corridors through downtown from the south”. **The tower would privatize public views of the water, North Shore mountains and beaches, and intrude on views to the city, sky and mountains** from the South False Creek waterfront up the rise, including Fairview Slopes, South Granville and Kitsilano. **Skyline and View studies didn’t analyze impacts on resident, office and visitor views in these heavily populated, highly visited areas.** Vancouver House blocks many views from these communities, from streets, sidewalks and bike paths, such as those on 10th and 14th Ave. (see page 5 photos).

5. ***The social housing component is flawed, offering an unacceptable quality of life for residents, and in stark contrast to the luxury condo component.***

- While the City has adopted the model of developers subsidizing social housing, **the contrast between housing types is extreme.** This will be a high-profile project, with strong public and expert scrutiny. Vancouverites want liveable, affordable housing, not more tall, luxury condos.
- It’s ironic that the City sold this lot (conditionally) and [is now seeking land for low-cost rentals](#).
- **After waiting for years to see development of this City-owned site, zoned for 17-storey social housing, liveability for all should be a priority.** However, the tower/podium design, with market condos above the bridge deck and market housing below/next to the bridge is a **striking and embarrassing metaphor for social inequity in the City.** Separate entrances, lobbies and elevators starkly reinforce the different liveability standards for each group.
- The [Urban Design Panel report](#) was **highly critical of quality of the podium social housing** fronting the bridge deck, citing lack of light/shading, lack of privacy, air pollution, and traffic noise. These issues remain, despite the redesign, which proposes an outdoor children’s play area on level 3, at bridge deck level, and 1/3 of the social units with windows facing the bridge.
- **The amount and quality of social housing is far from what was envisioned** under the *False Creek North ODP, Beach Neighbourhood G/L* and existing.
 - The proposal has 152 units; we estimate current zoning would allow about 50% more.
 - The G/L show the social housing units away from the bridge and along the Mews and Beach.
 - Most units (97) are small (less than 750’), with only 55 family units over 750’.
- The City’s definition of “social housing” vis-à-vis true affordability for middle and low income families have been highly [controversial](#), and this **project could exacerbate public and expert [doubt and concern](#) about this program, especially when combined with luxury condo**

towers.

#liveabilityfirst: Our VISION for 2021 and beyond:

The rezoning at 601 Beach has been turned down by Vancouver City Council. Existing zoning for a 17-story social housing building is still in place.

The City is seeking options to provide attractive and liveable social housing in a way that showcases for residents and visitors the City's commitments to sustainability and liveability of Downtown South, and the communities in and around the watery heart of Central Vancouver –the False Creek Basin, including False Creek North and South, Fairview and South Granville.



Not more of this*

The False Creek North communities complement the [False Creek South redevelopment plans](#), including a “diversity” of people and a “mixed-income community consists of one-third each for low-, middle-, and high-income residents.”

The Vancouver “Higher Buildings Policy” (adopted 1997, amended 2011, revised 5 times, last in July 2018) is undergoing a comprehensive 20-year review, with full consultation, (possibly in concert with the City Plan initiative). The sites for so-called “Gateway Higher Buildings” – sore thumb height anomalies on the periphery of the Downtown Peninsula – are deleted and higher buildings are kept in the CBD where they don't affect residential and amenities and the visitor experience.

An updated Official Development Plan (ODP) (and/or Neighbourhood Guidelines or similar) is being prepared for False Creek North and South, and integrated with Downtown South, Fairview and South Granville, with full consultation. The plan is integrated with related initiatives, especially the Granville Bridge Upgrades, Granville Loops project, and greenway and bike network.

It focuses on balancing #liveability and #sustainability for immediate and adjacent neighbourhoods, including light, space, recreational amenities and views towards the mountains, which are our real “gateways” – to the natural setting and healthy ecosystems that make Vancouver globally unique.

Policy provisions for Community Amenity Contributions ensure that social housing on the site provides truly affordable and liveable housing. New models are found that don't depend on high-rise luxury condos with starkly contrasting amenities and separate entrances.

*Images top and below right: *Vancouver House: Whose House Is This?* [Christopher Cheung](#) 11 Nov 2019. TheTye.ca, retrieved Jan. 22 from: <https://thetyee.ca/Culture/2019/11/11/Vancouver-House/>

