

CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-05-31	14:09	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	This is an inappropriate scale for this residential neighbourhood. I usually support density and affordable housing initiatives, but this building does not fit in with the character of E. 10th ave and will adversely affect the community with a long interruption to the bikeway, sidewalks including increased traffic in the long run. This area needs traffic calming and gentle density, not 17 storey buildings amongst heritage homes. Not the right location for this at all.	Cameron Barker	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-01	12:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	The trees in this city block are some of the biggest in the city, providing precious shelter and nourishment for urban wildlife, while cleaning the air and providing much needed shade for the community (pedestrians and cyclist). Building these towers on 10th avenue would certainly disrupt this rare oasis that exists just one block away one of the busiest streets in Vancouver (Broadway).	Fabian Garces	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-01	21:10	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	I am writing to oppose the rezoning application for 469-483 East 10th Avenue unless the Tenant Relocation and Protection Policy protects all tenants currently living in these homes. I live on 11th Avenue East and St. George and believe that it is vitally important to maintain a current level of affordable rental housing with these new developments and not displace people who are already part of the community. I have lived in neighbourhoods where affordable rental housing was removed and only those who could afford much higher rents moved in after development and it fundamentally changed the diversity and culture of the neighbourhood.	Barbara Fries	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-02	12:49	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Absolute Opposition to Rezoning Proposal of 469-483 E 10th Ave.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 469-483 E 10th Ave .</p> <p>I am not opposed to change. I am not opposed to building more affordable housing. I am ABSOLUTELY FOR THAT.</p> <p>But I AM 100% against negative change, and chance done in a bad and destructive way – which this project, and other projects in the Broadway Plan, are. There is a RIGHT way to do this, and THIS is NOT the right way.</p> <p>This proposal is in an arts and residential neighbourhood and community. The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDABLE homes in this area (NOT demolish them and displace thousands of residents in place of these ugly, environment destroying – anti Green – luxury towers that only the wealthy can afford to live in), and more social housing – which ABC just voted to reduce even further; absolutely shameful. They clearly do not care one iota for the actual people of Vancouver – who projects like this absolutely do not serve. They only serve the wealthy.</p> <p>DO NOT BLOCK THE MOUNTAINS. This is the reason why Vancouver is so amazing and people choose to very work hard and call it home Without the mountains, and with these ugly luxury towers, Vancouver will just be another ugly, crappy, urban jungle.</p> <p>It absolutely makes sense to build along Broadway as that is where the Subway line will be. But the surrounding neighbourhoods should not be destroyed for towers.</p> <p>This neighbourhood is NOT a Downtown. It is NOT a City Centre.</p> <p>It is part of Vancouver’s rich history, being one of its oldest; with beautiful, ALREADY</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	Appendix A

			<p>AFFORDABLE, low-rise buildings that compliment the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>There is no place for luxury towers. These towers will not enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and community. They will destroy it.</p> <p>It makes ZERO sense to destroy already affordable housing for these monster towers, which will, no matter how much The City continues to claim, NOT be affordable.</p> <p>If these proposals were actually building the much needed, and more, affordable housing, then people would be absolutely on board – but not in the form of towers.</p> <p>And these towers are not going to be affordable housing any way.</p> <p>Even having apartments in these towers at 20% bellow market rate, they are still going be at least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and they will be SIGNIFICANLTY smaller as well.</p> <p>So we will be asked to lose our beautiful, affordable homes, to be rehoused god knows where and in god knows what conditions, then eventually move into these towers and pay MUCH more and have MUCH LESS space. THIS IS PURE INSANITY.</p> <p>Do not Scorched-Earth existing, beautiful, affordable, neighbourhoods for new developments. Instead, build on undeveloped land or on top of commercial buildings.</p> <p>The video on The City website of this tower does not actually show INSIDE the building.</p> <p>If it did, it would show that the living spaces in these towers are SIGNIFICANTLY smaller than the size of the already affordable housing that The City wants to tear down to build this tower.</p> <p>A one bedroom in the already existing affordable housing in the beautiful low-rise buildings here average 600 sq ft.</p> <p>The “small scale units” in these towers will be HALF the size, if not even smaller. That is not a livable space. That is not a home.</p> <p>AND WHY CAN’T THE CITY GIVE ESSENTIAL INFORMATION CLEARLY? WHY HIDE THE ACTUAL LIVING SPACE MEASUREMENTS IN THIS FLOOR SPACE RATIO 5.5 GOBBEDLDYGOOK? WHY CAN’T YOU JUST SIMPLY SAY HOW MANY SQUARE FEET AN APARTMENT AND A ROOM IS???? WHY SO DECEPTIVE?</p> <p>The proposal states that 20% of the apartments in this tower will be at below-market value.</p> <p>BUT BELOW-MARKET RENT IS STILL UNAFFORDABLE. THIS IS NOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING.</p> <p>My rent is \$1200. Others pay just \$1000, or even less. And we pay this for beautiful one-bedroom apartments that are 600 sq ft or larger.</p> <p>These apartments this luxury tower will offer are significantly smaller than this.</p> <p>So, we are being asked to give up our ALREADY AFFORDABLE, beautiful, healthy sized, homes for tower apartments that are much smaller and will cost much more.</p> <p>THIS IS NOT LIKE-FOR-LIKE.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>THIS IS NOT HELPING THE HOUSING CRISIS, BUT INSTEAD ADDING TO IT.</p> <p>And taking living space away from people with ALSO ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS.</p> <p>Towers completely go against the concept of providing affordable housing and Vancouver being the greenest and most beautiful city.</p> <p>High rises such as this tower, and these heights, are UTTELRY HIDEOUS. DISGUSTING.</p> <p>These towers will not be for residents of the community. They will be for the wealthy.</p> <p>They will block the natural light that is so important to all aspects of health and wellbeing.</p> <p>You deprive people of space and light, this will ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS, as well as ADDING TO THE HOUSING CRISIS.</p> <p>The City claims there are excellent Tenant Relocation and Protection Policies.</p> <p>This is pure fantasy, and an insult.</p> <p>Where will The City put all these Vancouver residents who are made homeless when their affordable homes are destroyed for these luxury towers to be built go? – it most certainly will not be in the same neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It does not say where these displaced tenants will go for the years that it takes to tear down their homes and build these towers.</p> <p>And that the tenants who are forced out of their beautiful, affordable homes for these towers will be able to move back in to them at below-market value.</p> <p>As I have already said, this will STILL BE HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS MORE than the rent they are paying in their already affordable homes, and the space will be much, much smaller too.</p> <p>People live here because they love it and because it is ALREADY AFFORDABLE. People with low to middle income, healthcare workers, seniors, people with disabilities and essential healthcare needs.</p> <p>Do we all need to apply under with The Registry for Social Housing? So that we are not forced out of our neighbourhoods by these unaffordable towers? So, is it a case of, Register for Social Housing or be homeless?</p> <p>Also, many people live here because THEY HAVE TO - I am just one of those people. And there are thousands more here like me. And if I cannot afford to live here, because of losing my affordable housing to these luxury unaffordable towers, I’m completely SCREWED.</p> <p>Rezoning projects like this force residents out of their homes and communities; taking them away from the essential, life-sustaining, healthcare that they need to have access to.</p> <p>And forcing people who live here because they also work here is going to result in them all having to driving in to the area (as they will be forced to live in the Suburbs and there is no transit infrastructure to here from most suburban areas – another reason why I am such a proponent of building OUT – NOT UP - and creating proper infrastructure there and between there and the city); so more cars, more traffic, and more pollution.</p> <p>Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

I refer you to the Grenfell Tower Fire in London in 2017.

This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.

But the fact remains that BECAUSE IT WAS A TOWER IT WAS A SIGNIFICANT RISK FACTOR; as people were not able to get out in time due to limited stairwell space and access, and seniors and people with disabilities being unable to use or get down the stairs in time.

TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.

This was a 24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured. There have been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.

THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.

I live in a 3-STOREY LOW-RISE APARTMENT. We had a FIRE alarm just before Christmas. Everyone was OUT OF THE BUILDING WITHIN JUST 30 SECONDS. Think about this...

The City wants towers that height and even higher; up to 50 story's, 50, now 60.

More floors in a tower =/+ more people in the tower = the more extreme risk to get everyone out safely in the event of a fire; and the more the chance of safety and survival goes down – more deaths.

There is a formula used in building risk assessment mathematics that says if you go above 6 floors, each story adds another 5 % risk (or 5% less chance of surviving a fire), and another 5% for the floor above, and so on – so each added floor adds 5% further increased risk of death in case of a fire in these towers.

