

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	15:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>The 3 blocks on E 10th Ave between Guelph St and Fraser St have more 100-year-old Edwardian homes than anywhere else in Mount Pleasant East. It is an architecturally significant strip in a city that often overlooks its architectural history. These historic homes are lovingly cared for, multi-family residences on a quiet residential street framed by gigantic, leafy chestnut trees.</p> <p>These three blocks on E 10th are a special place in our neighborhood, and few streets are quite as strikingly beautiful as this one. If the north side of E 10th between Saint George St and Carolina St is to be transformed into higher density housing, please take this opportunity to help improve our unique neighborhood by approving buildings that feel connected in scale and architectural significance to the residences around it, and that enhance the beauty and charm of the street. The proposed site plan does not achieve any of this. If approved, it would not only be a missed opportunity to improve upon what is already here, but it will also be a detriment to the neighborhood and the families living nearby.</p> <p>Please consider the following:</p> <p><b>BUILDING SCALE:</b> The proposed building will look gigantic on this block and tower over the lovely homes around it. It also lacks observable references to the heritage character and aesthetic of the street. Many wonderful new condo developments along the Broadway Corridor have sprung up within 1 block of the site proposal: The Saint George (5 stories), 550 EB Studio Apartments (4 stories), 2525 Carolina St (6 stories), 595 E Broadway (4 stories), for example. These buildings offer high density housing at a scale that is appropriate for the surrounding neighborhood. It will be very strange to have a 19-story building on our quiet residential street when just one block away the adjacent condos along the Broadway Corridor artery are all 6 stories or less. We understand the need to add density even on quieter streets, but we shouldn't have to bust up an entire block to achieve that, particularly on a street as lovely as E 10th Ave. There are still so many vacant, struggling and dilapidated commercial buildings along the Broadway Corridor inside 3 blocks of the proposed site plan; a 19-story building should find an available site nearby on the main artery that is better suited to support its scale.</p> <p><b>TRAFFIC AND BIKER SAFETY:</b> E 10th Ave is not a through street for cars. Two blocks from the proposed building site, E 10th Ave terminates at Guelph St. for cars travelling West from the proposed site plan (only bike traffic can cross Guelph). If this 19 story tower is built, the traffic bottleneck along the street and the surrounding streets will be significant. The 10th Avenue</p>	Laurel Thomson	Mount Pleasant	

Corridor bikeway is already one of the busiest west to east corridors in Vancouver's cycling network, and this vehicle traffic bottleneck will be unsafe for bikers.

PARKING: The building proposal includes 175 rental units but few parking spaces. Today, E 10th Ave doesn't have enough parking for its current residents, and, as outlined above, E 10th Ave terminates 2 blocks from the site plan at Guelph St, which means that cars circling around looking for parking will create a bottleneck of congestion and endanger bikers.

CITY COUNCIL PROCESS: The article published on September 19, 2023 in the Globe and Mail interviewing the developer Mr. Fast about this application includes this quote from Mr. Fast which is really in poor taste: "The city could choose to reject the application.. But we have also met with the majority of the council members and they have given us their verbal approval for the project". The public hearing hasn't even happened yet and the developer is speaking openly about this project being a "done deal" in a national publication. Does Vancouver City Council really care so little for residents' concerns? That Mr. Fast would have the confidence to say this publicly speaks volumes about just how much power developers have in Vancouver and it really disenfranchises residents.

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	15:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am writing to register my concern about the proposed Re-zoning of 523 -549 E. 10th ave. I have serious concerns about the capacity of the Civic infrastructure, schools, medical facilities, roadways, transit, sewer and water resources, to accommodate the massive amount of density proposed across the Broadway Plan area. As an example, in the nearby Simon Fraser elementary, just working with current RT-6 increases in density, children in the catchment use a lottery system to attempt to get into the school.</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is currently a community that has worked hard to increase density in a measured and transitional way to honour the existing character of the neighbourhood while bringing in creative new solutions to welcome a cross section of new residents.</p> <p>I believe our City has an opportunity and an obligation to find the very best housing solutions for all of us. I want to be delighted by and proud of how we create community and provide for our friends and neighbours. The proposal I see for the Re-zoning of 523-549 E. 10th, multiplied by approximately 150, unfortunately very similar developments, across the Broadway Corridor do not make me hopeful. We can do better.</p> <p>I ask that the Council seriously consider whether these new units will actually be an affordable and liveable space. That they consider the impact these developments will actually have on the existing neighbourhoods, on more than one level. Please take a walk in these neighbourhoods, from Clark to Arbutus, but especially right now, from Kingsway to Fraser along 10th. Truly understand the opportunity we have to enhance these neighbourhoods, not destroy them. To plan for the benefit of the residents of Vancouver, not just the financial gain of the developers.</p> <p>And because the playing field seems to constantly change, eg. 2 towers per block to as many as will fit, I ask all of you to take a deep breath and a step back. Please put a hold on approving developments in non CD1 zones. Density does not necessarily imply affordability. Please take a look at the larger picture and see how, together, we can avoid mediocrity and make this City marvelous and affordable for all.</p>	Carol VanCamp	Mount Pleasant	
2024-11-12	15:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This tower and the others will displace many long time residents who have built their lives and a thriving community in this neighbourhood that they love. A neighborhood with lots of character, gardens, mature trees, and other nature that is a valued escape to quiet greenspace for many. The houses here are each home to many renters who can simply not afford to move elsewhere.</p>	Kevin Adair	Mount Pleasant	

