

## 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent PH-R1

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
09/17/2020	16:53	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	I am against the application as proposed. I feel that in this neighbourhood, buildings are being approved of individually and are not being looked at from a community perspective as they are doing in other areas such as false creek. There are so many changes going on within the area with multiple new construction projects and street revisions, you can?t even walk down the street without having to cross many times due to closed sidewalks. You are told not to drive to reduce congestion and pollution, yet it takes twice as long to walk due to detours. I have not seen a recent larger community plan. I do not believe the impact 601 Beach and other buildings in the beach district were taken into consideration in the aspects of density, school access, current congestion and traffic, affordable housing or current and future community needs.	Laura Berube		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	16:59	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	I am writing in opposition to the rezoning application for 601 Beach Cr. As an owner/resident of s.22(1) Personal and Confidential to 601 Beach Cr, I have the following concerns about the proposed rezoning: - Light in the area will be further diminished in the shadow of the new tower - this in turn affects the health of those who live in the area - Crowding and high traffic levels - walking or driving in the neighbourhood, one can already feel it is crowded and busy especially as people using the area's public spaces (e.g. George Wainborn Park, seawall) include not only local residents but also people who come from other parts of the city - Insufficient school spaces - the area has many young families already and not enough school spaces available - Vision of Gateway at the north end of Granville St Bridge does not fit the character of the surrounding neighbourhood There are clear negative impacts to adding the proposed level of density on livability for the residents of the neighbourhood. We care about the future of this property and what type of building and density is right for the neighbourhood and wider community. Thank you for your consideration.	Christine Chu		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.

## 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent PH-R1

09/17/2020	17:28	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Hi, I sent in a PDF earlier. I just went over it and corrected typos and edited it for clarity. If possible, please use this revised one for the Council and Mayor, and just discard the old one. Thank you!	Stuart Dee	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	APPENDIX A
09/17/2020	19:05	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	To Whom It May Concern, I strongly oppose the Rezoning Application regarding the 55 storey tower at 601 Beach Crescent. I regularly visit my family and friends who live directly beside this land and across the street, adding this level of density would make the neighbourhood less livable. I have been using the seawall, adjacent park space and Granville Bridge for a long time, another 55-storey residential mixed-use building would diminish ability to enjoy these areas. Lydia Hsu	Lydia Hsu	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	19:08	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	To City Council, I do not live in the neighbourhood surrounding this site, but I have been a resident of downtown Vancouver for over 15 years. Residents of the Beach Crescent neighbourhood have communicated in detail and eloquently about the many concerns associated with this rezoning application. As a concerned downtown resident, I oppose this rezoning application. The propose development is markedly inconsistent with the original plan for a moderately sized social housing development on this site. The proposed development is also incompatible with the goals of enhancing liveability in the city and increasing the stock of truly affordable housing. I urge City Council NOT to approve this rezoning application at the Public Hearing. Sincere regards, Ann Robson Vancouver, BC	ANN ROBSON	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.

**1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent PH-R1**

09/17/2020	19:12	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>To whom it may concer, I oppose this rezoning. The land was originally sold by Concord to the City for social housing. To have the City turn around and sell it for a mere \$20 million is rubbing salt in the wounds of a city struggling to deal with dirt, garbage, broken and filthy sidewalks and roads. Tents and campers everywhere! Crime Is spreading rapidly throughout the city. A 55 Storey tower with only a few social housing Units hardly seems the way to go to fix our problems. It is not what the Mayor promised when he ran for his role. For that height and that low sale price of the land, the developer should be asked to fund a school and daycare (And more) that are sadly lacking in this area. Please Councillors say 'No' to this project. Insist that it is built as previously zoned and get on with building caring and attentive social housing that fits into the neighbourhood and that residents who purchased there understood would be coming in their futures. Sincerely Virginia A Richards</p>	Virginia Richards		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	19:14	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>Dear Council, I am a resident of the Beach District Neighbourhood and I oppose the rezoning application for 601 Beach Cr. 601 Beach Crescent should remain 100% social housing. The market housing units will inevitably be the focus of the proposed development, resulting in delays and inadequacies to the much needed social housing. Furthermore, the well-being and outcomes of future residents of the intended social housing will suffer as a result of the additional density from the market units and decrease to light in the area from the tall tower. Thank you, Helen Ko</p>	Helen Ko		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.

Good evening Mr. Mayor and Councillors,

Thanks for the opportunity....

from a paper on Natural Light and the Urban environment:

**"Natural light is one of the most important amenities to insure a vital, dynamic and inhabitable city."**

I'd like to add my strong opposition to the proposal for rezoning for the 601 Beach development, and urge council to reject the proposal.

This neighborhood from the very beginning, and through many succeeding master plans, was intended to be a quiet, residential area, not a commercial one. The **liveabilityfirst** group and others have clearly detailed how this project **will destroy the liveability and quality of life in the neighborhood**. It violates the master plan, and destroys the public's trust in the city's urban planners.

I'd like to add something that's not discussed much, but is recently being given much more importance in urban planning, with respect to quality of life. This project proposes a very tall building, extremely close to three other buildings that are spaced apart and laid out well to prevent adverse shadow impact on each other.

Everyone values views and viewing corridors. A good view could add tens of thousands of dollars to a unit's value. But hardly anyone considers the importance of shadow impact and direct sunlight access, which in terms of health and quality of life, is even more important. From vitamin D production to minimizing Seasonal Affective Disorder, direct sunlight is extremely important to physical and mental health.

I suffer from Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD). This is triggered by lack of sunlight, including the months with less light, eg, wintertime. The most common symptoms include: depression, extended sleep hours, loss of energy, concentration, motivation, and ability to work. It creates feelings of sadness and hopelessness. 10% of the population is afflicted, and another 20% have a milder form. Like normal depression, It's hard to imagine the suffering unless one has experienced it. The worst cases lead to suicide. It is such a severe effect, that I often have to schedule my shoots outside the country during winter months just to function normally.

To minimize the effects of lack of light, I had to find a unit with all glass walls, and with a South and Southwest exposure and a balcony. With these requirements, and a certain budget, it took over a year to find a suitable unit to live in, and had to wait a couple more years for it to be completed. I studied the plans and models showing the entire neighborhood, and chose a building and a height that will guarantee me direct sunlight as much as possible till sundown, taking into consideration all future buildings around it. The plan and model both clearly showed that the maximum height of the building that can be built in the empty lot in front was 17 stories.

This proposed skyscraper is completely out of place in this neighborhood. Its height is clearly a violation of the Bridgehead Guidelines. The policy for Higher Buildings was intended for the Central Business District in the downtown core. This tower, because of its placement and

proximity, will have **major adverse shadowing** and sunlight impacts on the three condo buildings around it in the same block, as well as on George Wainborn Park. Depending on the building and unit height and season, it will rob the residents of their direct sun for most or all of the afternoon and evening, affecting hundreds of them. In the city's General Policy for Higher Buildings, it clearly states: **Careful consideration should be given to minimize adverse shadowing and view impacts on public realm** including key streets, parks and plazas, **as well as neighbouring buildings.**

Other buildings in Vancouver have been turned down because of adverse shadow impacts. I **strongly urge council to reject this rezoning proposal.** We would be happy if the city retained the original plan which has existed for years. Another possibility is to allow a different development with a building about 17 stories with a wider footprint to accommodate more units; Another option, if the setback to the bridge can be reduced, and any tower part be made shorter, and pushed as far North and as possible towards Pacific. This will minimize the adverse shadow and direct light impacts of the tower on the three adjacent buildings and park.

Thank you for listening to our concerns regarding this rezoning proposal.

Sincerely,

Stuart Dee

Stuart Dee  
Travel Photographer/Writer

s 22(1) Personal and Confidential

American Society of Media Photographers  
Society of American Travel Writers

One good paper on this subject, ANALYSIS OF BUILDING SHADOW IN URBAN PLANNING: A REVIEW , can be found at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310604884\\_ANALYSIS\\_OF\\_BUILDING\\_SHADOW\\_IN\\_URBAN\\_PLANNING\\_A\\_REVIEW](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310604884_ANALYSIS_OF_BUILDING_SHADOW_IN_URBAN_PLANNING_A_REVIEW)

Please see some key quotes below.

The high rises are affecting the urban environment with a high percentage of shadow on surroundings that can have negative impact on others. Hence "Solar Access" has become a contemporary issue for urban planning.

...in addition, shadows of unplanned high rises have **also negative impacts to human health**, comfort living, block natural ventilation and/or reduces economic value of land, affect building design, orientation, and landscaping. (Bronin 2009, Brophy et al. 2000 in Al-Qeeq 2008, Lau & He 2011, Mardaljevic 2004)

Global literature on shadowing effects or solar access to buildings show **they have great impact on our daily life...** Literature reveals the necessity for analyzing shadow effects to urban surroundings of a high multi-stored building is thus multidimensional.

... the necessity of solar access/rights in various urban units like residential ones is prescribed as a must by many researchers for better living. (Anon 2005, Bruce 2008, Lau & He 2011, Littlefair 1998, Mardaljevic 2006, Ogundele et.al. 2011, Sakinc & Sozen 2012, Fontoynt et al. 1984, Menzies & Wherrett 2005, Ne'eman & Shrifteilig 1982 in Lau & He 2011)

According to Hayati and Sayadi (2012), tall buildings can have adverse impacts (increasing congestion population, environmental pollution, reduce citizen access to fresh air and sunlight, wind flow) A study showed that in Chicago in 1923, **dark caverns created by shadows of tall buildings caused depressed workers, an increase in “winter diseases,” congestion in the streets, and the possibility of fires** (CAF, 2002). **Urban spaces which are frequently used meant to be vibrant all year thus need to ensure a healthy environment through assurance of solar access.**

Solar access should be determined before planning an area, where diversity of geographical locations would be included to reduce the negative impacts of extreme shadowing. That is why preserving access to the sun, then, by controlling environmental shadowing is a key concern for the future (Rafiadeh 2005).

Many laws around the world regarding the shading effect of a structure have considerably depicted priority for assuring the comfort from extreme shadowing. Laws of different cities in the world have different perspectives to preserve the residents' preference to get solar access to reduce discomfort. The planning law of the state of Massachusetts about setback rules, land use provision, zoning regulations and lot coverage are strictly maintained to ensure the solar access without blockages. The “Solar Rights Act” of state of New Mexico, set back rules of city of Ashland, Oregon, where three setback rules considering the standards named as solar setbacks, defines what will be the appropriate setbacks of buildings and its height. Not only in USA but also in Slovakia, New Zealand, Brazil has solar ordinances to assure solar rights that ensure shadow and light to the inhabitants. These laws offer maximum solar access to the inhabitants as these areas are winter prominent.