

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Org	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
09/16/2020	16:16	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	'Poor doors' included in this proposal should be sufficient grounds to reject the application. What kind of message would this send to the wider community if City Council supports having segregated entrances for 'market' and 'social' housing units? The plans also show separate play areas based on market and social units. The proposed tower should not exceed 425 feet, as this was the maximum limit placed in the Vancouver Views study that took many years to complete. There needs to be integrity to the process. At 535 feet in height, this tower will block more views from the south side of False Creek. This is why the City should reconsider allow any more intrusions into the QE view cone, as the protected view cones have served the interests of residents well over the years and have kept this City looking spectacular. The social housing component was part of the plan for a very long time. Market rental is not social housing and the two designations should be kept separate in the ledger. By permitting a design that combines an very expensive tower with a lower podium, the City is potentially committing to very high maintenance costs over the life of the building, as costs will in some way be shared. The full financials of the sale of the former City-owned land and the proposed design should be taken into full account. Please reject this rezoning proposal. It's possible to build 8 FSR on this site in a manner that is a closer fit to the currently approved policy. Sincerely yours, Stephen Bohus, BLA	Stephen Bohus		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Grandview-Woodland	No web attachments.
09/16/2020	23:07	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	I urge Council to turn down the rezoning of 601 Beach Ave., 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.	Gil Hermstadt		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
09/16/2020	23:35	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Great effort to create a gateway with a match to an existing structure. Beautiful exterior design and presentation. Great reliance on this aesthetic measure. I don't see the need. Unless substance is lacking otherwise. Regarding aesthetics: I would prefer to maintain a lower profile and provide the aesthetic appeal by incorporating into the Yaletown scale and maintaining a broader north shore view. This is on the Yaletown side of the bridge. It must incorporate into that community not rival or match Vancouver House. This is the signpost for Yaletown. Livability: I am concerned that floor plans for each unit are not presented in the inclusions. Hard to accept a project when size, configurations, probability of inboard bedrooms is not dispelled. How livable will this building be? Hard to tell with the included information. Then there are the more obvious questions, Impossible to find school placements, as publicized in the local media, so where will the children attend school? Can we handle more congestion so close to a bridge? How does this development add to our city? Hopefully there are strong measures in place to insure/secure the units for occupancy not speculation. Thank you!	Irma Sewerin		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

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

09/17/2020	00:27	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I am writing in opposition of the rezoning of 601 Beach Crescent. Vancouver does *not* need another Vancouver House that's even bigger than the Vancouver House. The Vancouver House has already proven to be an utter failure for the city as it produced: - incredibly expensive unaffordable luxury housing, - unaffordable rental housing that starts at \$3,200 for a 1 bedroom, and - so-called "public benefits" like chandelier public art piece that is not a public benefit, but rather a reminder of the inequities in our city. From an urban planning form perspective, we have also seen the disruption and obstruction the Vancouver House has caused to the city's skyline. Whereas most other buildings fit within the skyline envelop, the Vancouver House protrudes, dominates and looms over the city at all angles around the city. We don't need to repeat the same mistake with an even larger building at 601 Beach Crescent. This is a irreversible decision. Further, the building proposed for this application is actually higher than what is actually allowed in the city's own Higher Building policy. The policy allows for 425' max height, but this proposal is for a 535' building. The rezoning should be rejected simply on that basis alone. Thank you for your time and consideration. Regards, Melody	Melody Mah	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	05:45	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	I strongly oppose the planned proposal for 601 Beach Crescent. I was born in Vancouver in 1960, raised in Richmond and later lived and worked as a Chartered Professional Accountant in Vancouver from 2001 to 2014. I officially left Canada in August 2016. As you can see, I am very familiar with what it is like to live and work in Vancouver. I still own and rent out my former residence at 455 ? 1606 Beach Crescent. I oppose the project for the following reasons: 1. Lack of schools, waiting lists at schools. Infrastructure for residents needs to be put in place before the residents move in. 2. Segregation of social housing from market housing (Separate entrance, separated amenities) We don't want to create a social problem by labelling certain citizens as being of a lower class. 3. Traffic and congestion 4. Air pollution leading to increased health issues, higher health care costs, leading to lower productivity and a poorer economy. 5. It takes away the focus from Vancouver's natural surroundings and puts it on the architecture. People choose to live in Vancouver because it is so close to nature! 6. It makes the city less attractive to live in. The one existing tall building next door has severely lessened the natural beauty that Vancouver used to have. 7. I believe that more multi-family dwellings could be built in other parts of Vancouver where there currently are more single-family dwellings. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Maja Züst	Maja Züst	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	I do not live in Vancouver	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	07:52	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Prefer to have the city stop all new development until a new city plan has been put in place. We are losing our city and mountain views to massive concrete towers that are blocking the views of mountains and water. At this rate we will never know we have nature at our doorstep when only a select few living closest to the water will ever see it from their homes. The city is allowing over development and Vancouver is getting uglier by the year. Stop Now. Make a plan.	Hilary Macdonald	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

