

3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1066-1078 Harwood Street - OPPOSE

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Full Name	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
06/20/2022	19:53	PH2 – 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1066-1078 Harwood Street	Oppose	too much density for busy location. Out of place re neighbor buildings Too tall	Peter Marr	s22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
06/21/2022	10:24	PH2 – 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1066-1078 Harwood Street	Oppose	Please see attached PDF.	Diana Matrick		West End	Appendix A
06/21/2022	16:59	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1066-1078 Harwood Street	Oppose	I'm oppose because of huge environment impact on our neighbors and bald eagle. This propose will change full scale appearance of downtown west end	Tomas Jeck		Downtown	No web attachments.

OPPOSE: 1332 Thurlow Street and 1065 Harwood Street
OPPOSE: 1066-1078 Harwood Street

Dear Mayor Stewart and Councillors:

I oppose all of these for the following reasons:

These developments once again raise important and increasingly ignored questions over what “affordable” housing really means, and which is the right kind of housing for the West End. The so-called “abundant housing” lobby in this city relentlessly pursues a line that more rental capacity automatically equals lower rents and more affordable housing. Last year, rental capacity in the city was reported to be at a 21-year-peak – and rents are equally at all-time highs. Is it possible that building more stock isn’t the silver bullet it claims to be? It is notable that the developers claim the towers will be 100% rental, with fewer than 20% set aside as “below market” rental. Bear in mind that [average market rent](#) in the city of Vancouver stands just shy of \$3,000 a month. Units in brand-new luxury towers will presumably command far more than this. In this scenario, “below market” hardly equals affordable in the West End a neighbourhood whose renters have already sustained a long, painful period of [renovictions](#) and [demovictions](#). Why isn’t the city planning more inclusionary supported housing in this area? The type of housing so plainly needed in an area a short walk from the [Rapid Access Addiction Clinic](#) at St. Paul’s Hospital, safe consumption Dr. Peter AIDS Foundation; where homelessness, vulnerability and mental health challenges are evident, and where residents are used to supporting and welcoming neighbours in need of more help on the road to permanent housing and stability. Bosa Properties isn’t proposing to build on vacant land. It is proposing to tear down long-existing, purpose-built rental units. Not for the people who need it most and can afford it least. But for people who can afford to pay well over

\$6,000 a month for unobstructed sunset views over English Bay. Dressing it up as rental does not equal affordability! Not only are these towers physically and aesthetically out of step with the neighbourhood – they are the wrong housing in the wrong place. Why has the city not insisted on non-profit housing to keep this housing stock for supported housing purposes? Local residents have had zero information from the city re: impact on traffic in the neighbourhood, which is hemmed in by one-way streets and turn restrictions. Thurlow runs one-way from north to south. Beach Avenue is down to one lane, a step the city would like to make permanent. During construction, which will take years, residents who access their homes via laneways between Burrard Street and Thurlow will only be able to enter and exit via Burrard, which already has a number of no-left turn restrictions. Getting to and from their homes will require labyrinthian calisthenics requiring the circling of entire city blocks in order to enter the lane. Against the backdrop of rubber stamping anything and everything with the word “rental” in it, city council must consider these questions:

- 1) Is this development in keeping with the character and demographic of the West End?
- 2) Why is this development offering nothing in the way of supported housing with so many facilities and programs in the neighbourhood aimed at assisting those who are vulnerable and chronically underhoused and where supported housing already exists, without problem or pushback?
- 3) Why another demoviction in a neighbourhood where so many residents have already suffered rising rents, loss of housing, and loss of stability?

4) What provisions are being made to accommodate residents who live in the neighbourhood through construction? Traffic flow and access to laneways will be further restricted in an already highly restricted area with permanent no-left turns heading north on Burrard and no provision to turn right onto Pacific/Beach from Burrard. What happens to people in the neighbourhood with mobility issues who cannot simply walk, or ride their bikes or rely on transit?

These two high-rise towers should not be approved until there are answers to these questions.

I implore you to vote against these developments.

Thank you very much.

Kind regards,