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	15:47	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Although I don't live in the immediate area of this proposed development, I do live in the Mount Pleasant/Riley Park vicinity. I have walked past this spot many times and and continue to be flabbergasted that there is a proposal to put a 19 storey building smack in the middle of a residential street, a mere one block from Broadway and even more surprised that it would be on one of the busiest bike designated streets in the city. While I am very much in favour of increased density to help the current housing situation, I cannot believe that you would be considering approval for this building in this location. Why would it not be situated on Broadway which is already a car thoroughfare and a much more appropriate place for the location of a building of this magnitude? With 110 parking stalls and that many cars coming in and out, I can't even begin to imagine how that is compatible with the amount of bike traffic that there is on 10th Avenue. It would seem to me that that would create a major hazard. Are we not meant to be promoting bikes over cars in this city? I could even understand it being between Broadway and 10th on one of the side streets but actually on 10th itself, how can that even be considered? Of course we need more housing, of course we need another child care facility but a 19 storey building with 110 parking spots on a residential, bike designated street seems madness. It also seems extraordinary to plonk such a huge building in the middle of a residential street. I could understand a 4 storey building that blends in with the neighbourhood but this is going to be a blight on what is a peaceful residential street that currently sees more bikes on it than cars. There are a number of areas I could visualize this building being located in this area, but definitely not here! I am opposed to this and some of the other 15 storey+ buildings being proposed in residential neighbourhoods.</p>	Fiona Cameron (formerly Norris)	Riley Park	

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	14:47	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>-I have lived for 45 years with my wife and raised my two children in a Mount Pleasant neighbourhood just off Broadway and have lived through the many impacts and changes that our increase in city population with the accompanying need for additional housing has brought to the area.</p> <p>-However, this proposed development is completely out of scale and out of character with the existing homes and streetscapes in East Mount Pleasant. The existing RT-5 'Conditional' zoning has worked well in these neighbourhoods to provide a reasonable and manageable increase in density but a change to CD-1 is unwarranted.</p> <p>-This proposed development will cause a disproportionate densification in the local population which will put additional stresses on local community facilities, recreational and cultural which are already struggling to cope with the increases of the last 15 years.</p> <p>-The units larger than studio or one bedroom will be targeted to families and a substantial number of those families will own a vehicle. With less than 1/3 of these units having access to on-site vehicle parking, the need for spill-over vehicle street parking will be increased substantially in this area which is already choked with residents in multi-family dwellings who depend on street parking.</p> <p>-Market pricing of housing in Mount Pleasant is already unaffordable to most prospective owners and tenants. There are no long term guarantees or COV bylaw enforcement that those units defined to be 'Below Market' will remain at those initial 'Below Market' levels nor are there guarantees that the units will revert to private ownership and be flipped for profit in the future.</p> <p>-The existing and emerging Mount Pleasant family population needs substantially more subsidized \$10/day daycare. There are no guarantees that the pricing on 25 private daycare spaces will be affordable.</p>	Michael DuBelko	Mount Pleasant	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	14:53	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the 500-block of East 10th Avenue, which would replace existing buildings with a 19-storey high-rise tower. This development would introduce significant negative impacts on our community for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased Traffic and Safety Concerns: East 10th Avenue is a narrow street that is already a major bike route in Vancouver. Adding a high-density residential tower will dramatically increase traffic, both from residents and from delivery vehicles, creating a hazardous environment for cyclists and pedestrians alike. The current infrastructure is simply not suited to handle this level of traffic without compromising safety.</li> <li>2. Lack of Affordable Housing: This project does not address the critical need for genuinely affordable housing. The new high-rise units would likely be priced at or just below market rates, which remain unaffordable for many working families and individuals in our community. Instead of providing housing options that support long-term residents, this development risks pushing out young families and working people, eroding the vibrant, diverse community that defines our neighborhood.</li> <li>3. Loss of Community Space and Family-Friendly Environment: The proposed development threatens to transform a family-friendly area where children play safely and where neighbors gather. Our community's unique character, which includes spaces safe for kids to play and events like Halloween trick-or-treating, will be lost to the impersonal feel of high-rise developments.</li> <li>4. Environmental and Health Impacts: East 10th Avenue is lined with beautiful, mature trees that contribute to the natural charm and environmental health of our neighborhood. The construction of a high-rise would risk the destruction of these trees. Additionally, the deep excavation required for such a project could exacerbate the rodent problem that residents are already struggling to manage. We are spending hundreds of dollars on pest control, and further disruption could make this problem much worse.</li> </ol> <p>I urge the council to consider these factors and prioritize preserving the character, safety, and livability of East 10th Avenue. High-rise development may be appropriate in some areas, but this side street is not suited for such a drastic transformation.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the voices of those who live, work, and care deeply about the future of this neighborhood.</p>	Heidi Chan	Mount Pleasant	