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

09/17/2020	09:17	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>Inserting a 55-storey tower in a unique shoreline community designed to have primarily tiered 10 ? 38 storey buildings runs counter to area policies. The City supports a vision of family-friendly communities downtown. 601 Beach would add 455 units to the 100s of 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. The tower would futher privatize public views of the water, beaches and North Shore mountains, 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, densely used areas. 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 amount and quality of social housing is far from what was envisioned under the False Creek North ODP, Beach Neighbourhood G/L and existing zoning for a 17-storey building. ? The proposal has 152 units; we estimate current zoning would allow about 50% more. ? The G/L show social housing units away from the bridge, along the Mews and Beach Ave. ? Most units (97) are small (less than 750?), with only 55 family units over 750?.</p>	Mark Sissons	None	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown
------------	-------	--	--------	--	--------------	------	-----------------------------------	----------

APPENDIX A

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

09/17/2020	09:30	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to the proposed rezoning at 601 Beach Crescent being considered today. This is a misuse of the land and only exacerbates the issues dividing the prosperous from the ordinary citizens. The concept of providing space for average incomes (which is provided with restrictions and qualifications anyway) by creating a disproportionate amount of housing for higher incomes - for which lots of building is already being done or in stages of planning and which constitute a minority of city residents - is bad social policy and will not lead to a happier city. The lower levels will be hemmed in with little in the way of views and light, while the highest floors will be blessed with plenty of both. How do you think a young person growing up knowing that the better-offs are above him literally as well as in dollars? People could live in one of the lower suites for 50 years knowing that never in their lives would they have the prospect of being able to apply to move into one of the uppermost levels. What does a more or less permanent sense of being at the bottom within a society do to people's mental and physical health? This is actually well known. Professor Robert Sapolsky is only one of the writers who has addressed this. His writings and lectures on the effects of stress - very much including the stress of real and perceived inequalities within cultures - emphasize that perceived low status is as detrimental to physical and mental health as actual income inequality. Apart from the scholarly research, I find the concept of a whole lot of better-off people being gifted with better places to live than income-straitened people in the same city by the city no less, repugnant. I have lived most of my life at a household income around the Canadian median. However, apart from the social aspect, I also object to the placement of a 55-story building in this location, where it will interfere with important view angles. Vancouver's stunning natural setting is one of the pleasures in life that matter to people at every income level and life circumstance. The sidewalk and roadways and bridges are places where we feel better or worse about our place in the world. I do not oppose all tall buildings, which can be beautiful of course, and at times thrilling, but this does not appear to be an appropriate spot for this height. Please do not approve this re-zoning. Thank you. Joan Bunn</p>	Ms JOAN BUNN		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	11:34	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	See attached.	Stuart Dee		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	APPENDIX B

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

09/17/2020	11:37	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	To whom it may concern, It may be too later for me to speak yet I believe my question is of upmost importance. First, regardless on the ongoing construction, Pacific Ave has always been a traffic nightmare. I fear that this increase of residences will make Beach Ave, a once pleasant neighbourhood street, it?s twin. A congested roadway with speeding cars, not mindful of pedestrians. I routinely see cars failing to stop at intersections on Pacific . Will Beach become another such route? Nothing but nothing has been done to improve the traffic or the roadway. Don?t speak of ?shared drinking or bike routes?! This is not the demographic living here. Most are ?down-sizers ? who do not wish to put their lives on line each time they set outside. Looking also at affordability! Will any of these new units be affordable to a B.C. Millennial ? I doubt it. Will the staring price be several million as in the Vancouver House or the other tower on Hornby ? To whose benefit, certainly not for this community. I understand it is valuable land, yet how about a little green space, a community garden. I see the one on Burrard and Davies is to be demolished and replaced by yet another tower! We speak of Vancouver being a ? green city? sure does not look it . The colour of Vancouver is concrete gray! Respectfully, Halina Rath Resident	Halina Rath	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	11:41	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	These are my reasons for opposing the application. This feedback was previously submitted on Nov 18, 2019. Feedback - Rezoning Application - 601 Beach Crescent 11/18/2019 - 05:24 am - Comments: 1. This property is zoned for 17 stories 2. Increasing to 55 stories is beyond the capacity of Beach Cr and the neighbourhood to handle the increased traffic and density especially with the increased traffic and density that will already result from Vancouver House development. 3. Setbacks have improved on Beach Cr but not enough setback distance on Seymour Mews. 4. Driveway is right next to existing driveway of 583 Beach Cr. Unprecedented to have adjacent driveways for 2 high density buildings which will lead to more traffic, more accidents and higher risk to pedestrians using Beach Cr and the neighbourhood. Location of the driveway should be moved to an area that will minimize these risks. Thank you for your consideration. Barry Inouye	Barry Inouye	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	11:44	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	See attached	Bernd Banke	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential <input type="checkbox"/>	West End	APPENDIX C
09/17/2020	11:45	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	We are definitely opposed to this Rezoning. Gordon and Heidi Reid s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Gordon and Heidi Reid	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	11:57	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Dear Sirs, I am writing to oppose the application to rezone 601 Beach Crescent because the occupancy density in the area has already gone out of hand with a lot of high rises all built in one small area. I find it very difficult to enjoy the sea wall area that I was used to. Thank you. Howard Chu s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Howard Chu	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kerrisdale	No web attachments.

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

09/17/2020	12:03	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	I oppose the rezoning of 601 Beach Crescent. 3 of the primary reasons are: 1. Lack of Schools 2. Segregation of social housing from market housing (Separate entrance, separated amenities) 3. Traffic and congestion	Shannon Kolind		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	12:22	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	See attached	Ian Crook		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	APPENDIX D
09/17/2020	15:30	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	See attached	Mira Bajic		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	APPENDIX E
09/17/2020	15:32	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	As a concern citizen I am opposing this unreasonable development on every ground. I am living in the neighbourhood for more than 12 years and it is like to live in construction site. All the nearby developments disrupted our lives weekly. On occasions unable to leave our driveway (missed scheduled appointment) for reason that huge construction truck was loading and unloading construction material and machinery for full hour. The street is narrow ,people and delivery and moving trucks double-parks there is no other choice. This development would make everything worth and I am not able to take another 5+ more years of next door construction ,noise ,traffic disruption and all the other problems that come with it. Karel Janousek	Karel Janousek		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	15:34	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I strongly recommend opposing this rezoning for a 55-storey building from the original 17-storey social housing. The social house aspect of this project is an afterthought. For a project this size, it only offers 152 units for social housing. You can easily get more units for Social Housing from a 17-storey building with a lot this size. Since the City of Vancouver is all about inclusion, how is it that this project has a separate entrance for the social housing units (aka. ?Poor Doors?) instead of a common entrance and segregated playgrounds for the social housing units and market units? Decisions like this are contrary to what Vancouver strives to achieve. Vancouver needs more affordable housing not luxury condos. The need for luxury condos are already being addressed by Vancouver House right next door, The Pacific by Grosvenor and 1335 Howe by Onni one block over. If Vancouver's goal is truly to provide more affordable housing, it would be very wise to REJECT this proposal. We only have so much space to build, why not add more social housing instead of another luxury condo with prices out of reach of the majority of people? Thank you for your time. Respectfully, Pia Villanueva	Pia Villanueva		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

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

09/17/2020	15:37	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>Dear City Council I am writing in regard to the proposed new development at 601 Beach Crescent. I own an apartment in a neighbouring building per the above address. I am extremely dismayed at the difference between the original proposal for this site and the new proposed development. As I understand it, this land was originally given to the city for social housing - as everyone knows, probably the most needed type of housing in the city. When the city sold it to the developer, the intention was for a 17 storey building. Now we are looking at another giant building of 53 storeys, taller even than the new Vancouver House building beside it. Do we really need more huge high-rises that obscure the mountain views for people driving into the city over the Granville bridge? My main concern, however, is that while there will indeed be social housing accommodated in the new plan, this is what the land was originally intended for. It should not be merely a token part of the new plan by a developer who received a pretty nice deal on this piece of land. A particularly egregious aspect of the plan is the concept of two entry doors, one for the poor and one for the rich. I can't believe this is even being contemplated in this day and age. Shame on city council if they allow this stratification of social classes to be intentionally built into any property at all, let alone one that was originally intended to support the less wealthy inhabitants of the city. How are we supposed to trust the decision-making abilities of City Council when they get steam-rolled by developers who think they can just do as they wish in the city. There are other contentious elements to the proposal including lack of sufficient schools nearby and increased traffic congestion in an already busy area with a business college soon to open. I urge Council to reject this proposal and ask the developers to come back with a proposal that is more in line with the original concept for the land and that does not further increase the divisions between rich and poor in the city. I think we have all learned during the Covid pandemic that we are far more dependent on the ordinary workers of the province - the relatively poor and underpaid - than on the extremely wealthy who can afford the kind of "upper level" accommodations that are now the primary focus of the development. It's time to give these essential workers a very big break! Sincerely Maureen Sanders</p>	Maureen Sanders		s 22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
------------	-------	--	--------	---	-----------------	--	-----------------------------------	----------	---------------------

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

09/17/2020	15:38	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>Dear City Council I am writing in regard to the proposed new development at 601 Beach Crescent. I own an apartment in a neighbouring building per the above address. I am extremely dismayed at the difference between the original proposal for this site and the new proposed development. As I understand it, this land was originally given to the city for social housing - as everyone knows, probably the most needed type of housing in the city. When the city sold it to the developer, the intention was for a 17 storey building. Now we are looking at another giant building of 53 storeys, taller even than the new Vancouver House building beside it. Do we really need more huge high-rises that obscure the mountain views for people driving into the city over the Granville bridge? My main concern, however, is that while there will indeed be social housing accommodated in the new plan, this is what the land was originally intended for. It should not be merely a token part of the new plan by a developer who received a pretty nice deal on this piece of land. A particularly egregious aspect of the plan is the concept of two entry doors, one for the poor and one for the rich. I can't believe this is even being contemplated in this day and age. Shame on city council if they allow this stratification of social classes to be intentionally built into any property at all, let alone one that was originally intended to support the less wealthy inhabitants of the city. How are we supposed to trust the decision-making abilities of City Council when they get steam-rolled by developers who think they can just do as they wish in the city. There are other contentious elements to the proposal including lack of sufficient schools nearby and increased traffic congestion in an already busy area with a business college soon to open. I urge Council to reject this proposal and ask the developers to come back with a proposal that is more in line with the original concept for the land and that does not further increase the divisions between rich and poor in the city. I think we have all learned during the Covid pandemic that we are far more dependent on the ordinary workers of the province - the relatively poor and underpaid - than on the extremely wealthy who can afford the kind of "upper level" accommodations that are now the primary focus of the development. It's time to give these essential workers a very big break! Sincerely, Esmond Sanders</p>	Esmond Sanders		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
09/17/2020	16:10	PH2 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 601 Beach Crescent	Oppose	<p>We Oppose Rezoning Application - 601 Beach Crescent It's time the City of Vancouver stopped relying upon massive and intrusive developer-led projects such as this destructive 'Vancouver Gateway' concept and commit to community planning. Petition signatures gathered at: https://www.liveabilityfirst.ca/ Includes 143 signatures with 40 petitioner comments.</p>	Candace Smith	liveabilityfirst.ca	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	See Petition (143 names)
09/17/2020	16:12		Oppose	<p>Hello Denise and City Clerk Team, Please see the attached file for a petition in opposition to the Rezoning Application. I could not figure out how to submit it online. Can you please include this in the package to the Mayor and Council? Kindly confirm that this will be included. Sincerely, Ross Lam</p>	Ross Lam		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	See Petition (163 names)
09/17/2020	16:12		Oppose	<p>I am oppose to The height of the building - one high rise - Vancouver House already increased density of the neighbourhood. This will causes increased traffic volume and noise level and changed the character of the neighbourhood.</p>	katherine k tong		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.

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

09/17/2020	16:13		Oppose	<p>Good afternoon, I would like to express my concerns about the rezoning application for 601 Beach Crescent. I currently live in the Azura II and have grave concerns about this project. When you presented information in your open house, you failed to take the impact on my building in consideration. My suite currently faces the site where this monstrosity would be build. This building would impact my well being greatly as it would deprive me of the sunshine that my suite currently receives. I am also very concerned about the shadowing onto George Wainborn Park which is literally the backyard for everyone living along Beach Crescent. I am also very concerned about the additional traffic congestion this tower will bring to my neighborhood. You have recently eliminated lanes along Richards Street for a bike lane and have a proposal to remove lanes from the Granville Street Bridge. This area is already significantly back up during rush hour traffic and the number of residents in a building this size will add a great deal of idling cars to the neighborhood. This will further contribute to a negative affect on the environment. The infrastructure in this area is not equipped for such a volume of people. There is already difficulties in getting children into local schools and this volume of new residents would further strain the local school system. The local bus along this route is a minibus and is already full with people half the time. The wait at St. Paul's hospital is already significant without an additional influx of people from this tower. This is further concerning when the hospital is relocated outside of the downtown core with the current limited bus service in the area. Lastly and most concerning is the City's breach of trust relating to this parcel of land. It was gifted to the City with the intention of it being put towards a 17 story tower for social housing. Instead the City turned around and sold it significantly for majority of market housing and significantly limited the number of social housing units being built. The proposal has only allotted a very limited number social house units within the building on a very discriminant basis. This include separate "poor door" entrances and separate play areas for children from social housing units. This proposal is a complete failure to the original intention of the gift of this land as well as to those most in need of the City's help in finding attainable housing in the downtown core. I sincerely hope the City takes these facts into consideration and oppose the current proposal for 601 Beach Crescent. I thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.</p>	Aleisha Fazekas		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 building and area residents, and the many visitors that live, work and recreate in and around the iconic Vancouver landscape that is False Creek. **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. The so-called "gateway" sites were added along the

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

In any case, the project runs contrary to the (relevant) HBP guidelines (Feb. 2018 version):

- 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').* **Urban Design Committee 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 neighborhood.**
- 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 photos on [#LiveabilityFirst](#)); and the proliferation of luxury, investor-owned condo towers downtown.

¹ Proposed by GBL Architects Ltd. for Pinnacle International:
<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/601beach/index.htm>

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



- **Open Space & Views**: The tower will intrude on **views, open space and amenity values** for the huge expected increase in **people who “walk, roll and bike” across the 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 the 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 cars and bikes, spilling into an already busy area, affect **congestion, bike lanes, driver/cyclist/pedestrian safety, emergency vehicles and air pollution?**

3. ***Neighbourhood impacts: The proposal is counter to planning guidelines intended to ensure that False Creek North is home to liveable compact 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 support 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 the 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.

c. **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 of 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 been considered, but should be, given the location, scale and extreme height of the project. This is in part due to some disconnect between City planning processes and rezoning 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, beaches and North Shore mountains, 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, densely used areas.** Vancouver House blocks many views from homes, streets, sidewalks and bike paths in those communities, e.g., along 10th and 14th Ave. (see website).

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 and now Metro [is seeking municipal 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 zoning for a 17-storey building.
 - The proposal has 152 units; we estimate current zoning would allow about 50% more.
 - The G/L show social housing units away from the bridge, along the Mews and Beach Ave.
 - 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, South Granville and Kitsilano.



Not more of this*

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 impact residential communities 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 dovetailed with Downtown South, Fairview, South Granville and Kitsilano plans, with full consultation. The ODP focuses on creating compact and complete downtown communities, with less reliance on the car, and for a diversity of residents. These neighbourhoods are models of urban #liveability and #sustainability, contributing to the City's new “Climate Emergency Action Plan” and its “bold new actions”.

The City's review of rezoning and development permit application take into account infrastructure, transportation and schools, as well as the cumulative impacts of other projects in the area, e.g., Granville Loops multi-use development. Developments are integrated into the City's public realm initiatives, such as Granville Bridge Upgrades, Greenways and bike networks.

Policy provisions for Community Amenity Contributions ensure that social housing on the site provides truly affordable and liveable housing for residents. New models are found for social housing provision that don't depend on permitting more high-rise luxury condo towers, with starkly contrasting quality of life and amenities, and separate entrances for social housing residents. Development within False Creek North communities follows the model in the proposed False Creek South redevelopment plan, which aims to provide for “diversity” of people and a “mixed-income community consists of one-third each for low-, middle-, and high-income residents.”

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



Dear Mayor and Councillors,

"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 area.

The **liveabilityfirst** group and others have detailed clearly how this project **will destroy the liveability and quality of life in the neighborhood**. It violates the master plan, and the destroys the public's trust in the city's urban planners.

I'd like to add something that is 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 talks about view, it 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 (Recent studies show that staying indoors for Covid-19 reduced Vitamin D to an extent that actually made people more prone to being infected and harmed by the virus.), 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, ability to work, 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 strong disorder, 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 choose a unit with all glass walls, and with an 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 till sundown, taking into consideration all future buildings around it. The plan and model both clearly showed a building with a 17 story limit in the lot adjacent to our building.

This proposed skyscraper is completely out of place in this neighborhood. It's 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 it's placement and proximity, will have **major adverse shadowing** and view impacts on the three condo buildings around it in the same block, as well 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 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.**

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

Please see some key quotes below.

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; or, if the setback to the bridge was reduced, and the taller part of any development be made shorter, and pushed as far North and as possible towards Pacific, to minimize the adverse shadow and direct light effects of the skyscraper on the three adjacent buildings.

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

Sincerely,

Stuart Dee

Stuart Dee
Travel Photographer/Writer

§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential

American Society of Media Photographers
Society of American Travel Writers

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.

From: Bernd Banke
To: [Public Hearing](#)
Subject: [EXT] 601 Beach Crescent - Rezoning Application
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 10:02:41 AM

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

tonight is the public hearing for the re-zoning application at 601 Beach Crescent, in the heart of our beloved neighbourhood. Unfortunately due to work I won't be able to participate but would like to address my concerns via this email:

We have lived in Vancouver since 2006 and have closely followed the developments over the years. I have always been very proud of being part of such a beautiful and proactive city, which has always put the public interest as its main focus. Vancouver is world renowned for being one of the most liveable cities in the world. But it seems we have reached a point where financial gain of big scale developers and investors holds precedence over the well being and wishes of the local Vancouver Community and its neighbourhoods, and the retention of its city & nature charm. We all understand growth is important for a sustainable future but this has to be achieved in conjunction with the view and wishes of the residents of Vancouver, as well as in accordance to keep our world renown Vancouver skyline with the beautiful backdrop of our North Shore Mountains clean of luxury high rise buildings which only benefit a few but will effect the rest of us long term residents negatively.

Having a huge tower looming over our Beach Crescent neighbourhood will rob many residents of this part of their life and the reason why we chose to live in specifically this pocket. Also, the shadow of the proposed 54 story tower would effect parts of Georg Wainborn Park as well, which is the main green recreational space in our neighbourhood.

I have spoken to neighbours who are facing the West Side of Vancouver House as well as other neighbours who live in the vicinity of the Charleson. They all mentioned a very noticeable decrease in the natural breeze flowing around the buildings to their apartments. They mention that before the new high rise buildings, they always had a natural flow of air coming into their units which now has changed dramatically to the point of complete cut off of the natural air circulation. A 54-story tower at 601 Beach Crescent would surely have a similar effect on its neighbouring towers as well.

Another neglected point is the added artificial light pollution. The construction workers have started leaving lights on in the Vancouver House and we can already see how it lights up the neighbourhood during the hours of darkness. The completed Vancouver House plus the proposed development at 601 Beach Crescent would light up our neighbourhood

tremendously.

