

CD-1 Rezoning: 1780 East Broadway - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-10	14:41	CD-1 Rezoning: 1780 East Broadway	Oppose	<p>Absolutely we need more housing but the fact that only 10% are allocated affordable housing “at market” rate is unacceptable with the rental/ housing crisis! This community + neighborhood needs below market rate apartments available to them.</p> <p>Minimum 20% need to be affordable + have a guarantee that when people move out- the units will stay affordable. Also the lack of support/ partnership with local arts companies in the neighborhood regarding the plaza and theatre space does not give me confidence that the space will be utilized to its fullest extent !</p>	Mikenzie Page	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-10	15:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 1780 East Broadway	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Councilors.</p> <p>I am a resident of Grandview-Woodlands.</p> <p>I OPPOSE this Proposal in its current form.</p> <p>I was originally one of the scheduled public presenters. But I'm unable to attend the 10 June re-scheduled public presentations. Therefore, I'm submitting my remarks in writing.</p> <p>The development site for the Proposal is part of my backyard where on a weekly basis my family and I bike, go to the Rio, go for dinner, get our x-rays and blood tests, hop on the sky train and the 99, grab a pint, get our insurance renewed, etc. It’s a welcoming, personal and creative place and home to diverse people. It’s sometimes a bit unruly, but that’s the way we like it.</p> <p>I'm not a NIMBY.</p> <p>I'm a YIMBY for development and housing. I'm a YIMBY for density, for economic rejuvenation. Things change. This neighborhood has always been in flux. I adored Café Deux Soleil. But its successor, Chanco’s, is a mighty fine eatery. I miss Wonderbucks. But Rufus Guitar and Drums has brought some well needed rock ‘n roll to the ‘hood.</p> <p>But I’m not a YIMBY at any cost.</p> <p>And this Proposal comes at an incredible opportunity cost while not contributing solutions to the affordable housing crisis or materially making the neighborhood a better place. This site could be a game changer, a real keystone for the Grandview-Woodland community and Vancouver, while also making its developers a lot of money.</p> <p>I’ll only focus on two core reasons for my opposition:</p> <p>1. FIRSTLY...</p> <p>The Proposal flies in the face of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan’s requirements for height and density at this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• On height—the shortest tower will be more than 54% higher than permitted in the Community Plan, while the tallest will be over 83% taller.</li><li>• On density—the proposed 7.5 FSR residential density will be more than 66% greater than the maximum 4.5 FSR for residential permitted in the Community Plan.</li></ul> <p>The Proposal is not asking for slight adjustments. The developers are acting like the Community Plan does not exist.</p>	Patrick Fergusson	Grandview-Woodland	Appendix A