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	13:35	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I live on east 10th ave. and am vehemently opposed to the displacement of so many residents from the proposed building under the Broadway Plan. These houses are not occupied by one or two people, often they hold upwards of nine or ten individuals, most of which have been living in these places for ten plus years. These are not just rental units that we can actually afford (unlike literally anywhere else in the city); these are our homes. I understand the need to expand, but do it along broadway, where it makes sense. Don't take away the reason why so many of us love this neighborhood: our community.</p>	Sarah Smith	Mount Pleasant	
2024-11-12	12:24	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Please consider my comments in opposition to the proposed rezoning and development at 523-549 East 10th. My opposition is for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unsafe   I have been living on this street for nearly a decade and witnessed first-hand many crashes and near-accidents given all of the people using the street at present. A large building will attract more cars, and there simply isn't the capacity for this residential street to accommodate it. If this redevelopment proceeds, there will be more and more accidents and unsafe conditions for those living in the neighbourhood. 10th Avenue is not a wide enough street to accommodate more people and cars. There is already fierce competition between bikes and cars/parking, as it is a bike lane. There is a need to address safety concerns for tenth avenue right now, before a monstrous building is added.</li> <li>2. Tenant Evictions   The homes/apartments that are part of the proposed rezoning are tenanted. Where are these people to go? In the interest of "adding housing", many people will be displaced.</li> <li>3. Destructive to local community   Tenth avenue is a community/neighbourhood. There are already overcrowded amenities (schools, stores, parking, etc.). This specific location does not have the capacity to accommodate masses of people being added. Additionally, this will force out local artists, singles, families and youth, people who have lived in the neighbourhood for years.</li> <li>4. Historic preservation   Many of the homes along 10th avenue are designated Heritage homes. Introducing monstrous new builds will degrade the fabric and character of this beautiful street.</li> </ol> <p>I would advocate for slowing the pace of this project, and taking a closer look at the neighbourhoods and streets that you are choosing. Broadway and Fraser make more sense for this type of development, not a narrow, tree-lined family neighbourhood street.</p>	Rebecca Recant	Mount Pleasant	

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	12:28	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	I am appalled that developers are allowed in to completely change the character of this neighbourhood. Throughout Mount pleasant there are applications to destroy the unique heritage of age old neighbourhoods. I can understand clusters of high density housing around skytrain hubs on main thoroughfares but to totally damage areas in between is unacceptable.	ken pattern	Mount Pleasant	
2024-11-12	12:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	I have concerns about this proposal. Having participated in Broadway Planning events this particular development is not in keeping with what was expressed at these sessions. This proposal is out of scale for the neighbourhood and will put unreasonable pressure on already over capacity amenities like the community centre and neighbourhood house.	Carol White		<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2024-11-12	16:25	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	I have lived in Mt Pleasant for 30 years. I recall public meetings about increasing density in the neighbourhood with taller apartment buildings along main arterials such as Main Street, Cambie Street, Broadway, and Kingsway. Most residents supported that plan. This rezoning is different; it is a misfit to have large tall apartment blocks amongst predominantly 2-3 storey homes. In fact the neighbourhood is already quite dense (with duplexes, triplexes etc), but retains liveability. Towers looming over, blocking light, and increased traffic is not a sign of progress. It seems someone has declared 'open season' for developers ( who stand to profit the most). I fear that this is the beginning of multiple such rezoning applications in an otherwise very liveable neighbourhood.	Y Case	Mount Pleasant	



**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	16:31	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear City Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development project due to its imposing size and the disruptions it would bring to our family-oriented, moderate-income community.</p> <p>The scale of this development feels misaligned with the character of our neighborhood. It not only threatens to overshadow existing homes but also undermines the sense of community that has long made this area special. Our community is one where families live in close-knit environments, and the introduction of such a large structure could lead to significant shifts, including increased traffic, noise, and strain on local resources, which many residents may struggle to accommodate.</p> <p>While I appreciate the need to build more housing in our city, I urge you to reconsider the scale and impact of this project and to take into account the voices of the families and individuals who have built their lives in this neighborhood. Thoughtful, appropriately scaled development is critical to preserving the qualities that make our community vibrant, affordable, and family-friendly. This project is the antithesis of these ideals.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the interests of our community.</p>	Matthew Hirji	Mount Pleasant	
2024-11-12	16:31	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>What are the developers going to be doing about managing the massively increased vehicle traffic on 10th, with regard to keeping 10th ave a safe and major artery for cyclists/pedestrians?</p>	Kenji Eu	Mount Pleasant	

2024-11-12	16:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am very concerned that a highrise building in this block will be totally incongruent with an otherwise intact, aestically pleasing block of mostly character (heritage?) homes and will destroy character housing stock. Most homes on this block are in good condition, and though of dense single family home massing, they are still appropriately medium density as they are multi unit quadrplexes etc. I totally agree with the city greatly increasing density to allow for more affordable housing, but there are surely much more amenable areas to up zone to high density than an existing medium density block of relatively attractive, uniform (originally single family) character homes. Highrises should be in clusters more adjacent to existing or future rapid transit stations (eg Broadway and Main), or in existing underutilized lands, such as parking lots, stand alone low density commercial buildings, former industrial or institutional areas, replacing aging 3 storey apartments, along arterial like Broadway itself or Downtown. Blocks such as the 500 block E10th can be incrementally infilled to increase density while keeping the existing character/ aesthetic relatively intact. At the very least, this proposal should only be approved while preserving existing character home(s) in the development.</p>	John Hill	Mount Pleasant	
2024-11-12	16:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Developers have already started the process of demovicting thousands of tenants in the Broadway Plan area (485 city blocks from 1st to 16th Avenue, Vine to Clark) of Vancouver.</p> <p>Residents have been assured multiple times by City Council and staff that these tenants are protected by Vancouver’s Tenant Relocation and Protection Policy (TRPP) (<a href="https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/protecting-tenants.aspx">https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/protecting-tenants.aspx</a>), purportedly the best such protections in North America.</p> <p>2. WHAT’S REALLY HAPPENING?</p> <p>According to a CityHallWatch count (which goes beyond what the City has published in a July 26, 2024 Broadway Plan implementation update), 86 towers are in the development process pipeline in the Broadway Plan area as of as of August 27, 2024. Among these 86 towers, 49 proposed towers, if approved would mean demolishing 54 walk-up apartment buildings (typically three storey, still-affordable, still livable, mature rentals) and replacing them with unaffordable 20+ storey towers with tiny, unlivable units, only 20% of which would be so-called “below market” (which does not mean affordable for most Vancouverites). The other 80% would rent at market prices, which the majority of renters can’t easily afford.</p> <p>Where are all the thousands of demovicted tenants going to move to in a city that already has a vacancy rate hovering around 0.9%, at the same time thousands of units are taken off the market while towers are being built?</p> <p>3. HOW DID WE GET HERE?</p> <p>With few exceptions, under strong lobbying (and funding) by the real estate and development industry and its “industry-spawned” proxies, past and</p>	Leona Rothney	Mount Pleasant	

present politicians have been all-in for the Broadway Plan and its precursors, at both the municipal and provincial level. This includes former mayors Gregor Robertson and his Vision Vancouver Councillors, Kennedy Stewart (independent then Forward Together), the former NPA, even the current Vancouver Greens and local BC Green party candidates, OneCity, and current Mayor Ken Sim and all his ABC Vancouver members. Plus, at the provincial level the NDP under premier David Eby and housing minister Ravi Kahlon, and all NDP MLAs, including those that represent constituents in Vancouver, voted silently and obediently as a bloc under the political whip to support legislation that is being exploited by Vancouver planners to turbocharge the Broadway Plan (and much else). ABC Vancouver also consciously decided NOT to track demovictions. (<https://globalnews.ca/news/9690937/vancouver-city-council-motion-track-broadway-demovictions-rejected/>). Only former councillors Colleen Hardwick (TEAM) and Jean Swanson (COPE) opposed the Broadway Plan when it was debated in 2022. The next provincial election is October 19, 2024. This is voters' chance to engage with the incumbents and candidates in their ridings about their concerns. The next municipal election is in October 2026. Meanwhile, citizens need to act, organize, and communicate their concerns to influence policy and decisions.

#### 4. RENTER PROTECTIONS (?)

Now, let's look at the regulations and guidelines that purportedly protect renters.

Excerpt of a City of Vancouver info sheet entitled "Do you know what your renters' rights are?"

What are the new protections for renters in the Broadway Plan area?

If you are a renter living in the Broadway Plan area and your home is being replaced with a new rental building or is undergoing a major renovation that requires you to move out, you may be eligible for some or all of the following protections:

1. Option to come back to the new rental building at the same rent you are currently paying or a 20% discount to citywide average rents, whichever is lower
2. Option of a monetary rent top-up to avoid paying more in rent while you wait to come back to the new building
3. Financial compensation of between four to 24 months' rent based on how long you have lived in your rental home
4. Payment of your moving expenses with a flat rate of \$750 for a studio or one bedroom apartment, and \$1,000 for two or more bedroom apartments
5. Help finding a new rental home that meets your needs
6. Additional financial compensation and assistance if you have a low income or face other barriers to housing

Excerpt of Vancouver's Tenant Relocation and Protection Policy (TRPP) Guidelines

“A new unit may be secured by either the tenant themselves, or with assistance from the applicant, in both cases the applicant is responsible for payment of the temporary rent top-up. It is at the applicants’ discretion how the rent top-up is paid (e.g. direct deposit or cheque etc.); however, the tenant may express preference. For details on requirements for cases where the applicant provides assistance finding new accommodation for the tenant, refer to Section 2.1(e).

In cases where the tenant secures their own unit, the rent top-up will be provided up to a maximum of the difference between the tenant’s existing rent and the average market rent by unit type for newer rental units in the City of Vancouver, as published annually by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). Table 1 provides the current applicable rents for this top-up calculation.”

So, if you are being demovicted from one of these towers being proposed under the Broadway Plan, you can either receive financial compensation based on how long you’ve been in the unit, or choose to either have the landlord find you a new unit or find it yourself, with the landlord paying the difference in rents from your current unit to your new unit until the tower is built at which time you can then move into it at your current rent.

If the developer finds you an apartment, there’s no limit on how much they can top up, BUT the unit can be anywhere in Vancouver. It doesn’t have to be in your current neighbourhood. If you find your new unit, the max the developer is required to top up to is \$2,342 for a one-bedroom unit as per the chart above. (If you live in Kitsilano, good luck finding anything decent for that amount.) Anything above that amount will come out of your pocket.

Developers have found a loophole to avoid tenant protections as much as possible and to make money in the interim, already removing housing from the community.

Renters in one property on West 8th Avenue in Kitsilano have been told that it will take two years for the development permit process to complete and construction to begin, and about three more years for construction. So if they are demovicted, for the next five years the lives of these renters will be upended.

It could also be a state of constant stress if they decide to stay and choose the rent top up option to move at the end of the two years. If they choose the financial compensation and leave at any time prior to the end of the two years, this is what they will get:

(b) Financial compensation provided based on length of tenancy:

4 months’ rent for tenancies up to 5 years;  
5 months’ rent for tenancies over 5 years and up to 10 years;

6 months' rent for tenancies over 10 years and up to 20 years;  
12 months' rent for tenancies over 20 years and up to 30 years;  
18 months' rent for tenancies over 30 years and up to 40 years; and  
24 months' rent for tenancies over 40 years  
This can take the form of free rent, a lump sum payment, or a combination of both. This is generally at the discretion of the owner, but the tenant may express preference.

#### 5. "UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES" OF THE TENANT PROTECTIONS

If tenants choose the financial compensation option and decide to move out before the development permit and approval process ends does that mean that unit becomes vacant for the remainder of the process? Does the landlord rent it out again for the duration of the development process? You would think so. But, no, developers/landlords have found a way to monetize those vacant units and in the process are in violation of the recent BC Short Term Rental Legislation which came into effect on May 1, 2024. They are now illegally renting out these vacated units on Airbnb using property management companies. (Some of these units may have been vacated before a development rezoning application was even filed and just left vacant so that no compensation would be required for a new tenant of that unit.)

#### 6. CASE STUDY IN BROADWAY PLAN AREA (AUGUST 2024)

People are currently noticing Airbnb short-term rental listings for units in buildings slated for demoviction under the Broadway Plan. This could be a systemic issue in the Broadway Plan area.

Worthy of intense public and official scrutiny, JTA Development Consultants currently has rezoning applications for 13 buildings in the Broadway Plan area, including 1855 West 2nd Ave, 1550 W11th and 2225 West 8th Ave. We have just received a report (Aug 27) that nine of 27 units at 1550 West 11th Avenue are now Airbnbs. "It's insane," wrote a long-term tenant of that building.

The building at 2225 West 8th Avenue has eight units listed for short-term rental so far, and based on the pattern we are observing, more are likely to come. See details here: [https://cityhallwatch\[.\]wordpress\[.\]com/2024/07/06/2225w8th-jta-21storey-tower-qa-jul3-16/](https://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2024/07/06/2225w8th-jta-21storey-tower-qa-jul3-16/)

Another JTA project is at 1855 West 2nd Avenue.

We get into details on that one in this separate post as a concrete case study, published simultaneously: "Broadway Plan case study: Skirting renter protections and short-term rental rules, this developer seeks a 20-storey tower rezoning at 1855 West 2nd Avenue." Link: [https://cityhallwatch\[.\]wordpress\[.\]com/2024/08/27/rezoning-developer-skirts-short-term-](https://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2024/08/27/rezoning-developer-skirts-short-term-)

rental-rules-1855w2nd/

#### 7. VANCOUVER CITY VS PROVINCIAL POLICIES ON STRs

If short term rental units are being rented for a “30 night minimum,” they would purportedly be in compliance with the City of Vancouver’s bylaws that govern short term rentals, which only apply to short term rentals under 30 days within a principal residence. (See By-laws tab under documents at this link – <https://vancouver.ca/doing-business/short-term-rentals.aspx#bylaw>)

Units in Vancouver renting for longer than 30 days require a long term rental business licence. Plus, all landlords must comply with the BC Residential Tenancy Act (RTA) and provide tenants with an emergency contact. <https://vancouver.ca/doing-business/long-term-rental-business-licence.aspx>

However, B.C. Bill 35 (Short-term Rental Accommodations Act) which went into effect on May 1, 2024, specifies a 90 day minimum, in addition to a principal resident requirement.

According to Bill 35:

“short-term rental accommodation service” means the service of accommodation in the property of a property host, in exchange for a fee, that is provided to members of the public for a period of time of less than 90 consecutive days or another prescribed period, if any, but does not include a prescribed accommodation service;

“principal residence” means the residence in which an individual resides for a longer period of time in a calendar year than any other place;

“principal residence requirement” means the requirement imposed under section 14 (1) [principal residence requirement];

“property host” means a person

(a) who is legally entitled to possession of a property where short-term rental accommodation services are provided, and

(b) who has responsibility for arranging for the short-term rental offer;

16 (1) A provision of a short-term rental bylaw made under the Vancouver Charter has no effect if it is inconsistent with the principal residence requirement under this Act.

Excerpt of Short-Term Rentals: Policy Guidance for B.C. Local Governments

... Principal Residence Requirement: While the provincial principal residence requirement will be enforced at the provincial level, local governments should not grant zoning (or other permission) to short-term rental hosts, where inconsistent with the provincial legislation. Local governments may wish to review their bylaws and consider whether any updates may be warranted in light of the new provincial rules.

... Business License Updates: After May 1, 2024, municipalities that currently regulate STRs may consider reviewing and updating business license bylaws

as needed to align with what is permitted under the Act. Local governments may wish to communicate early with hosts via business licence renewal notices whether they will be able to continue operating.

... Enforcement Responsibilities: Local governments will continue to be responsible for enforcing their own bylaws, while the provincial compliance unit will be responsible for enforcing the provincial Short-Term Rental Accommodations Act.

... The Short-Term Rental Accommodations Act establishes a provincial role in the regulation of short-term rentals. The Province continues to recognize the important role local governments play in regulating short-term rentals through tools such as bylaws, policies, and business licensing.

Local governments are not responsible for enforcing the provincial legislation in their community, including the provincial principal residence requirement. The Province will enforce the legislation through the provincial compliance unit.

If bylaws are currently more permissive than the provincial standard, provisions in the bylaw that are inconsistent with that standard would no longer be in effect. Note that section 10 of the Community Charter states: "A provision of a municipal bylaw has no effect if it is inconsistent with a Provincial enactment." In addition, the STRAA specifies that "a provision of a short-term rental bylaw made under the Vancouver Charter has no effect if it is inconsistent with the principal residence requirement under this Act." If they choose, local governments may continue to regulate short-term rentals of less than 30 days only, leaving the Province to regulate rentals of up to 90 days.

#### 8. WHAT CAN YOU DO IF YOU SUSPECT ILLEGAL STR UNITS IN THE BROADWAY PLAN PRIOR TO DEMOLITION FOR REZONING?

The BC Short Term Accommodations Act and related regulations would suggest that the B.C. provincial government will enforce the 90 day minimum, that the City of Vancouver can just enforce the 30 day limit, and but that the B.C. legislation overrides the City of Vancouver bylaws.

If you suspect a building is in violation of the BC Short Term Accommodations Act, please read on.

The Province has established a Compliance and Enforcement Unit (CEU) within the Short-Term Rental Branch in the Ministry of Housing. The CEU works to ensure that the provincial short-term rental rules are being followed.

At this link: File a non compliance report with BC CEU Short Term Rental Branch.

Use the Public tip information form: [https://submit\[.\]digital.gov.bc\[.\]ca/app/form/submit?f=b51d07fc-9e9d-4259-a148-ee47c9b5bed3](https://submit[.]digital.gov.bc[.]ca/app/form/submit?f=b51d07fc-9e9d-4259-a148-ee47c9b5bed3)

				<p>Our case study 1855 West 2nd Avenue provides specific example of how to complete the forms. LINK - <a href="https://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2024/08/27/rezoning-developer-skirts-short-term-rental-rules-1855w2nd/">https://cityhallwatch[.]wordpress[.]com/2024/08/27/rezoning-developer-skirts-short-term-rental-rules-1855w2nd/</a></p> <p>9. CLOSING NOTE</p> <p>We encourage concerned individuals to track the reporting of Airbnbs and follow up, as it's generally not clear to the public if anything actually gets done. How much is the Province enforcing its regulations? Who is on the receiving end of the reports? How quickly are reports processed? Is there any accountability and transparency in this process? For all we know, the Province could just be ignoring the reporting.</p> <p>Maybe time will tell.</p>			
2024-11-12	16:54	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>As a resident and home owner that lives on this section of East 10th, I am strongly opposed to the building of a 19 storey tower on our quiet, low traffic, family oriented street.</p> <p>Parking and traffic flow is already an issue on the street on a daily basis and adding a tower (or two) would increase the problems that already exist.</p>	Jeff Ferguson	Mount Pleasant	
2024-11-12	16:55	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>I am a concerned resident of Mount Pleasant and I write in opposition to the rezoning at 523-529 east 10th Ave.</p> <p>I have been involved in shape your city consultations for many years now. I was very aware of the Broadway Plan in all its permutations. I knew that change was coming in terms of densification but even so, I never imagined that these new towers would find their way into otherwise low rise residential streets. I am disheartened and dismayed as to how this could be a sensible part of the plan.</p> <p>How is any of this type of proposed change in keeping with supposed Broadway Plan goals of being sensitive to neighbourhood character and retention of tree canopy? Residents are not opposed to adding density. We welcome a range of density ideas which would provide much needed family housing at a scale and design which would better fit in with the existing character of the community. An 19 story tower right in the middle of an otherwise very low rise street is both insensitive and inappropriate.</p>	Stephanie Von Dehn	Mount Pleasant	



Mount Pleasant has been doing density right for many decades. We have a mix of single family, lane ways, duplexes and triplexes, town homes and many low rise, truly affordable and spacious, rental buildings. Why not do more of the type of density that still allows for retention of character, community feel and neighbourliness. Building these towers in residential areas like east 10th will lead to a significant loss of the local identity and liveability that make this area so unique.

Why is the city facilitating and encouraging the removal of whatever last vestiges of character and history Vancouver has and replacing it with cookie-cutter, massive towers on quiet residential streets? How does this even qualify as thoughtful city planning? Where is the planning for amenities for this inevitable increase in population? We are already 20 years behind in building for schools (e.g., Olympic Village school situation), community centres and health facilities. Riding rough-shod over community plans that had been meticulously thought out was such a betrayal of its citizens. Approving rezoning like this is an extension of that complete disregard us citizens feel from those in city hall.

There are a number of specific issues as well.

- Despite the intention, people still own and use cars. With limited parking in the building, dozens of cars will crowd the streets.
- The commercial aspect of the tower will add still more cars. Where will they all go?
- 80% of the building will be tiny, unaffordable units out of step with median Vancouver wages and, despite claims in the application, mostly unsuited for families. We need more missing middle family housing and this is the place for it, but this tower provides mostly tiny units.
- Apart from the out of scale size, the building design itself is poor. This design should be rejected for aesthetics alone. Where is the thought in design to integrate the neighbours at street level? I've seen well designed towers that at least have pleasing street level amenity spaces and feel integrated with the street level neighbours.
- I suspect that the developers have no intention of building this, but hope to get the zoning and flip it to someone else who might. We have already seen this play out in Mount Pleasant. This should not be encouraged. The disruption of tenants living in fear of eviction while developers play games with land inflation is cruel.

I know city staff assert that renters want to live in towers on quiet streets, but council should also care about how existing residents feel about the huge change to the area they have invested in and lived in for many years. This is

not well thought out density. This is a nuclear level of density and to not expect pushback from residents is to minimize how important people's homes, neighbourhoods and communities are to them.

We keep hearing that it is because of the subway line that these areas must carry a disproportionate burden of density. This does not make sense to me considering the massive amounts of transit we have all over the city. People are not reliant on this one route. Why does a tiny spur line that ends on Arbutus translate into the wholesale destruction of our communities where we have chosen to live and raise our families.

There are also so many nearby places to build considerable density without impacting the neighbourhood like this. Why not focus on areas recently rezoned from commercial to residential.

This kind of tower in this location is essentially uniformly opposed by all who live nearby. Does the city really mean to tell residents that their views are entirely worthless, or do you seek to build consensus with residents about how (not if) we densify?

I am a born and raised Vancouverite. I attended three of the most recent open houses on the Broadway plan. I heard pat responses such as "change is hard" and "you can always move if you don't like it" from the planners in attendance. It highlighted for me how disconnected those in city hall are to the citizens of this city. Sadly, I believe that we are merely seen as "impediments". I am not alone in this sentiment. It is heartbreaking to feel this way after growing up here and now raising my family in this city.

That being said, I do hope that Mayor and Council will consider the overwhelming views of residents who will actually be impacted by this tower and reject the rezoning.

Sincerely,

Stephanie von Dehn

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	16:55	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I live directly across from the proposed development.</p> <p>This area of 10th Ave E is very narrow, as well as being a designated bike route. Cars cannot pass each other, and even a car passing a bike often feels dangerous. I am concerned about the impact that both construction and additional traffic will have on the safety of this area, especially with 2 towers proposed on a single block, with an additional tower less than 1 block away.</p> <p>The height of the building, while within the limits of the Broadway Plan, is well outside what would be expected on a quiet neighbourhood street. Additional housing is needed in Vancouver - but residents should not have to bear the impact of the city's decades of poor planning.</p> <p>This tower is 1 of 2 that is proposed on this street. If one should be developed, the plan for 469-483 E 10th Ave be preferred. The ground level units better integrate with the current feel of the neighbourhood, while the retail space would be welcome. The tower at this address could be at home in downtown Vancouver - not on this tree-lined street.</p>	Kelli O'Reilly	Mount Pleasant	

**CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-11-12	16:57	CD-1 Rezoning: 523-549 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>THIS APPLICATION SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED AS THE BUILDING DOES NOT FIT THE LOOK AND FEEL OF THE WHOLE NEIGHBOURHOOD.</p> <p>THERE ALREADY IS A SHORTAGE OF PARKING. THE BUILDING WOULD NOT BE DIRECTLY NEAR THE SKYTRAIN STATION SO WHY BUILD HERE.</p> <p>SHADOWING IS OF GREAT CONCERN AS THE STREET IS ALREADY DARK DUE TO THE HUGE CHESTNUT TREES SHADING THE STREET,</p> <p>YOU NEED TO CONSIDER THE INCONVENIENCE AND NOISE THIS WOULD CREATE FOR PEOPLE LIVING IN THE AREA.</p> <p>I FEEL THE CITY ALONG WITH THE PROVINCE ARE NOT TREATING TAX PAYERS WITH ANY RESPECT. THERE HAVE BEEN MANY DEMOVICTIONS AND RENOVICTIONS IN MT. PLEASANT OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS AND THIS IS STILL HAPPENING. CITY STAFF LIED TO OUR RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION AND SAID THIS WOULD NEVER HAPPEN AND NOW IT HAS. SO MANY RENTERS ARE SITTING ON PINS AND NEEDLES WONDERING WHEN THERE TURN IS TO LOSE THEIR HOMES. I JUST FIND THIS SO APPALLING THAT CITY STAFF DO NOT LISTEN.</p> <p>ALSO, WE AS A COMMUNITY WORKED ON THE COMMUNITY PLAN FOR YEARS JUST TO BE IGNORED IN THE END.</p> <p>PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS APPLICATION</p> <p>L. ROTHNEY RAMP (Director Residents Association Mt. Pleasant)</p>	Leona Rothney	Mount Pleasant	