

CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-19	18:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I want to comment on the proposed social housing project for West 5th Avenue, but also on the general tearing down of existing family-friendly neighbourhoods to fill the coffers of developers. While I understand that social housing is needed in Vancouver, mainly due to housing unaffordability artificially created by foreign investors, I do not support the tearing down and general destruction of the beautiful and iconic Kitsilano neighborhood to alleviate the housing crisis, nor do I believe it will solve the deeper issues that involve our social drug crisis that also leads to homelessness.</p> <p>The addition of huge buildings to a peaceful, family oriented, picturesque residential area will forever alter the face and history of Vancouver. Shame on you for very poor planning and for the lack of foresight that has gone into these rezoning approvals.</p>	Cristina Alarcon	Kitsilano	
2025-06-21	15:19	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Much too tall, especially considering it is on a hill. Five storeys is sympathetic to the neighbourhood and would not cast a shadow in all of Kitsilano. The area needs more doctors, nurses, schools, police, and grocery stores. Infrastructure before population increase.</p> <p>A building this tall costs so much to construct and run, there is already proof in the area that these developments do not result in affordable units.</p>	Stacy Taylor	Kitsilano	
2025-06-22	19:17	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>My understanding of the position of the neighborhoods concern about social housing in this area is that the scale is far too large. There are already social housing units comfortably fit into the community with an appropriate scale that is manageable and not disruptive.</p> <p>If this building was a quarter the size of what's proposed, it would be a more likely to allow people to integrate into a healthy neighborhood. I live, work, walk this neighborhood and I feel the scale will not encourage a healthy environment for the local residents or the people being placed who need help.</p> <p>I have supportive housing across the street and directly east of my home and they feel like neighbors, however placing 40 times the residents in the same square footage does not seem like a fit with the neighborhood.</p>	Andrew Paul	Kitsilano	
2025-06-23	13:45	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I'm writing to express concern and opposition to the scale of new developments proposed in Kitsilano. The neighbourhood is not currently equipped to handle a significant increase in population.</p> <p>Public infrastructure is already strained—public transit options are limited and unreliable, local schools are at full capacity with many children unable to attend their catchment schools, and community amenities such as sports teams, swimming programs, and the community centre are oversubscribed. The Kitsilano Community Centre itself has not seen meaningful expansion since the 1960s.</p> <p>Before any large-scale developments are approved, there needs to be a serious investment in infrastructure—particularly schools, transit, and community facilities—to ensure existing and future residents can access the services they need.</p>	Curtis Jagelewski	Kitsilano	
2025-06-23	14:45	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>There are already many issues with traffic congestion and a lack of safety measures at the corner of Arbutus St and 5th Ave. Adding 200 units and the additional bodies with no upgrades to the road infrastructure of that intersection is a recipe for higher collision rates and worse congestion.</p>	Jake Jackman	Kitsilano	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-24	15:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>With social housing this area will not be safe for anyone else to walk around. The businesses in the area will suffer from thefts, robberies and break ins. Social housing should be where the land is cheaper so that resources can go farther and less damage will be done. Any housing in this area should be for minimum wage workers, students or seniors, not criminals.</p> <p>The city should have to buy property back from anyone that doesn't want to live in the unsafe densified area for the original price they paid for their condo to live in a safe low rise neighbourhood. There is no need, nor resources for social housing in Kits. Kits should remain a place where people who work and pay taxes feel safe. This is a slap in the face for any hardworking residents.</p> <p>The Tri-Cities need to step up their social housing, Vancouver already has way too much of it and way more than it can handle. Our property taxes need to go down, not continue to go up to fund the drug addicts. The City needs to start supporting the middle class who keep the City running, instead of the repeat offenders who continue to drain it. This is not a good spot. It should be near the new St. Paul's hospital or VGH if it has to be on expensive Vancouver land, but that money could be better spent into reopening Riverview instead of building here.</p> <p>I fear for my life every time I have to walk by social housing downtown. People are passed out on the sidewalk with needles and weapons, while others are gathered around smoking crack and cigarettes, yelling and punching the air.</p> <p>Kits has been relatively safe compared to downtown so please do not bring those problems here.</p> <p>Richmond listened to their citizens to stop the social housing development so please do the same. No other City in the world houses dangerous repeat offenders in the most desired areas where people aspire to live.</p> <p>We paid an extremely high price for our condo to live in a clean, safe, low rise neighbourhood. There are going to be 6000 new rentals a short distance away in the 11 Indigenous buildings. This tower will cause overcrowding in an already busy area that doesn't have enough services/amenities for the people that currently live here. Towers will destroy this treasured area of Kitsilano. The newly rushed densification Broadway plan has not been thought through enough. Towers should only be allowed in areas with no view and large roads/highways. Any new high density build in Kits should be on pause until the City can see the effect of the 6000 new units and the impact it will put on the community. South of Broadway is better suited for development because the Kits streets can't handle more traffic.</p>	Linda Yochim	Kitsilano	
2025-06-24	15:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	Going from three story residential buildings in the area to TWENTY ONE stories is ridiculously aggressive and not viable for the neighbourhood. Please consider the entirety of the potential impact, and make a much more thorough, smarter, and thoughtful decision for the future of kitsilano.	Adrien Gendreau	Kitsilano	
2025-06-24	16:30	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	As a senior who has lived most of my adult life in Kitsilano I will no longer feel safe in my own community if supportive housing is allowed here. I will lose enjoyment of being able to go out in my neighbourhood. Please do not allow supportive housing in Kitsilano.	Antonio Alvarez	Kitsilano	

2025-06-24	19:50	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	No, definitely not. Most people in this area have had to work extra hard to be able to afford homes here. And to use tax dollars to build housing for drug addicts and criminals is ridiculous. Why work? When you can just do drugs and steal and be put up in apartments in one of the most sought after areas of Vancouver? Also, There is not enough road infrastructure to accommodate these towers especially with the 11 towers going in by the Burrard St bridge. Therefore these buildings should not be nearly as tall as they are planned to be and should be for people who work and need a bit more affordable rent. Not criminals and drug users. I had to pay a lot to live here and now this creates a safety issue for me and my partner. She should not have to worry about being attacked in her neighborhood with the cost to live here which the city set with their assessments..	Justin Richard	Kitsilano	
2025-06-25	08:50	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	200 social housing units in one building are too intense in our neighborhood.	Izumi Paul	Kitsilano	
2025-06-27	07:35	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	I am opposed. This building is TOO BIG and will destroy the character of the neighbourhood. Instead, build a Smaller building, and make the suites larger and more liveable, for a more reasonable rent. I am opposed.	kat collin	Fairview	
2025-06-27	09:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	A monster!	Janine Bond	Kitsilano	
2025-06-27	09:48	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	Purely based on the sheer size and quantity of these buildings being proposed in this neighbourhood, I am strongly opposed to this building being built. It will ruin the neighbourhood and cause a lot of negative impacts to the people that currently live the current building and surrounding area. Please please do not approve this application.	Tessa Carry	Kitsilano	
2025-06-28	09:42	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	The streets are tree-lined and too narrow, there is no infrastructure to support this. The picture of the proposed development is deceptive. This is the wrong area for a project of this magnitude.	Susan Lockhart	Kitsilano	
2025-06-28	19:35	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION of 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue.</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 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.</p> <p>This proposal is in an residential, family, neighbourhood community.</p> <p>The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. The disruption from this kind of construction and negative impact, creating more congestion and traffic. This kind of project is the LAST thing needed in this area. 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>This tower is FAR TOO TALL (AND EXCEEDINGLY UGLY) and will block light and views, and is not in keeping with the neighbourhood and existing buildings and community. THIS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN.</p> <p>There should be NO towers in residential neighbourhoods. Only towers along main transit</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