			<p>The Community Plan already gives scope for a huge development, but the developers simply want more.</p> <p>The Community Plan arrived at its priorities and these maximums for many reasons. The Community Plan was created so that developers had a transparent ‘field of play’ with clear ‘rules of the game’ and ‘NIMBYism’ would not get in the way of development. Instead, developers are demanding the City moves the goalposts.</p> <p>This is a 30-year Plan that was years and thousands of voices in the making. It’s not irrelevant. It is alive and applicable. How are communities and voters to trust a Council that simply ignores an agreement with the community whenever Council finds it convenient? Frankly, it feels like agreeing to a trade deal with a certain American President.</p> <p>You’ve heard lots of exhaustion from the public: this Project has taken forever; just get it done already; so many wasted years; etc. Instead of conforming to the Community Plan and City policies years ago and just got on with building, the developers have undertaken a campaign of attrition while doubling down on height and density.</p> <p>They are counting on the public to be exhausted and the City Council to be desperate so that we accept something, anything.</p> <p>And this Proposal will set a precedent. At the start of the hearing, multiple Councilors asked if there were any other approved Proposals that could serve as a precedent for this one, but there are none. If this is approved and becomes the precedent, the City Council might as well tear-up the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.</p> <p>2. SECONDLY...</p> <p>This Proposal utterly undermines the City’s and Community Plan’s goals to increase affordable housing. Despite the genuine belief of previous speakers in favour of the Proposal, greater market-driven supply does not translate into greater housing affordability.</p> <p>This Proposal is a study in how NOT to increase affordable housing for a diverse population.</p> <p>This proposal does not provide any below-market rental housing—the best it offers is that 10% of units will NOT EXCEED city-wide average market rents.</p> <p>However, like many parts of East Van, this is a community where rents and household incomes are lower than the city-wide average and where a range of socio-economic vulnerabilities are higher than average. Therefore, this Proposal will not create any new units that are affordable for the average household in Grandview-Woodland.</p> <p>With only 19.2% of ‘city-wide average rent’ units being family-sized, only 20 families of average city-wide income will be able to call this giant edifice home. So in those 1000+ homes that everyone keeps raving about, only 20 units will be accessible for families with an average city-wide income.</p> <p>Do these sound like numbers that are going to help the City tackle affordable housing?</p> <p>The reality has been and studies show—for example, from the CD Howe Institute—that simply increasing the supply of market-rate housing does not result in increased housing affordability. It’s counter-intuitive, but the reality is that a sole focus on market-driven supply solutions escalates prices.</p> <p>This Proposal flies in the face of evidence that creating affordable housing is not just about more market supply, it is about the KIND of supply. It’s HOW you build more supply and for</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>WHOM you build those units.</p> <p>Yes, adequate housing production needs to be stimulated, but prices will continue to skyrocket unless the City also enforces policies requiring a mix of housing choice and includes provisions for people who cannot afford market-rate housing. Affordable housing will not be achieved unless governments create a much larger non-market sector.</p> <p>The City is already falling behind its commitments for new developer-owned below-market rental unit approvals. It has only reached 14% of its target for these. At the same time, it has already reached 19% of its target for approved developer-owned market rental unit approvals. This one Proposal is not going to solve everything. But it does not make sense for the City take its foot off the pedal while it is falling so far behind in its approvals for new developer-owned below-market rental units.</p> <p>IN CONCLUSION...</p> <p>This is an ideal development site—so many advantages and so much opportunity, which the developers have willingly allowed to go to waste for years.</p> <p>So let’s have some courage. The Council has the chance to serve the needs of the community and find real solutions. The Council has the chance to get more creative and innovative. The Council has the chance to look for opportunities and partnerships—such as with the Provincial and federal governments—in order to do better than what the developers have proposed.</p> <p>Therefore, I offer one bold proposition—approve this monstrosity on one condition: 33% of units are reserved for for non-market rental housing, involving an appropriate mix of low-income public housing, essential worker housing and supportive housing.</p> <p>With additional funding from the Provincial and Federal governments, the City could purchase a long-term leasehold from the developers and manage the non-market units. The developers get a guaranteed income and the City creates affordable housing while boosting Vancouver’s economic growth and productivity.</p> <p>How’s that for setting a precedent?</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this public discussion. I am grateful for your consideration.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Dear Mayor and Councilors.

I am a resident of Grandview-Woodlands.

My recommendation is **against** this Proposal in its current form.

I was originally one of the scheduled public presenters. But I am unable to attend the 10 June re-scheduled public presentations. Therefore, I am submitting my remarks in writing.

The development site for the Proposal is part of my backyard where on a weekly basis my family and I bike, go to the Rio, go for dinner, get our x-rays and blood tests, hop on the sky train and the 99, grab a pint, get our insurance renewed, etc. It's a welcoming, personal and creative place and home to diverse people. It's sometimes a bit unruly, but that's the way we like it.

I am not a NIMBY.

I am a YIMBY for development and housing. I am a YIMBY for density, for economic rejuvenation. Things change. This neighborhood has always been in flux. I adored Café Deux Soleil. But its successor, Chanco's, is a mighty fine eatery. I miss Wonderbucks. But Rufus Guitar and Drums has brought some well needed rock 'n roll to the 'hood.

But I'm not a YIMBY at any cost.

And this Proposal comes at an incredible opportunity cost while not contributing solutions to the affordable housing crisis or materially making the neighborhood a better place. This site could be a game changer, a real keystone for the Grandview-Woodland community and Vancouver, while also making its developers a lot of money.

I'll only focus on two core reasons for my opposition:

**Firstly, the Proposal flies in the face of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan's requirements for height and density at this site:**

- **On height**—the shortest tower will be more than 54% higher than permitted in the Community Plan, while the tallest will be over 83% taller.
- **On density**—the proposed 7.5 FSR residential density will be more than 66% greater than the maximum 4.5 FSR for residential permitted in the Community Plan.