If we maintain the format of building low rise buildings that we have already existing in our beautiful neighborhoods here, then we would not have to worry ourselves with these statistics; with this rate that each floor that you build higher, the higher the risk people dying in a fire is.

If we keep with the low rise buildings, this would not have to be even a remote concern. As I said, my building had a fire alarm in early December 2024; it's a three level story, and even myself with a disability, we were all able to get out onto the street in less than 30 seconds. THIS LEVEL OF SAFETY SIMPLY CANNOT BE ACHIEVED IN TOWERS.

We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOURHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.

Also, this location is close to VGH and its helicopter landing pad and towers compromise the flight paths of emergency helicopters. And more people mean more cars and more traffic, compromising ambulance and public access to the hospital and urgent medical centres.

AND, local businesses will NOT survive if these towers and their mainstream retail outlets are built.

Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.

- STOP destroying Vancouver neighbourhoods.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• STOP destroying Vancouver communities.• STOP destroying Vancouver residents’ LIVES.• STOP destroying our beautiful Vancouver. <p>* STOP making it even harder and harder for people with disabilities to be able to remain in the Hospital Zone area for their healthcare and life support needs.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Very concerned and very proud Fairview resident,</p> <p>Fiona O’Connell</p> <p><small>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p> <p></p>			
2025-06-02	16:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This new building does not belong any where near a heritage street lined with massive trees. The tower would be absolutely out of place and time. I assume that this aspect of development will be dismissed, however, and the building will go ahead.</p> <p>So, I am now more concerned about the displaced renters, namely those who missed eligibility for protection under the Broadway Plan. I assume the renters could be granted special rights, and this seems fair and necessary, given the rental affordability crisis in this city.</p> <p>I understand that we need more housing, but surely there are other areas to develop that will not negatively impact entire neighbourhood climates and trample renter's rights.</p>	Caroline Harvey	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2025-06-03	16:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>As a resident of this block, and a passionate cyclist, I am very concerned that this new development will seriously disrupt a crucial bike safe street and vital non-motorized transit corridor through East Vancouver.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this development.</p>	Zahava Barwin	Mount Pleasant	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-04	11:33	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Please refer to the attached map, which highlights the density of active rezoning applications and recent developments in this small surrounding area.</p> <p>My family and I are deeply concerned about the proposed developments at 489–483 and 453–463 East 10th Avenue. We oppose both applications on the grounds of excessive cumulative density, safety concerns, and lack of infrastructure planning.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact Not Being Considered The proposals must be evaluated in the context of the surrounding developments. East 10th Avenue is a narrow, bi-directional street with a designated bike route. It is already heavily congested, and additional density will only increase the risks to cyclists and pedestrians who use the corridor daily. The street simply cannot support the scale of development currently proposed.</p> <p>Moreover, there are three nearby multi-unit developments either recently completed or under construction—highlighted in green on the map—that have significantly increased local housing density. It’s unclear whether these units are being accounted for in the Broadway Plan’s housing targets. If they are not, it represents a serious oversight, as these projects are already placing strain on local infrastructure, including traffic, schools, and child care.</p> <p>Additional Nearby Development Already Approved Just one block east, the application at 523 East 10th Avenue has recently been approved. It is extremely close to the proposed sites and will further exacerbate the same concerns around traffic congestion, school capacity, and access to daycare.</p> <p>Alternative Sites Make More Sense Two other sites are worth calling attention to:</p> <p>354 East 10th Avenue, already a large commercial property, could accommodate development with less aesthetic disruption and more appropriate scale, particularly given its proximity to Kingsgate Mall.</p> <p>The site of the derelict building that was demolished following multiple fires is currently unused and was previously residential. It should be prioritized for new housing instead of increasing density on an already overburdened stretch of East 10th Avenue. Again, if this site is not being included in density planning, it will eventually be developed, further compounding the issue.</p> <p>Tree Protection Is Not Being Addressed Finally, no information has been provided on how the heritage chestnut trees on the avenue will be preserved. These old-growth trees are in a delicate state and require protection and maintenance—especially during nearby construction.</p> <p>Conclusion In isolation, each application might seem reasonable, but when viewed together—and in the context of recent and upcoming developments—the proposed density is far too high for this small residential street. The character of the neighbourhood is being dramatically altered without due consideration for safety, infrastructure capacity, or environmental impact.</p> <p>We urge the city to pause and reassess the broader development strategy for East 10th Avenue. Residents deserve a coordinated, sustainable plan—not a patchwork of high-density projects that overwhelm the area.</p>	Stuart Farley	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1

CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-04	23:41	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>with 2 new towers in every block. this stretch of east 10th will become so heavily congested that it will making living here miserable for both old and new residents.</p> <p>There is so much focus to bring new residents to the neighborhood but not a single new amenity has been proposed. No new parks, no new schools, no new community centers.</p> <p>The current fitness room in the community center is completely unusable after 4pm. Dogs take over both grassy areas at Dude Chilling park and Robson park. Damaging the grass, digging holes.</p>	farhan patel	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-05	14:00	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	Building a 17 storey residential building would be a disruption to the overall aesthetics of the local neighbourhood and would unfairly displace residents living in that location. Instead of a 17 storey building, a 4-6 storey building would be more esthetically pleasing and comparable to the other apartment complexes in the area. Additionally, if a new residential complex is being built, than the previous tenants living in that space should be given the opportunity to live in the new building with a similar rent price to what they paid previously.	Elliot Chiu	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-05	16:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>i submitted a comment and the machine tells me 'oops, something went wrong' so i am resubmitting:</p> <p>i oppose the rezoning of the 400 block of 10th avenue. 30% of tenants on 10th will not be eligible for tenants protections because of a loophole in the policy. all tenants who took up residence before the rezoning application was submitted should be eligible for rehousing/compensation. Now, tenants who signed leases less than a year before the rezoning applications were filed, are not covered. These are our neighbours. They will become homeless because of the loophole.</p> <p>i also oppose the rezoning because the 10th Avenue chestnut tree corridor that runs from east van all the way beyond VGH is a vital, historical planting. It provides a shaded bike path and habitat for birds and animals. we should not be authorizing the cutting of an urban forest in this era of hot, hot summers and burdened electrical grid. 10th avenue should not be replaced by glass condos where every unit must be air conditioned. at the moment, the homes on 10th avenue do not constitute a burden on our electrical grid precisely because of the shade of these giant trees, over 100 yrs old. condo towers are not forward looking, best use for urban density in every street.</p> <p>the broadway plan, rushed through without proper shadow study and no concern for how glass towers overheat our streets in summer, should be modified to accommodate the people who live here now rather than retained in its current form as a hoped for bait for future unhappy residents.</p>	Dina Al-Kassim	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1
2025-06-05	19:54	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	Buildings in this neighbourhood should be kept to 6 stories or below to maintain the neighbourhood feel, manage parking and traffic volumns, and protect the bike thoroughfare on 10th. We can balance the increase in housing and safe communities by avoiding overcrowding in buildings that are too large for their neighbourhood	Julia Friesen	Grandview-Woodland	

CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-09	08:40	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>35% of the renters living at the proposed site are completely ineligible for tenant protections under the Broadway Plan and would be displaced with no support with finding a new place to live, no rent top-ups or financial compensation, and no guarantee of being able to stay in the neighbourhood and the city.</p> <p>At least 20% of the renters who would be demovicted have lived here for more than a decade, with some living here for more than 20 years.</p> <p>At least half of the renters living here are in shared houses and other communal living situations, which are inadequately addressed by the existing tenant protections under the Broadway Plan.</p> <p>Though this project promises to add more affordable housing to the neighbourhood, the overwhelming majority of new units it will add (80%) are market-rate rentals.</p>	Kasper Feyrer	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-10	15:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>There are several developments (4) approved within few blocks while the Vancouver residents overwhelming opposition to the Broadway Plan has been advocating for the review of the plan. City of Vancouver has been blindly approving residential towers without having consideration of the plan impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- where these residents will park?-what type of infrastructure is supporting of such influx of residents?- where these residents will go to school or childcare, hospitals?- are there any parks planned in the area?-are there additional community centers being built to support such population growth?- is there support from community of this plan and such developments?- how would you protect the heritage buildings ?-how does Broadway Plan enhance the city livability? it only destroys anything good that city has with 10th avenue cherished by its bike lane, old growth trees, quiet walkable street with character buildings,- Why city is planning Hong Hong Style of bland high-rises that do not fit into neighborhood nor enhance livability of the city? <p>Please stop and reconsider the Broadway Plan. it is ill thought and detrimental plan that DOES NOT improve anything in Vancouver</p>	Anna Bukreeva	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-12	23:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 469-483 East 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Tenants living at this addresses are not protected and cannot afford to live in the neighbourhood anymore after the redevelopment. We don't need more houses here. There's already plenty here that's empty and overpriced!</p>	Candy Carter	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1

APPENDIX A

Absolute Opposition to Rezoning Proposal of 469-483 E 10th Ave.