			<p>routes (Like ON Broadway; this location) Should NOT be any taller than a maximum of 12 storeys. And these should all be at AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRICES (which NONE of these proposals are), and should also include Social Housing – which THE MAJORITY of these proposals are not.</p> <p>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>And all of these rezoning proposals that the City are hellbent on forcing though also are not factoring in infrastructure. They are not factoring HUMANITY. They are not factoring the PEOPLE of Vancouver who live here and love here and call this their FOREVER HOMES. These neighbourhoods are already dense and there are already barely enough streets, park space, schools, health care access and GPs, for people already here. Now the City wants to build all these super tall towers and bring in 64,000+++ (one of the many high figures I have see on the news and other forms of media) to our ALREADY DENSE communities, with ALREADY STRAINING INFRASTRUCTURES.</p> <p>...and NONE of these god awful proposals being put forward (and through) are creating more parks.</p> <p>None will create more green space, more community space, more driving space, more parking space.</p> <p>None of them will be creating more schools, more libraries, more health care clinics, hospitals, more gyms and community centres.</p> <p>All these proposals will: Destroy existing affordable homes. Displace thousands, such as “the poor” (which include):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- veterans- seniors- low-income earners and families- mid-income earners and families- small business owners and workers- artists- medical workers who need to live in the affordable housing in these neighbourhoods for them to do their local healthcare work there- people with serious health care needs <p>All of the above “type” of humans, are of zero interest to these people.</p> <p>If you fall under the above descriptions, then you are nothing to these people and these proposals - to them:</p> <p>You are nothing. You are not Vancouver. You are not the future of Vancouver. You are useless, collateral damage, and you must go;</p> <p>So that the rich and the wealthy and the higher (“better?”) Class of people can come in; and then they will have the Vancouver, and that is the Vancouver that all these developers and proposals and the city, is envisioning.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>This is what all this really is. This is inhumane. This is utterly shameful</p> <p>The Vancouver as we have always known and loved and fought hard to protect, will be gone, gone to this greed and this vision. Vancouver will be dead</p> <p>For all this vision of influx of people into these luxury towers, the city and these proposals are also not factoring in how the life for all the (wealthy only) people that these luxury high rise towers will bring. No, it's just all about destroying infrastructure and community. Demolishing the incident infrastructure and community (and affordable homes) that we already have, to be able to put up fancy, ugly, high rise, show-box sized apartments, fire hazard, earthquake hazard, monstrous luxury towers.</p> <p>If you want to bring in more people – you need way more infrastructure and community buildings and needs!!!</p> <p>We need: To keep the already amazing and beautiful, and in keeping with the old character neighbourhoods aesthetic, and with being able to have visual access to lots of glorious light and the amazing, majestic mountains of Vancouver. This is why we are all here!! - we are here (and put up with all the nonsense; from city hall, from life in general) because this is Vancouver. Our supernatural, beautiful, incredible Vancouver. - because of its mountains, beaches, nature.</p> <p>Take this away, and Vancouver will very quickly become just be another sh!thole concrete jungle city, with disgusting, non-green, ugly, luxury high-rise monstrosities, that no one wants to visit or live at.</p> <p>And we need to build affordable housing in the right way – low rise buildings, in keeping with the beautiful, old, character neighbourhoods of Vancouver. Need to build on uninhabited land, undeveloped land, on top of commercial buildings.</p> <p>And we need to all be doing everything we can to protect our existing affordable housing and beautiful, old, character neighbourhoods (our proper, historical, Vancouver), protect it like gold -</p> <p>Not allow the city and these types of developers to do what it wishes to do with our land and homes, and lives: Which is to “scorch earth” it all, for wealth and the wealthy. The city and developers happily demolishing historical, aesthetically pleasing, fire and earthquake safe, low-rise buildings and homes, The city and developers happily displacing thousands of people and The city and developers happily destroying thousands of lives, The city and developers happily displacing medically vulnerable residents who have to live in these homes and neighbourhoods to have access to critical life sustaining medical care...</p> <p>All this, to put these high rise luxury, small-scale sizes apartments, that only the wealthy will be able to live in.</p> <p>Who on earth is this nonsense for???? Not Vancouver and it's people Only the developers and 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. 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 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 9.06 gobbledygook? 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>And this tower is UTTELRY HIDEOUS.</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</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

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.

And i refer you further still to yet another terrible even that just happened, that is another clear example and reason why not to build high-rises –

The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.

Hundreds of people died both in those towers and died by being trapped in the debris of those towers - even more reason to stop and proper think about the (non)safety of 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 NEIGHBOUHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a

				<p>dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.</p> <p>AND, local businesses will NOT survive if these towers and their mainstream retail outlets are built.</p> <p>Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• STOP destroying Vancouver neighbourhoods.• STOP destroying Vancouver communities.• STOP destroying Vancouver residents' LIVES.• STOP destroying our beautiful Vancouver. <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Very concerned and very proud Fairview, Vancouver resident,</p> <p>Fiona O'Connell</p> <p><small>§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p> <div></div>			
2025-06-29	18:27	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I live in the neighbourhood & oppose this development.</p> <p>An SRO should not be located in close proximity to an elementary school & a daycare.</p> <p>This development should be opposed for the same reasons as the similar development that was proposed in the same area & was not approved due to community concerns</p> <p>There has been a significant demographic shift with pot shops on West 4th & active drug dealing in our alley (behind the shops).</p> <p>The crime, violence & aggressive incidents in our alley occur weekly to daily. No one in our building goes down to the garbage at night or walks on the greenway at night. There's no room here for further decline.</p> <p>Arbutus is a congested and dangerous street already, for pedestrians, cyclists & vehicles. It is going to get worse with the sky train that has to shift everyone going to ubc onto buses. Until the sky train is completed, the impact of this is not yet known & should be decided & measured first.</p> <p>It got worse after Cornwall became a non-through street. Brdwy is limited due to sky train build, & traffic is rerouted onto 4th Ave. Then they can't drive through, so they use the alley. The existing closures on Cypress & Maple, plus 2 bike paths, have created traffic chaos.</p> <p>Please deal with the current problems first before adding more.</p>	Sandy Taylor	Kitsilano	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-07-03	13:29	CD-1 Rezoning: 2079-2085 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I support density — but not at any cost.</p> <p>The 2110 W 5th proposal fails to meet the intent of the Broadway Plan (TOA Tier 2), Housing Vancouver Strategy, Social Housing Incentive (SHI), Family Room Policy, and the Housing Design Standards for Families with Children.</p> <p>It lacks social partnerships, liveable unit sizes, and community benefits. Council must stop rubber-stamping out-of-scale towers that undermine good planning.</p> <p>TOA Tier 2 allows for increased height only when proposals align with the existing character, infrastructure capacity, and public benefits. Neighboring buildings are 3-4 storeys, without massive public benefit this should NOT be approved and is in clear violation of the Broadway plan's intentions.</p>	Kate Wilson	Kitsilano	