The Proposal is not asking for slight adjustments. The developers are acting like the Community Plan does not exist. The Community Plan already gives scope for a huge development, but the developers simply want more.

The Community Plan arrived at its priorities and these maximums for many reasons. The Community Plan created to help developer by creating a transparent 'field of play' with clear 'rules of the game' so that 'NIMBYism' would not get in the way of development. Instead, this Proposal moves the goalposts.

This is a 30-year Plan that was years and thousands of voices in the making. It's not irrelevant. It is alive and applicable. How are communities and voters to trust a Council that simply ignores an agreement with the community whenever Council finds it convenient? Frankly, it feels like agreeing to a trade deal with a certain American President.

You've heard lots of exhaustion from the public: this Project has taken forever; just get it done already; so many wasted years; etc. Instead of conforming to the Community Plan and City policies years ago and just got on with building, the developers have undertaken a campaign of attrition while doubling down on height and density. They are counting on the public to be exhausted and the City Council to be desperate so that we accept something, anything.

This Proposal will set a precedent. At the start of the hearing, multiple Councilors asked if there were any other approved Proposals that could serve as a precedent for this one, but there are none. If this is approved and becomes the precedent, the City Council might as well tear-up the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan.

**Secondly, this Proposal utterly undermines the City's and Community Plan's goals to increase affordable housing. Despite the genuine belief of previous speakers in favour of the Proposal, greater market-driven supply does not translate into greater housing affordability.**

This Proposal is a study in how NOT to increase affordable housing for a diverse population.

This proposal does not provide any below-market rental housing—the best it offers is that 10% of units will NOT EXCEED city-wide average market rents.

However, like many parts of East Van, this is a community where rents and household incomes are lower than the city-wide average and where a range of socio-economic vulnerabilities are higher than average. Therefore, this Proposal will not create any new units that are affordable for the average household in Grandview-Woodland.

With only 19.2% of 'city-wide average rent' units being family-sized, only 20 families of average city-wide income will be able to call this giant edifice home. So in those 1000+ homes that everyone keeps raving about, only 20 units will be accessible for families with an average city-wide income.

Do these sound like numbers that are going to help the City tackle affordable housing?

The reality has been and studies show—for example, from the CD Howe Institute—that simply increasing the supply of market-rate housing does not result in increased housing affordability. It's counter-intuitive, but the reality is that a sole focus on market-driven supply solutions escalates prices.

This Proposal flies in the face of evidence that creating affordable housing is not just about more market supply, it is about the **KIND** of supply. It's **HOW** you build more supply and for **WHOM** you build those units. Yes, adequate housing production needs to be stimulated, but prices will continue to skyrocket unless the City also enforces policies requiring a mix of housing choice and includes provisions for people who cannot afford market-rate housing. Affordable housing will not be achieved unless governments create a much larger non-market sector.

The City is already falling behind its commitments for new developer-owned below-market rental unit approvals. It has only reached 14% of its target for these. At the same time, it has already reached 19% of its target for approved market rental unit approvals. This one Proposal is not going to solve everything. But it does not make sense for the City take its foot off the pedal on this Proposal while it is falling so far behind in its approvals for new developer-owned below-market rental units.

In conclusion, this is an ideal development site—so many advantages and so much opportunity, which the developers have willingly allowed to go to waste for years.

So let's have some courage. The Council has the chance to serve the needs of the community and find real solutions. The Council has the chance to get more creative and innovative. The Council has the chance to look for opportunities and partnerships—such as with the Provincial and federal governments—in order to do better than what the developers have proposed.

Therefore, I offer one bold proposition—approve this monstrosity on one condition: **33% of units are reserved for for non-market rental housing, involving an appropriate mix of low-income public housing, essential worker housing and supportive housing.** With additional funding from the Provincial and Federal governments, the City could purchase a long-term leasehold from the developers and manage the non-market units.

With additional funding from the Provincial and Federal governments, the City could purchase a long-term leasehold from the developers and manage the non-market units. The developers get a guaranteed income and the City creates affordable housing while boosting Vancouver's economic growth and productivity.

How's that for setting a precedent?

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this public discussion. I am grateful for your consideration.

Patrick Fergusson

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential