

CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-05-29	14:26	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	This building is too tall for the neighborhood, please don't turn Mount Pleasant into another Brentwood with all these high rises and no character.	Jeff Wevers	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-01	16:01	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	The prosed building height is disproportionally too tall for the neighborhood. Please consider the integrity of the neighborhood and people who call it home. 19 stories will not fit, please consider something the height of the adjacent buildings. Thank you.	Rita Sheena	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-02	12:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Absolute Opposition to Rezoning Proposal of 325 E 6th Ave.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 325 E 6th 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 AFFORDBALE 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 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</p>	Fiona OConnell		

			<p>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 6 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>These towers 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> <p>I refer you to the Grenfell Tower Fire in London in 2017.</p> <p>This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

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 NEIGHBOUGHOODS. 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,

				<div>Fiona O’Connell</div> <div><div>§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential</div><div></div></div>			
2025-06-02	19:48	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	Current Resident in Opposition to the Proposed Rezoning Application and Bylaw Amendments. The proposed building is too tall. Please see the attached email correspondence.	Chris Sager	Mount Pleasant	Appendix A
2025-06-03	07:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	The height of this building isn't in keeping with the neighbourhood. It's just too high. The existing laneway and local roadways will also not support this density in this area.	Jennifer Marley	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-04	10:23	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I live at 311 East 6th Street, The Wohlsein, - a 2017 development with 6 stories.</p> <p>The 20 (now 19) stories does not fit into the residential culture of the neighbourhood. The services and traffic in the area are already absolutely maxed out.</p> <p>The proposed building is within a couple feet of 311 East 6th- towering the 6 story development by plus three times.</p> <p>This revised proposal does not support urban design principles of gradual densification and has no regard for a setback or relationship with 311 East 6th avenue or the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I do not support the redevelopment of this site as proposed. The new building should have an appropriate relationship to the adjacent buildings.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider to a significantly lower project.</p> <p>Lynn Parkin</p>	Lynn Parkin	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-06	10:28	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	This proposal does not consider the negative impact to 311 East 6th which has six floors plus the rooftop of living space. The rooftop is made up of patios that belong to sixth floor residents and gardens. On every side the balconies and windows face out. This means on the east side the balconies and windows will face a wall. 37 foot distance is not sufficient or equal to the 80 foot distance between towers on the other side. Negative impacts also include 100% blocking of sun, airflow restrictions, noise from heat pumps. The value of the condos will decline as a result. These impacts may be mitigated by increasing the distance between the two buildings and decreasing the height.	Janice Reid	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-06	22:21	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>- Proposed building at 19 storeys is significantly higher than any building in the surrounding area.</p> <p>- There is not enough setback between the proposed building and the existing building to the west. This would cause serious privacy issues.</p> <p>- The proposed building will replace an existing building that has appropriate, liveable sized apartments, for under-sized, unliveable sized apartments.</p> <p>- Re-design is needed to ensure the proposed building actually addresses Vancouver's housing needs (providing adequately sized apartments that people actually want to live in), and does not negatively impact the aspects that make the neighbourhood a nice place to live. Currently, the tallest building in the area is approximately 10 storeys; this would be about double that at 19 storeys and would block natural light to neighbouring buildings and stick out visually, changing the feel of the neighbourhood.</p>	Angelica Quiring	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-08	21:53	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>We have over 2000 empty strata condos in the city, why are we building another 20-story strata tower? People move to Mount pleasant to get away from downtown culture. This neighbourhood is full of families who are already having difficulty accessing daycare, basic services like swimming lessons, elementary schools. Where is the planning to support these already existing issues? You should be focusing on 2-3 bedroom rental housing for families, not 1-bedroom condos that will sit empty. We want community, not towers .</p>	Michelle Kangro	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-12	14:47	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Redevelopment in the neighborhood is inevitable and encouraged, however, the proposed height of development is not congruent with the surrounding area and other recent new builds. Mount Pleasant is also already underserved compared to the rest of the city for public infrastructure such as parks, dog parks and other amenities. This development proposes no improvements to public amenities to offset the significant increase in population at this address.</p>	Heather Graham	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-13	14:54	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>The proposed development is not consistent with the comprehensive goals for liveable neighbourhoods as outlined in the Broadway Plan. The architecture is not consistent with the history and character of the area, but rather appears to be a tower that would better suit the downtown core. Although it is proposed for a neighbourhood that has a distinctive history and character, it does not seem to have been designed with consideration of the historical nature of the Mt Pleasant community. The proposed 20 story size is not livable scale; if developed this tower will increase profit for the developer while decreasing livability for those in the neighbourhood. It does not bring market rental or 100% social housing but rather primarily strata-ownership housing with the minimum 20% for social housing. As is clear from the rendering, this tower will dwarf the other mainly low-rise buildings in the neighbourhood. Its walls of windows also bring environmental concerns in our warming climate. Finally, it will be 37 feet from the east wall of the building beside it (while allowing 80 feet between the building on the west side of the building), which has full-size windows directly facing the proposed tower, thus impinging on privacy and completely blocking sunlight for its neighbours. I am concerned this will result in decline in the value of the condos on that side of the building in addition to the privacy and light-limiting impacts.</p>	Bronwen Sprout	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-15	16:10	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 325 East 6th Avenue.</p> <p>One of my primary concerns is the impact this development will have on the existing trees on the property. The mature trees currently on site provide essential environmental, aesthetic, and community benefits. At a time when the City of Vancouver is actively working to increase urban tree canopy to combat climate change, reduce urban heat, and support biodiversity, removing any of these trees would be counterproductive and deeply concerning. I urge that all existing trees be preserved as part of any future plans for the site.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed development would severely compromise the privacy of residents living directly behind the property, particularly those at 334 East 5th Avenue. The existing trees and green space currently act as a natural buffer, which would be lost with this development. Replacing this with a multi-story structure would drastically alter the character of the neighborhood and negatively affect the quality of life for nearby residents.</p> <p>As a concerned community member, I believe thoughtful development should work with existing natural assets—not erase them. I respectfully request that the City deny the current proposal and work with developers to revise plans that prioritize environmental preservation and respect the privacy of neighboring homes.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this feedback.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Johnson</p>	Dave Johnson	Mount Pleasant	
2025-06-15	16:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 325 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 325 East 6th Avenue.</p> <p>One of my primary concerns is the impact this development will have on the existing trees on the property. The mature trees currently on site provide essential environmental, aesthetic, and community benefits. At a time when the City of Vancouver is actively working to increase urban tree canopy to combat climate change, reduce urban heat, and support biodiversity, removing any of these trees would be counterproductive and deeply concerning. I urge that all existing trees be preserved as part of any future plans for the site.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed development would severely compromise the privacy of residents living directly behind the property, particularly those at 334 East 5th Avenue. The existing trees and green space currently act as a natural buffer, which would be lost with this development. Replacing this with a multi-story structure would drastically alter the character of the neighborhood and negatively affect the quality of life for nearby residents.</p> <p>As a concerned community member, I believe thoughtful development should work with existing natural assets—not erase them. I respectfully request that the City deny the current proposal and work with developers to revise plans that prioritize environmental preservation and respect the privacy of neighboring homes.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this feedback.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rebecca Cron</p>	Rebecca Cron	Mount Pleasant	

APPENDIX A

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Chris Sager
Sent: June 2, 2025 7:42 PM
To: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: RE: Notice of objection to rezoning application at 349 East 6th Avenue and now 325 East 6th Avenue

Hi Bryan:

I am extremely disappointed that the staff's review of the application have lead to a recommendation from the General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability to approve this rezoning application.

It appears that staff's response to public concerns quite simply state that the proposal meets the Plan's expectations without any further regard. I see there were 114 respondents opposing the plan as compared to 13 in support.

I am again expressing my opposition to this rezoning application and proposed bylaw amendment.

I compel Mayor and Council to reject the proposed bylaw amendment.

Thanks,

Chris Sager

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Chris Sager
Sent: July 18, 2024 9:24 PM
To: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: Notice of objection to rezoning application at 349 East 6th Avenue and now 325 East 6th Avenue

Hi Bryan:

Please see the correspondence below re. the neighboring development and the precedent it set for the subject proposal at 325 East 6th Avenue.

I have updated the sketch I had provided previously as below considering the subject proposal at 325 East 6th Avenue.



I would like to provide notice of my objection to the proposed development at 325 East 6th Avenue and share that the height of the proposed development is absolutely unacceptable and demonstrates a complete and utter disregard for the current residents in the neighborhood.

I urge you to plead with the city planner to reject this rezoning application.

Chris Sager

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Chris Sager s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 8:25 PM

To: Planning Info s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Subject: Re: Notice of objection to rezoning application at 349 East 6th Avenue

Hello Marcel and Darren and to the attention of the Director of Planning.

I am disappointed that Council resolved to approve the subject rezoning application as submitted for a 12 storey building; especially given that 51% of the public respondents were opposed.

I am again advising of my objection to the development as proposed and appealing to the Director of Planning to make a decision to quash Council's approval.

As I have previously noted, a 12 storey building at this location two blocks East of Main Street is not aligned with the character and context of the neighborhood where recent developments closer to Main Street max at 10 storeys. This development will block the views of previously erected buildings to the West.

I fear that this approval will set a precedent for other developers (city and province as partners included) to solicit the city for rezoning approval to build similar height buildings in the neighborhood effectively eliminating any remaining view and daily sunlight of current residents in the area.

For example, it appears that the building immediately to the West has ceased to take on new tenants as residents vacate and I fear that a similar development application may already be in the works given the precedent set with the conditional approval at 349 East 6th. Please see attached sketch.

Again, I would welcome a development of this nature in this location that is aligned in height with the recent developments in the neighborhood.

Thanks,

Chris

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Chris Sager s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 10:18 PM

To: Planning Info s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Subject: Re: Notice of objection to rezoning application at 349 East 6th Avenue

Hello Marcel:

With the close of the public open house period, I would to again state my opposition to this application and in particular to the proposed height.

Thanks,

Chris

702 - 251 7th Ave E.

From: Planning Info s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 2:53 PM
To: Chris Sager s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: RE: Notice of objection to rezoning application at 349 East 6th Avenue

Hi Chris,

Thanks for your email and comments, much appreciated. They will be included with all comments received on the project and considered as part of the Rezoning review.

I encourage you to monitor the rezapps website for project updates including updates on virtual open house dates.

<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/349e6thave/index.htm>

Regards,

Marcel

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential | Rezoning Planner
Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability | City of Vancouver
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
[Redacted]

The City of Vancouver acknowledges that it is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh peoples

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Sager s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 8:04 PM
To: Gelein, Marcel
Subject: [EXT] Notice of objection to rezoning application at 349 East 6th Avenue

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

Hello Marcel:

I would like to provide notice of my objection to the subject rezoning application.

A 12 story tower at this location In a low rise residential neighborhood and this far from Main Street is not in line with the skyline of the neighborhood. It will block mountain views for many of the current residents and diminish the enjoyment of the area for those current residents.

I will personally lose another large portion of the mountain skyline view from my unit which has already been reduced by other close by developments.

Understanding that the neighborhood will develop and being supportive of social housing I would have much less objection to a smaller tower similar to the developments at Scotia and 6th.

Thanks,

Chris

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent from my iPad