Also, all the new high rise towers in the West End, along Pacific & Cambie as well as Yaletown have not been taken into account. Just in our immediate vicinity we have the Vancouver House (52 stories), the Charleson (43 Stories) and The Pacific (39 stories). Those new developments will add 890 new units with associated residents and vehicles to the Beach District neighbourhood. Not even taken into account the new developments along Drake, Davie and Helmcken. If we add up all the numbers there will be huge increase in residents in our neighbourhood. I am very concerned as there is no long term plan to look after the needed infrastructure as well. What about new schools, childcare & seniors facilities, green spaces, dog parks and especially roads and street side parking! Richards St has just been proposed to actually decrease car lanes to create better and safer bike lanes (which I very much support as it is necessary).

There will be a substantial increase in traffic even without the 601 Beach Crescent proposal, so adding 601 Beach Crescent to the mix will transform quaint Beach Crescent into a pendant to Pacific Ave, and the sanctuary of George Wainborn Park will be lost.

George Wainborn Park is well known in the downtown core for being a sanctuary and green retreat for all ages to enjoy and escape the city. Beach Crescent currently only serves as access for the adjacent buildings on Beach Crescent. It has purposely been kept as a one way street towards Beach Ave to avoid being used as an alternative to Pacific Avenue by non residential traffic. Having Vancouver House already in the immediate vicinity it will have an huge impact on the tranquility of the Beach Crescent pocket. Now adding another 450 residential/social housing units at 601 Beach Crescent plus the associated services vehicles, vendors, visitors etc will inevitably transform Beach Crescent into a major artery. And George Wainborn Park will lose it's peace and quite and people will be more concerned that their kids & dogs won't get run over by the constant stream of traffic.

The traffic data for the transportation study was collected on 22 Aug 2018, which obviously is a quieter time of the year due to school holidays, people taking vacations and people tend to walk and bike more due to summer weather. Furthermore The Southern end of Granville Street intersecting with Beach Ave was not accounted for as it is currently under construction

We all understand that 150 affordable housing units (if they actually are affordable units for locals) are beneficial for the city. But surely our neighbourhood does not need another luxury high rise tower which only enriches and benefits a few but negatively effects our whole beautiful neighbourhood. It has been originally zoned for a 17 story building to fit in the whole False Creek North development plan. All other building stuck to the original zoning so why change it for 601 Beach Crescent?

I am content with the original zoning but strongly oppose the rezoning proposal for a new 54-story tower at 601 Beach Crescent. The rezoning would have no benefits for our neighbourhood and also is not supported in any way through a long term sustainable plan to secure the needed associated infrastructures and public supports.

The neighbourhood and I are very concerned about not being consulted and heard in the decision made which will drastically impact our neighbourhood. I recommend having additional open houses before the final vote so we can continue the discussion to find a sustainable solution which will benefit everybody involved and effected.

Thank you very much for listening to our neighbourhood, I very much appreciated it!

With kind regards,

Bernd Banke

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Ian Crook
To: [Bligh, Rebecca](#); [Boyle, Christine](#); [Carr, Adriane](#); [De Genova, Melissa](#); [Dominato, Lisa](#); [Fry, Pete](#); [Hardwick, Colleen](#); [Kirby-Yung, Sarah](#); [Swanson, Jean](#); [Wiebe, Michael](#); [Stewart, Kennedy](#); [Public Hearing](#)
Subject: [EXT] 601 Beach Avenue
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 12:16:15 PM

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Stewart and Councillors

I am writing to you regarding the proposed revisions to the City's By-laws with respect to the proposed development of the site located at 601 Beach Avenue. There are a number of issues with this proposal and I will comment of a few of them below.

- The rezoning approvals sought would result in the construction of a building which will be almost 20% taller than contemplated in the Higher Buildings Policy; according to the City's Higher Buildings Policy, a building this tall should be located in the Central Business District, not on the north shore of False Creek. The building also represents a significant exception to the False Creek North ODP, which calls for buildings of 10-38 floors.
- The site is a less than ideal location for housing generally, and the social housing units will bear the brunt of the poor choice of location. The market housing- condominiums – will no doubt be targeted to high end luxury buyers, and there will be separate entrances for the condominiums and social housing units. It is also worth noting that the social housing units will be within 10 meters of Granville Street traffic, which cannot be good from a health perspective.
- Another issue with respect to this application is that lack of school capacity for the new residents of the buildings. The only school within walking distance is the Elsie Roy Elementary, and which is already operating at capacity, so it is unclear where City staff expect the new students residing in this building will receive their education. This seems to be a common theme with many developments coming to council recently: Staff supports developments in locations where critical infrastructure is lacking, and it is not immediately clear where schools would be constructed if funding were made available by the Province.
- One separate observation about the shadow studies referenced in the referral report: There is no commentary on the shadow analysis for the Winter Solstice – i.e. December 21. It would be instructive to understand why staff does not comment on this in the referral report, as the applicant did provide the information in both its original and revised submissions, for most hours of the day. Staff's treatment of shadow studies can be kindly described as inconsistent, particularly when the applicant has gone to the expense of obtaining the information, and the public and council would presumably want to understand the shadow impact of such a tall structure.

I recognize some of the decisions leading up to this application were made by prior councils, but those decisions do not bind this council. The City was given this land by Concord Pacific for social housing. The land was sold to the developer at a bargain price (\$20mm). While the City is obtaining much needed social housing units through this arrangement, it is not clear why a 100% social housing development – possibly developed in partnership with a not-for-profit, conforming to the existing by-laws, was not pursued, given the City's land acquisition cost was negligible, as many more social housing units could have been

constructed.

Given all of the foregoing, I ask that you vote against the proposed by-law revisions.

Regards

Ian Crook

From: Mira Bajic
To: [Public Hearing](#)
Subject: [EXT] Rezoning Application at 601 Beach - OPPOSED
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 1:14:55 PM

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Hello mayor and council,

I am writing to let you know that I am **opposed** to the rezoning application for 601 Beach Avenue.

Firstly, I am PRO-development and passionate about creating great communities. Secondly, I am a resident and home owner who wants to see the city continue to grow and thrive. As a real estate investor as well, I understand that continuing to delay approvals adds costs and increases prices of real estate for everyone: developers, investors, buyers, renters, etc. and there are ripple effects with workers and where they live to supply adding to labour costs, and social decline when an adequate supply of housing is not available. But my feeling ever since this development was proposed was that the application was not fitting with the neighborhood, does not achieve the land use strategy and will create more inequalities not less (i.e. Please, no Poor Door buildings). With COVID-19, I am concerned that not enough public opposition is being made or will be made on key decisions like this.

My thoughts are going to economics and the idea of "utility" (also "liveability"). In economics theory, there is an optimal city size, where the maximum utility of residents has not been achieved, and each additional person who moves to the city means that generally everyone is better off. But after that optimal city size has been reached, each additional resident who individually moves to the city makes themselves better off to the detriment of all others, since they ignore the impact of their decision on others. Developers have an opportunity to make profit as long as there is an excess of utility that has not been met by supply, and they will and should continue to seek these profits since that is how efficient markets work. But...sometimes efficiencies create unfairness and overall welfare loss to society, reducing everyone's overall utility (i.e. happiness, contentment, cohesiveness,...).

I am Block Watch Captain for WE-28, the complex next door to the proposed site, which includes three towers of Two Park West, Azura II and Aqua, and the street-level townhomes within our complex. I've seen the area change dramatically over the past 15 years and more, all very much positive for the community and WITHIN THE MASTER PLANNED COMMUNITY plans. The area has changed a lot, and with COVID-19, social decline has worsened...just this morning our concierge attended to and escorted another person off of Seymour Mews who appeared to have collapsed to rest with his shiny clean, purple women's bicycle, likely stolen from somewhere nearby.

When original owners such as myself bought into the building(s), it was with the understanding that the site next door was city land set aside for future social housing use. I continue to support this original plan for **social housing**, and would support city amenities such as a **school**. Why then is the city approving projects where so many people and their kids are being put into massive housing density buildings where there are no schools or related amenities and services for them??

I understand that many people will judge my opposition as self-interest or NIMBY-ism. I would like you to understand that it is a much broader concern than that. Solutions are needed, yes, for our housing needs, and I would support a master-planned approach that takes into account how the whole community's needs and utility is achieved, rather than a spot-zoning such as this. Please **reject** this application, and encourage the city to expand into underserved areas (East Vancouver comes to top of mind, for example, where utility has not been maximized, schools can be saved/expanded and land use will fit the diverse needs of a community) so that we don't have to inappropriate land use and deeper societal inequalities.

Thank you
Mira Bajic