I am a very proud, long-term Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 469-483 E 10th Ave .

I am not opposed to change. I am not opposed to building more affordable housing. I am ABSOLUTELY FOR THAT.

But I AM 100% against negative change, and change done in a bad and destructive way – which this project, and other projects in the Broadway Plan, are. There is a RIGHT way to do this, and THIS is NOT the right way.

This proposal is in an arts and residential neighbourhood and community. The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDABLE homes in this area (NOT demolish them and displace thousands of residents in place of these ugly, environment destroying – anti Green – luxury towers that only the wealthy can afford to live in), and more social housing – which ABC just voted to reduce even further; absolutely shameful. They clearly do not care one iota for the actual people of Vancouver – who projects like this absolutely do not serve. They only serve the wealthy.

DO NOT BLOCK THE MOUNTAINS. This is the reason why Vancouver is so amazing and people choose to very work hard and call it home. Without the mountains, and with these ugly luxury towers, Vancouver will just be another ugly, crappy, urban jungle.

It absolutely makes sense to build along Broadway as that is where the Subway line will be. But the surrounding neighbourhoods should not be destroyed for towers.

This neighbourhood is NOT a Downtown. It is NOT a City Centre.

It is part of Vancouver's rich history, being one of its oldest; with beautiful, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, low-rise buildings that compliment the natural beauty of the area.

There is no place for luxury towers. These towers will not enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and community. They will destroy it.

It makes ZERO sense to destroy already affordable housing for these monster towers, which will, no matter how much The City continues to claim, NOT be affordable.

If these proposals were actually building the much needed, and more, affordable housing, then people would be absolutely on board – but not in the form of towers.

And these towers are not going to be affordable housing any way.

Even having apartments in these towers at 20% below market rate, they are still going to be at least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and they will be SIGNIFICANTLY smaller as well.

So we will be asked to lose our beautiful, affordable homes, to be rehoused god knows where and in god knows what conditions, then eventually move into these towers and pay MUCH more and have MUCH LESS space. THIS IS PURE INSANITY.

Do not Scorch-Earth existing, beautiful, affordable, neighbourhoods for new developments. Instead, build on undeveloped land or on top of commercial buildings.

The video on The City website of this tower does not actually show INSIDE the building.

If it did, it would show that the living spaces in these towers are SIGNIFICANTLY smaller than the size of the already affordable housing that The City wants to tear down to build this tower.

A one bedroom in the already existing affordable housing in the beautiful low-rise buildings here average 600 sq ft.

The “small scale units” in these towers will be HALF the size, if not even smaller. **That is not a livable space. That is not a home.**

AND WHY CAN'T THE CITY GIVE ESSENTIAL INFORMATION CLEARLY? WHY HIDE THE ACTUAL LIVING SPACE MEASUREMENTS IN THIS FLOOR SPACE RATIO 5.5 GOBBEDLDYGOOK? WHY CAN'T YOU JUST SIMPLY SAY HOW MANY SQUARE FEET AN APARTMENT AND A ROOM IS???? WHY SO DECEPTIVE?

The proposal states that 20% of the apartments in this tower will be at below-market value.

BUT BELOW-MARKET RENT IS STILL UNAFFORDABLE. THIS IS NOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

My rent is \$1200. Others pay just \$1000, or even less. And we pay this for beautiful one-bedroom apartments that are 600 sq ft or larger.

These apartments this luxury tower will offer are significantly smaller than this.

So, we are being asked to give up our ALREADY AFFORDABLE, beautiful, healthy sized, homes for tower apartments that are much smaller and will cost much more.

THIS IS NOT LIKE-FOR-LIKE.

THIS IS NOT HELPING THE HOUSING CRISIS, BUT INSTEAD ADDING TO IT.

And taking living space away from people with ALSO ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS.

Towers completely go against the concept of providing affordable housing and Vancouver being the greenest and most beautiful city.

High rises such as this tower, and these heights, are **UTTERLY HIDEOUS. DISGUSTING.**

These towers will not be for residents of the community. They will be for the wealthy.

They will block the natural light that is so important to all aspects of health and wellbeing.

You deprive people of space and light, this will ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS, as well as ADDING TO THE HOUSING CRISIS.

The City claims there are excellent Tenant Relocation and Protection Policies.

This is pure fantasy, and an insult.

Where will The City put all these Vancouver residents who are made homeless when their affordable homes are destroyed for these luxury towers to be built go? – it most certainly will not be in the same neighbourhoods.

It does not say where these displaced tenants will go for the years that it takes to tear down their homes and build these towers.

And that the tenants who are forced out of their beautiful, affordable homes for these towers will be able to move back in to them at below-market value.

As I have already said, this will STILL BE HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS MORE than the rent they are paying in their already affordable homes, and the space will be much, much smaller too.

People live here because they love it and because it is ALREADY AFFORDABLE. People with low to middle income, healthcare workers, seniors, people with disabilities and essential healthcare needs.

Do we all need to apply under with The Registry for Social Housing? So that we are not forced out of our neighbourhoods by these unaffordable towers? So, is it a case of, Register for Social Housing or be homeless? Also, many people live here because THEY HAVE TO - I am just one of those people. And there are thousands more here like me. And if I cannot afford to live here, because of losing my affordable housing to these luxury unaffordable towers, I'm completely SCREWED.

Rezoning projects like this force residents out of their homes and communities; taking them away from the essential, life-sustaining, healthcare that they need to have access to.

And forcing people who live here because they also work here is going to result in them all having to driving in to the area (as they will be forced to live in the Suburbs and there is no transit infrastructure to here from most suburban areas – another reason why I am such a proponent of building OUT – NOT UP - and creating proper infrastructure there and between there and the city); so more cars, more traffic, and more pollution.

Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.

I refer you to the Grenfell Tower Fire in London in 2017.

This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.

But the fact remains that BECAUSE IT WAS A TOWER IT WAS A SIGNIFICANT RISK FACTOR; as people were not able to get out in time due to limited stairwell space and access, and seniors and people with disabilities being unable to use or get down the stairs in time.

TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.

This was a **24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured.** There have been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.

THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.

I live in a **3-STOREY LOW-RISE APARTMENT.** We had a **FIRE** alarm just before Christmas. Everyone was **OUT OF THE BUILDING WITHIN JUST 30 SECONDS.** Think about this...

The City wants towers that height and even higher; up to 50 story's, 50, now 60.

More floors in a tower =/+ **more people** in the tower = the more extreme risk to get everyone out safety in the event of a **fire**; and the more the chance of safety and survival goes down – **more deaths.**

There is a formula used in building risk assessment mathematics that says **if you go above 6 floors, each story adds another 5 % risk** (or 5% less chance of surviving a fire), and another 5% for the floor above, and so on – so **each added floor adds 5% further increased risk of death in case of a fire in these towers.**

If we maintain the format of building low rise buildings that we have already existing in our beautiful neighborhoods here, then we would not have to worry ourselves with these statistics; with this rate that each floor that you build higher, the higher the risk people dying in a fire is.

If we keep with the low rise buildings, this would not have to be even a remote concern. As I said, my building had a fire alarm in early December 2024; it's a three level story, and even myself with a disability, we were all able to get out onto the street in less than 30 seconds. THIS LEVEL OF SAFETY SIMPLY CANNOT BE ACHIEVED IN TOWERS.

We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOURHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.

Also, this location is close to VGH and its helicopter landing pad and towers compromise the flight paths of emergency helicopters. And more people mean more cars and more traffic, compromising ambulance and public access to the hospital and urgent medical centres.

AND, local businesses will NOT survive if these towers and their mainstream retail outlets are built.

Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.

- STOP destroying Vancouver neighbourhoods.
- STOP destroying Vancouver communities.
- STOP destroying Vancouver residents' LIVES.
- STOP destroying our beautiful Vancouver.

* STOP making it even harder and harder for people with disabilities to be able to remain in the Hospital Zone area for their healthcare and life support needs.

Yours sincerely,

Very concerned and very proud Fairview resident,

Fiona O'Connell

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential