

CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-07-16	08:42	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Building height is too large for the area, especially on the side street, it simply does not make sense for the given location. Why are we building 5-6 story new builds on Main st in the surrounding area then allowing 17 units here all of a sudden.</p> <p>I could understand 8 floors, although I believe 6 is the most appropriate for this site.</p> <p>I believe that between 12th and 41st along Cambie and Main should be capped to 6-8 stories as to preserve the neighbourhood charm. We can still build adequate housing at that height without compromising the neighbourhood.</p>	Liam Malan	Mount Pleasant	
2025-07-17	16:16	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION OF 45 E. 16th Ave.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 45 E. 16th 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 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 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>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

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.

...and NONE of these god awful proposals being put forward (and through) are creating more parks.

None will create more green space, more community space, more driving space, more parking space.

None of them will be creating more schools, more libraries, more health care clinics, hospitals, more gyms and community centres.

All these proposals will:
Destroy existing affordable homes.
Displace thousands, such as “the poor” (which include):

- 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

All of the above “type” of humans, are of zero interest to these people.

If you fall under the above descriptions, then you are nothing to these people and these proposals - to them:

You are nothing.
You are not Vancouver.
You are not the future of Vancouver.
You are useless, collateral damage, and you must go;

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.

This is what all this really is.
This is inhumane.
This is utterly shameful

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

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

			<p>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 6.8 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>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

And this tower is UTTELRY HIDEOUS.

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

				<p>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> <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...</p> <p>The City wants towers that height and even higher; up to 50 story's, 50, now 60.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 –</p> <p>The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.</p> <p>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 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.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <small>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small> </p>			
2025-07-18	15:40	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>The Subject menu on your website didn't let me select the right topic. This is about the following: On the morning of Tuesday, July 22, Vancouver City Council will be considering sending a "referral" report entitled "Standardized Apartment Districts and City-Initiated Zoning Changes to Implement Broadway Plan and Cambie Corridor Plan". I don't even know where to start. This is a completely unreasonable proposal. Taking away the Public Hearing process would result in far less transparency and accountability. I don't trust the current city council now, and this plan has even more potential for corruption.</p>	Iris Torchalla	Kitsilano	
2025-08-23	15:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>We strongly oppose the proposal for a 17-storey mixed-use tower at this site.</p> <p>Key Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of Context: The tower is grossly out of scale with surrounding 3–6 storey buildings and would dominate a quiet, leafy residential neighbourhood. It would overshadow Mount Pleasant Park and nearby homes, blocking sun and privacy. • Contrary to Planning Principles: The Broadway Plan calls for tall towers closest to transit stations. This site is one of the farthest from the new Broadway Line stations, where only mid-rise development is intended. The proposal ignores the principle of tapering building heights with distance from transit. • Transit-Oriented Area By-law Violation: At ~800m from the nearest station, the site is only eligible for up to 8 storeys, not 17. • Negative Neighbourhood Impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic, parking shortages, and cyclist/pedestrian safety risks, especially at Ontario St. bike route. • Strain on already full schools, daycare, and local services. • Loss of neighbourhood character and village feel, especially near Main Street Village. • Harm to Mount Pleasant Park: The tower would crowd and overshadow this heavily used community green space, diminishing sunlight, views, and its open character. • Displacement and Poor Affordability Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current tenants would be displaced for years, losing rent protections. • Proposed “below market” rentals are limited, small, and not truly affordable for families. • Net affordability in the neighbourhood would decline. • Excessive Scale: At 56m, the building is six times taller than neighbours and would stand out as a misplaced high-rise in a low- to mid-rise community. <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We support careful, planned densification in Mount Pleasant. An 8-storey building could add housing while respecting the neighbourhood, the Broadway Plan, and the site's distance from transit. A 17-storey tower here would be harmful, out of place, and contrary to the City's own planning goals.</p>	Henry Slaughter	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-08-23	15:16	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>We strongly oppose the proposal for a 17-storey mixed-use tower at this site.</p> <p>Key Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Out of Context: The tower is grossly out of scale with surrounding 3–6 storey buildings and would dominate a quiet, leafy residential neighbourhood. It would overshadow Mount Pleasant Park and nearby homes, blocking sun and privacy.• Contrary to Planning Principles: The Broadway Plan calls for tall towers closest to transit stations. This site is one of the farthest from the new Broadway Line stations, where only mid-rise development is intended. The proposal ignores the principle of tapering building heights with distance from transit.• Transit-Oriented Area By-law Violation: At ~800m from the nearest station, the site is only eligible for up to 8 storeys, not 17.• Negative Neighbourhood Impacts:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased traffic, parking shortages, and cyclist/pedestrian safety risks, especially at Ontario St. bike route.• Strain on already full schools, daycare, and local services.• Loss of neighbourhood character and village feel, especially near Main Street Village.• Harm to Mount Pleasant Park: The tower would crowd and overshadow this heavily used community green space, diminishing sunlight, views, and its open character.• Displacement and Poor Affordability Outcomes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Current tenants would be displaced for years, losing rent protections.• Proposed “below market” rentals are limited, small, and not truly affordable for families.• Net affordability in the neighbourhood would decline.• Excessive Scale: At 56m, the building is six times taller than neighbours and would stand out as a misplaced high-rise in a low- to mid-rise community. <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We support careful, planned densification in Mount Pleasant. An 8-storey building could add housing while respecting the neighbourhood, the Broadway Plan, and the site’s distance from transit. A 17-storey tower here would be harmful, out of place, and contrary to the City’s own planning goals.</p>	Sarah Ardron	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-09-01	19:10	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>It is so disappointing and disheartening to see that this proposal is still active. A 17-storey tower at this location does not add a single positive to the neighbourhood; it will be an eyesore; add too many people to a very busy neighbourhood without any increase in green space and other community amenities; add additional traffic to a very congested road, further increasing the number of people racing through our streets to avoid the lights at 16th and Main; add unneeded commercial space at ground level; etc. I understand that a policy exists to limit building heights in established neighbourhoods to 6-8 stories. How much more established can our neighbourhood be? Our house, for e.g., was built in 1905! We don't oppose increased density. I've lived in the area for over 30 years, and have seen the gradual replacement along 16th Ave east of Oak of single family homes with multi-unit condos in what has been - up until now - a respectful manner. A 6-8 storey development with ground-level townhomes would be a lot more appropriate for that location than what is currently proposed. Also, we receive these notifications in a somewhat haphazard fashion it appears. There are a dozen or so high rises proposed in our general neighbourhood, yet I've only been given the opportunity to comment on 2 of these proposals. Why is that? Also, high rises should be limited to such main streets as Broadway, Cambie, Main, etc. A 17 storey tower at this location on 16th would be unprecedented. And it would be there essentially forever, providing an architectural middle finger to our neighbourhood. And, finally, the existing apartment building appears to be working just fine. If it needs to be densified further, doubling its height would be much more respectful of the neighbourhood. Thank you. Timo Makinen. P.Eng., MRM, MBA</p>	Timo Makinen	Riley Park	
2025-09-02	08:16	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>We may need more housing in Vancouver. But the answer to this problem isn't to tear down existing affordable housing, to target areas that are already dense, and to leave empty lots empty. We should instead prioritize the building of non-market and co-op housing. The policy gives developers a pass to destroy our homes and an incentive to force long term tenants out. Landlords frequently pressure tenants to leave early and do everything they can to delay or avoid providing tenants compensation they are owed. To do so, Tenant Relocation "Specialists" are hired by developers to accelerate the displacement process. The City of Vancouver has been courting developers and the creation of high rises since the 1970s, tripling the amount of housing units (more than any other North American city). None of this has alleviated the housing crisis in Vancouver.</p> <p>Densification re-shapes the nature of a neighbourhood in the process, as smaller scale landlords often raise their rents to narrow the price gap with new developments. These inflationary gains bolster the speculator market with only minimal affordable rentals offered in exchange.</p> <p>The ability of densification to lower rental prices depends on what kind of housing is being built. But densification usually means the building of privately owned, for-profit housing. This often displaces tenants in truly affordable housing in order to build new high-income housing.</p> <p>The City of Vancouver has been courting developers and the creation of high rises since the 1970s, tripling the amount of housing units (more than any other North American city). None of this has alleviated the housing crisis in Vancouver.</p> <p>Densification re-shapes the nature of a neighbourhood in the process, as smaller scale landlords often raise their rents to narrow the price gap with new developments. These inflationary gains bolster the speculator market with only minimal affordable rentals offered in exchange.</p> <p>The ability of densification to lower rental prices depends on what kind of housing is being built. But densification usually means the building of privately owned, for-profit housing. This often displaces tenants in truly affordable housing in order to build new high-income housing.</p>	j sawatsky	Mount Pleasant	

2025-09-02	09:22	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Hello - thanks for taking my comments on the building proposed at 45 East 16th.</p> <p>17 stories on this street is too tall and will spoil the feeling of the neighbourhood. I don't have a particular concern about the introduction of the commercial space on the ground floor, but do note that this may cause concern for others who live directly in the vicinity.</p> <p>I particularly think about the park at 16th and Ontario that will have units looking directly into it. The building will also block sunlight in the park in the morning, and cast shadows on the surrounding neighbourhood to the east in the afternoon.</p> <p>Further, that park is already in heavy use, and having that many more people in the neighbourhood will create additional strain on the infrastructure (the park doesn't even have a bathroom yet)</p> <p>Further, parking in the neighbourhood is already an issue, and this will make the area very congested. Have you drive on 16th in the last 5 years? It's best to avoid it, and this will make it even worse.</p> <p>My main point is that this will feel really generic and overpowering in this area. People already flock to this area because it's got a great vibe. This building will ruin that.</p>	Erin Shaw	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-03	07:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>The height of this building is out of proportion for the neighborhood. It will directly impact sun/light into the neighboring yards including my own. Adding this height of building into a neighborhood of low rise dwellings will change the characteristics of the neighborhood into a high rise urban site. Despite the city's insistence that no one will own a car/drive, that's not true and the increase in car traffic, cars parked in the neighboring streets will have huge negative impact. Services in this area that are already deficient or inadequate will be stretched further: minimal food shopping, limited and overcrowded school availability.</p>	Lori Tucker	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-05	13:05	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION OF 45 E. 16th Ave.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 45 E. 16th 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 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 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>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>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

			<p>There should be NO towers in residential neighbourhoods. Only towers along main transit 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:</p> <p>Destroy existing affordable homes.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>You are not Vancouver.</p> <p>You are not the future of Vancouver.</p> <p>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 6.8 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</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

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.

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

				<p>AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOUHOODS. 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.</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 <small>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p>			
2025-09-05	14:58	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.</p> <p>1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency</p> <p>The proposed development does not meet the Plan’s requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.</p> <p>Staff have argued that the site’s extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.</p> <p>The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome</p>	Mhelanni Gorre	Mount Pleasant	

			<p>directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself. Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan’s intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan’s stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community. Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan’s Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city’s tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan’s vision of preserving “green and leafy streetscapes.”</p> <p>The project’s solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city’s most heavily used bike routes. The City’s 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building’s lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan’s frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood. Sincerely, Mhelanni Gorre 19-2649 Quebec St Vancouver, BC			
2025-09-05	15:26	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	I strongly oppose the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.	CATHERINE KALKE	Mount Pleasant	Appendix A Attachment 2
2025-09-06	06:07	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	I live in a low-rise apartment unit a couple of blocks away and I oppose the development at 45 E 16th Ave. I worry that this neighbourhood is gentrifying too rapidly, and displacing long-term tenants like myself who have affordable rental options. By letting in a number of high-rises to the neighbourhood, rents will go up and affordability will go down. The character of the neighbourhood, one of the oldest in the city, marked by single detached heritage homes, lane way homes, and low-rise units will be destroyed, making way for another yaletown style neighbourhood marked by high rise buildings. Please say no to this unit. Thank you, Rami Katz	Rami Katz	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-06	14:53	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	SAY NO TO HI RISE TOWERS IN BEAUTIFUL MOUNT PLEASANT! There will be a public hearing on Sept 18 for another re-zoning proposal for a hi-rise at 45 E 16th currently an affordable rental building that will be demolished. Go to the following web site for details (https://vancouver.ca/.../contact-council-public-hearing.aspx). We encourage everyone who can, to speak in person or online at the public hearing. Feel free to send the following letter verbatim or add your own personal context. Dear Vancouver City Council, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety. 1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency The proposed development does not meet the Plan’s requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys. Staff have argued that the site’s extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well. The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site	Leona Rothney	Mount Pleasant	

			<p>directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself. Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan’s intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan’s stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community. Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan’s Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city’s tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan’s vision of preserving “green and leafy streetscapes.”</p> <p>The project’s solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city’s most heavily used bike routes. The City’s 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building’s lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan’s frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.</p> <p>Sincerely, L. ROTHNEY <small>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p> <div></div>			
2025-09-07	20:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>SAY NO TO HI RISE TOWERS IN BEAUTIFUL MOUNT PLEASANT!</p> <p>There will be a public hearing on Sept 18 for another re-zoning proposal for a hi-rise at 45 E 16th currently an affordable rental building that will be demolished. Go to the following web site for details (https://vancouver.ca/your-government/contact-council-public-hearing.aspx). We encourage everyone who can, to speak in person or online at the public hearing. Feel free to send the following letter verbatim or add your own personal context.</p> <p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (herein referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.</p> <p>1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency</p> <p>The proposed development does not meet the Plan’s requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.</p> <p>Staff have argued that the site’s extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.</p> <p>The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it</p>	Matt Drake	Mount Pleasant	

			<p>calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself.</p> <p>Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan’s intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan’s stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community.</p> <p>Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan’s Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city’s tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan’s vision of preserving “green and leafy streetscapes.”</p> <p>The project’s solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city’s most heavily used bike routes. The City’s 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building’s lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan’s frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.</p> <p>Sincerely, Matt Drake</p>			
2025-09-08	10:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>TOD</p> <p>The site is 900 m from the Broadway and Main transit station which is outside of the 800m ring for TOD. At 17 stories the building should with 200m of the station, there is no need for a tower of this size 900m from the station.</p> <p>Shadowing and Looming</p> <p>A 17 storey tower in an area is only 3 stories will create shadowing and remove green space as the current building is set back. Based on the shadowing studies, which leave out Dec 21, the buildings to the north, and the northeast a corner of Mt Pleasant Park, will be in shadow 6 months of the year for part of the day. The pedestal is 4 stories and should be limited to 3 to match neighbouring buildings. The commercial space on the ground floor will further crowd the sidewalk and is unnecessary given the proximity to Main St. The ground floor would be better suited to additional housing units to match neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>Lack of Park Space</p> <p>Mt Pleasant has the second highest density of people per hectare of park in the city 2,700 per hectare even higher than downtown at 2,200 per hectare. To increase to the level of density that is created by this type of development without any increase in park space is against planning norms, especially since people in very small apartments (63% of units under 500 sq ft) and towers in general need access to green space.</p> <p>Affordability</p> <p>Excluding the 20% below market rentals the rent will need to be in the range of \$5 sqft (per M. Geller letter to Vancouver is Awesome March 8, 2024). This would mean Studio rent \$2,000, 1BR rent \$2,300, 2BR rent 3,500 and 3 BR rent \$4,300. These rents are likely in excess of the rents in the existing building so overall affordability will not increase.</p>	Andrew Nichols	Mount Pleasant	

2025-09-08	10:36	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I live i.5 blocks from the proposed site. I have read the report in full. This is a ridiculous development proposal that will benefit no one but the developer and the City's capital coffers. All of the previous concerns articulated were brushed off. There are no services, amenities or facilities available o accommodate this large a development.</p> <p>1. Schools are already over capacity with no possibility of increasing it. (Acknowledged in the report with no solution)</p> <p>2. The childcare facilities cited in the report are already full with waiting lists.</p> <p>3. Transit on Main Street is already overcrowded with no improvement; there is no transit on 16th. The increased traffic will impact the park, childcare and schools.</p> <p>4. This is a neighbourhood that can use medium-rise density but this high-rise, like all the others o the BP, will inflate land prices and make a more human density impossible.</p> <p>What a disaster. It will help ME personally by increasing my property value but it will destroy the neighbourhood.</p>	Lyn Bartram	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-08	15:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am a resident of the unit block of West 16th Avenue and have lived in that block with my family (including two small children) since 2017. As a resident two blocks away from the proposed development, I am very familiar with the neighbourhood, its community and how community spaces are used. I ask City Counsel to reject JTA Development Consultant's ("JTA") application to rezone 45 East 16th Avenue to CD-1 in order to build a 17-story 145-unit mixed use rental building.</p> <p>I strongly oppose JTA's application as the proposed 17-story building:</p> <p>1. does not fit with and will fundamentally alter the neighbourhood's character; and</p> <p>2. would add significant density to an area already lacking in important community amenities such as sufficient park and public school spaces.</p> <p>Contrary to Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mt. Pleasant and in particular the blocks of 16th Avenue between Cambie Street and Quebec Street are unquestionably residential areas. The neighbourhood is a mix of single-family homes, townhouses and low-rise apartment building (typically about three-stories). It is a wonderful neighbourhood filled with families who often gather at Mt. Pleasant Park and get to know each other in a way one might expect in a suburb not in the heart of the city.</p> <p>The low-rise nature of the buildings in this area of 16th Avenue add to the character and local neighbourhood feel of the area. A 17-story building is entirely contrary to what is currently in the area. There is nothing even close to the height and density of a 17-story apartment building anywhere near 45 East 16th Avenue. The application material itself clearly shows on pages 40 and 42 that there is not a single building remotely close to the proposed 17-story height until you get down to the area of Broadway St. and Kingsway St (an area that is very obviously not primarily residential). There are not even any buildings on Main Street that rival the height of the proposed building. Any development on the site of 45 East 16th Avenue must be low-rise so that we are able to maintain the character of the neighbourhood so many of us live in, know and love.</p> <p>Density</p> <p>45 East 16th Avenue is located in an area of Vancouver that is already lacking in park space and public school spaces for the residents in the area and adding an additional 145 units in one-building would only exacerbate that problem, especially given the number of other developments (both townhomes and apartment complexes) occurring in the area.</p> <p>With respect to park space, VanPlay establishes the target that all areas in Vancouver should have 1.1 hectares of park space for every 1000 residents. Yet, Mt. Pleasant, and the area surrounding 45 East 16th Avenue in particular is not even close to meeting that target. Based on the City's own 2016 Park Provision Study (Park Provision Study 2016), the area around 45</p>	Clare Benton	Mount Pleasant	

				<p>East 16th Avenue had less than 0.28 hectares of park space for every 1000 residents. Adding more residents to the neighbourhood, especially in an apartment building where the residents will presumably need greater access to public greenspace, will only worsen the lack of public park space.</p> <p>With respect to access to public schools, the local elementary school, Simon Fraser Elementary is already incredibly oversubscribed with many children in the neighbourhood needing to attend General Wolfe or another elementary school for at least the first few years before being able to attend Simon Fraser. Families move into neighbourhoods like Mt. Pleasant thinking they will be able to walk their kids to school, send them to the neighbourhood school with their neighbourhood friends and the area of surrounding 45 East 16th Avenue is already so full of families that many of them do not get to do this and instead have to drive their kids to school or walk/bike them across busy streets (16th and 25th). The Recommendation Report itself already notes that the VSB has indicated that Simon Fraser Elementary will be at 176% capacity within 6 years. The City should not make this problem worse by densifying an area that does not have the community amenities needed to support a larger population.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns and I hope you oppose JTA’s proposal.</p>			
2025-09-08	20:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	Please see attached letter	Scott Mullen	Mount Pleasant	Appendix B
2025-09-09	12:49	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Rezoning from RM-4 (Residential) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District will result in loss of local planning control and community character.</p> <p>CD-1 rezonings often enable higher-end or luxury developments to justify increased density or building height. This will displace existing renters in older, more affordable buildings — a common concern in RM-4 zones, which are often low-rise multi-family areas with moderate-density rental housing.</p> <p>The city needs more 3-5 level buildings. Buildings such as the one proposed of 17 storeys will increase parking need and street congestion near a beloved park which should prioritize pedestrians, block sunlight in the park, bring increased car traffic near the nearby school (more cars = less safe for children).</p>	Niv That	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-10	08:55	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am a resident of the building adjacent to the proposed redevelopment at 45 East 16th Avenue, and I have serious concerns about this application.</p> <p>Firstly, the scale of the proposed building appears disproportionate to the surrounding area. At its proposed height, it would be one of the tallest buildings outside of downtown Vancouver, yet it is not located on a major transit or commercial corridor. Main Street, the nearest commercial hub, is several blocks away, and this development risks creating a disconnected and inconsistent urban fabric.</p> <p>Secondly, parking is already a significant challenge in our neighbourhood. My building does not have assigned parking, and I often have to circle the area multiple times to find a spot. With my office now located in Port Kells, public transit is not a viable option for my daily commute or site visits, making reliable parking essential. Adding a high-density development without adequate infrastructure will only worsen this issue.</p> <p>In its current form, this proposal does not seem to align with the needs or realities of the neighbourhood. I urge the City to reconsider or reject this application until a more context-sensitive and infrastructure-supported plan is presented.</p>	William Corse	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-10	10:17	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th	Oppose	Dear Vancouver City Council,	Karen Webber	Mount Pleasant	

		Avenue	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.</p> <p>1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency</p> <p>The proposed development does not meet the Plan’s requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.</p> <p>Staff have argued that the site’s extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.</p> <p>The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself.</p> <p>Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11- storey building would be consistent with the Plan’s intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan’s stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community.</p> <p>Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan’s Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city’s tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that</p>		
--	--	--------	---	--	--

				<p>currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan’s vision of preserving “green and leafy streetscapes.”</p> <p>The project’s solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city’s most heavily used bike routes. The City’s 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building’s lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan’s frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.</p> <p>Sincerely, Karen Webber s.22(1) Personal and Confidential</p>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-09-10	14:25	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and City Council,</p> <p>My name is Alistair,, and I am a resident of Mount Pleasant, living on Quebec Street. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the rezoning application for 45 E 16th Avenue. My primary concerns with this proposal are its excessive height and density, the negative impact on our community's public spaces, and the displacement of tenants.</p> <p>Height and Density: The proposed 17-storey tower is completely out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood, which is primarily composed of low-rise buildings and is zoned as RM-4. This significant increase in scale is not a suitable form of densification for this specific location.</p> <p>Impact on Public Spaces: The shadow studies for this project are alarming. The proposed building will cast a significant and detrimental shadow over Mount Pleasant Park, a vital green space and a hub for our community. This will reduce sunlight on the park, impacting its usability and enjoyment for residents throughout a large part of the day.</p> <p>Displacement of Tenants: The current building at 45 E 16th Avenue is a long-standing rental apartment building. This rezoning would lead to the demoviction of its current residents, an issue that contributes to Vancouver's ongoing housing crisis. It's a priority to protect existing affordable housing, not to demolish it for new, more expensive units.</p> <p>Traffic and Parking: The addition of 145 new units and commercial space with only 63 parking spots will undoubtedly worsen the existing traffic congestion and parking challenges in our already busy neighbourhood.</p> <p>I urge you to vote against this application. While I support thoughtful densification, this proposal is not the right fit for our community. A more appropriate and respectful development would be one that is scaled to the neighbourhood, preserves our public spaces, and doesn't displace residents.</p> <p>Sincerely, Alistair</p>	Alistair Jensen	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-09-12	09:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Thank you to the Mayor, Council and staff for their work in considering this application and soliciting comments from local residents.</p> <p>I oppose the rezoning application at 45 East 16th Avenue from RM-4 (Residential District) to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development District) to allow for a proposed “17-storey mixed-use building [which] includes 145 rental units; at least 20% of the residential floor area for below-market rental units; commercial space on the ground floor; a floor space ratio (FSR) of 6.8; and a building height of 55 m (180 ft.), with additional height for rooftop amenity space.”</p> <p>Specifically, I support maintaining the existing RM-4 zoning restriction on all commercial uses on this site. I would, however, support a zoning change that permits a 6-storey residential building on this site, and change the existing RM-4 restriction of height from 10.7 m to 19.9 m (currently applicable only to social housing). I support incentives to encourage a diversity of social, affordable rental, co-operative, and co-housing models of housing in Mount Pleasant.</p> <p>Neither of the applicable planning documents for this area, the Vancouver Plan and the Broadway Plan, envision mixed-use high-rises along 16th Avenue between Cambie and Main Streets. While the Vancouver Plan sets out 1-25 storey residential structures across the “Metro Core/Broadway” area, the image for this area (“Transect of Metro Core/Broadway - Building height and massing,” page 57) suggests that building heights gradually lower away from the rapid transit route. The Broadway Plan describes the “Mount Pleasant South Apartment Areas” to have “Mid- to High-Rise” buildings. The map of this area (Figure 10.1, page 186) also suggests building heights decreasing away from Broadway. Further, it clearly shows centres of mixed-use buildings in other areas of Mount Pleasant, not 16th Avenue.</p> <p>While not an applicable planning document, the recent city-initiated proposed zoning changes (“Referral Report” dated June 30, 2025) also envisions the subject property to remain within a low-rise residential district (Appendix M, page 3).</p> <p>In my opinion, accepting this rezoning application from RM-4 to CD-1 for this site should first be preceded by an updated urban plan shaped by community input.</p>	Elisabeth Kwan	Mount Pleasant	

2025-09-12	12:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Frontage & Height:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Broadway Plan requires 45.7 m (150 ft) frontage for towers; site only has 40.4 m.● Staff applied “flexibility” here but not next door at 35 E 16th — inconsistent application.● Rule was created to prevent oversized towers on narrow sites; stretching it undermines the Plan.● Approving a tower here would orphan 35 E 16th and remove any coherent east-west building height transition, leaving one tower beside a park-constrained corner site.● At the southern boundary of Broadway Plan; should be at lower end of 12–20 storey range.● Neighbourhood context: surrounding buildings are 3–4 storeys. <p>Public Services (Schools & Childcare):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Simon Fraser Elementary projected at 176% capacity by 2031 (before new developments).● This project + Yukon & 14th could add ~100 family-oriented units, potentially dozens more students.● Already reliant on portables, childcare waitlists 1–3 years.● Without infrastructure planning, new residents won’t have access to schools or childcare nearby.● Contradicts Plan’s vision for walkable, complete communities. <p>Environment & Neighbourhood Character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Removes 67% of mature trees (8 of 12), some over 4 storeys tall.● 12 additional cedar trees not accounted for in the referral report.● Contradicts Urban Forest Strategy to protect leafy, green streetscapes.	John Mathews	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-12	22:09	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.</p> <p>1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency</p> <p>The proposed development does not meet the Plan’s requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.</p> <p>Staff have argued that the site’s extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.</p> <p>The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself.</p> <p>Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan’s intent, provide significant new</p>	Annie Cassells	Mount Pleasant	

			<p>housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan’s stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community.</p> <p>Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan’s Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city’s tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan’s vision of preserving “green and leafy streetscapes.”</p> <p>The project’s solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city’s most heavily used bike routes. The City’s 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building’s lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan’s frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

2025-09-13	07:58	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan's community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.</p> <p>1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency</p> <p>The proposed development does not meet the Plan's requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.</p> <p>Staff have argued that the site's extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.</p> <p>The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, "flexibility" has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan's requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself.</p> <p>Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan's intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board's 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan's stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community.</p>	Ron Bar-Shlomo	Mount Pleasant
------------	-------	------------------------------------	--------	--	----------------	----------------

				<p>Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan's Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city's tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan's vision of preserving "green and leafy streetscapes."</p> <p>The project's solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city's most heavily used bike routes. The City's 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building's lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan's frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ron Bar-Shlomo <small>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p> <div></div>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

2025-09-13	09:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This development raises serious concerns for our community:</p> <p>Loss of Green Space: The proposed site is one of the few remaining green areas in our neighborhood, providing vital open space for residents and local wildlife. Once lost, this natural buffer cannot be replaced.</p> <p>Proximity to Bike Path: The location is directly adjacent to a well-used bike path that serves families, commuters, and recreational users. Increased traffic and construction near this corridor will pose serious safety risks and degrade its usability.</p> <p>Traffic and Safety Impact: The area is already experiencing significant traffic congestion during peak hours. Adding a high-rise will introduce hundreds of additional vehicles, creating unsafe conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, and children in the neighborhood.</p> <p>This proposal needs to be reconsidered with greater care for the long-term livability, safety, and environmental integrity of our community. We urge the planning department and city council to preserve the green space, protect the bike path, and prevent unsustainable traffic increases by rejecting this rezoning application.</p>	Fion Yung	Riley Park	
2025-09-14	00:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This building is way too big for the location. There's no mention of number of parking stalls in the flyer, which, if not sufficient for the building, will impact the surrounding neighborhood negatively because it's already chock a block full of cars. There would need to be at least 145 parking stalls because pretty much every family has at least one or maybe two cars. The cars have to live somewhere, and the streets can't hold them! They're full! Additionally, where will the children that live in the building go to school? Simon Fraser elementary is already full with the children in the neighbourhood. 16th Ave is also a tiny street, and totally unable to support a gigantic building like this without major infrastructure upgrades. Somebody needs to think about this thing with some foresight. Thx!</p>	Newell Cotton	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-14	11:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose a tower at 45 east 16th. s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential and have a huge list of reasons why a tower should not be built here. I have managed to shorten this list to 8 points:</p> <p>PARKING:</p> <p>-the building designs has no parking. this is ridiculous. This block already has a street parking (and traffic) problem. our building (23 suites) has 13 spots. they are all used. that's about 1/2 of the suites with cars. plus more park on the street. the plan for the new tower has no parking planned, and planning to add about 122 more units means a minimum of 60 more cars to the block. which there simply isn't room for. plus they plan to add commercial space</p> <p>-where will they park? or customers? when I do have a car, trying to find parking in the evening is already a chore. often, I will have to drive around 6+ blocks before I find a space. this is defeating the purpose of the heavily traffic-calmed neighbourhood. this tower would also bring 3-5 years of construction to a road that is a main artery in east-west commuting. my experience with all the big construction in town is that they randomly close streets and sidewalks without warning. this, plus the 50ish personal vehicles from construction workers, will make the neighbourhood even more impossible to access/drive through. I have attached 2 photos (looking east and west) from 16th and Ontario on a friday evening. it is a red light, 3 cars are stuck in the intersection and traffic is at a standstill. please don't add construction and 150 more residents to this block.</p> <p>PRIVACY:</p> <p>- by putting a tower in a non-tower neighbourhood, you are destroying the privacy of upwards of hundreds of people. this also reduces everyone's land value.</p> <p>THIS SYSTEM IS PUSHING TENANTS INTO COMPLIANCE</p> <p>- this entire "broadway plan" system that is in place to "help out tenants being evicted" is really just driving the idea into our heads that this is going to happen, so there's no point in fighting it. I am being asked to hand in forms that say where I want to live when evicted before city council has even looked at the permit application. I'm told that this is to streamline the process, but really it's just telling us that there's no point in arguing, your</p>	greg williams	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1 Attachment 2

			<p>home will be destroyed regardless.</p> <p>PROSPERO INTERNATIONAL REALTY INC IS A GREEDY COMPANY THAT DOESN'T CARE ABOUT TENANTS. GIVING THEM THIS PERMIT WILL JUST REINFORCE THIS TYPE OF GREED</p> <p>- the company who owns this property (Prospero International Realty Inc) has shown us tenants repeatedly that they just want to make money and do not care about tenants. they bought the building in 2020 and immediately told the tenants that they won't tear down the building. in fact, they told us we'd all be getting window and door upgrades and balcony repairs. (mine was very rotten with holes in the floor). the renovations took way longer than we were told. of the three things promised, I got new windows only. then tenants got a notice that, under RTB-151, Prospero was going to try and raise all our rents to pay for the upgrades. the arbitrator gave Prospero a second chance, when they were completely unprepared for a phone meeting that 10+ tenants were all prepared for. Prospero never took their second chance because: a) they didn't have documentation to prove their work, and b) they were trying to make some tenants pay for replaced doors they never got - but more importantly c) they gave up on this because they were applying to tear down our home and build a tower. there are still holes in the floor of my balcony 5 years later. Please don't reward this company for their greed.</p> <p>THE RUMOUR THAT EVERY BLOCK IN THE BROADWAY PLAN AREA GETS ONE TOWER PERMIT IS CAUSING A RACE FOR DEVELOPERS TO CLAIM PERMITS.</p> <p>- this is awful and should be stopped. enough permits have been given out already for the broadway plan. please stop. We need to see what it looks like when everyone starts building before giving more permits. I've noticed multiple properties owned by my landlords that have applications for towers. Can they even afford to build multiple towers? or are they just cash-grabbing and will sell the properties as soon as they get the permits?</p> <p>ADVERTISING 20% SUITES BELOW MARKET VALUE RENTALS BARELY COVERS THE PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVING IN THE BUILDING. SO IT SHOULD ALSO BE ADVERTISED THAT THEY ARE ALREADY SPOKEN FOR.</p> <p>- there are 23 suites at 45 e 16th. they want to build 145 units and they say 20% will be below-market rentals. that's about 30 suites - of which 23 of them should be considered already claimed by the existing tenants.</p> <p>IF YOU ASKED EVERY RESIDENT ON THIS BLOCK IF THEY WANT A TOWER, MORE THAN HALF WOULD SAY NO. PROBABLY MORE LIKE 95%.</p> <p>- why hasn't this been done? I haven't been asked if I want a tower where my house is. not a single person I've spoken to wants this tower here. and yet, COV drops a postcard in the mail and expects everyone to make the effort to go online, or write a letter or sign up to speak at council. just to say no. by doing this you are putting the onus on the residents to make it known that a tower is not wanted. I am telling you now: it is not wanted by the resident of this block or the neighbouring blocks. if you just asked directly, you'd get a very clear answer.</p> <p>WHY IS IT CALLED RIGHT-OF-FIRST-REFUSAL??</p> <p>- this name already suggests that the displaced tenants won't want to live in the new building. that they get a chance, but they will probably refuse it. this is negative manipulation by suggestion. why is it called that? why not called something positive like. "DISPLACED-HUMANS-RIGHT-TO-HOUSING" or "GUARANTEED-PLACE-TO-LIVE"? I feel already defeated by this name and by the fact that I will be giving up my top floor suite for what is surely going to be one of the crappiest suites in the new building.</p> <p>In conclusion, this building is old and should maybe be replaced soon, but it doesn't have to be immediately. new windows and doors have given 45 east 16th a little new life - and tearing it down now would really counter the "green" image Vancouver is going for. I firmly believe that A TOWER SHOULD NOT BE BUILT at 45 East 16th. It would ruin this</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				neighbourhood in the ways I outlined above, and in many other ways. if the building really needs replacing, in my opinion, 6 stories is more than enough for this neighbourhood.			
2025-09-14	12:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>As a direct neighbour to this project, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan’s community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.</p> <p>1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency</p> <p>The proposed development does not meet the Plan’s requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.</p> <p>Staff have argued that the site’s extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.</p> <p>The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself.</p> <p>Given that this site sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan’s intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.</p> <p>2. Public Services Already Over Capacity</p> <p>The Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.</p> <p>While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and</p>	Ryan Medd	Mount Pleasant	

			<p>single parents, undermining the Plan’s stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community.</p> <p>Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.</p> <p>3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.</p> <p>The Plan’s Urban Forest Strategy seeks to expand and protect the city’s tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan’s vision of preserving “green and leafy streetscapes.”</p> <p>The project’s solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.</p> <p>4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists</p> <p>The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city’s most heavily used bike routes. The City’s 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building’s lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.</p> <p>5. Commercial Space</p> <p>The development proposes ground level commercial space. I am at a loss to understand the need, whether now or into the future, given the proximity to Main Street, and the regularly available commercial space there. Not only would this commercial space strain already existing parking infrastructure, the alleyway would be overburdened with delivery transportation.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan’s frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<div>Sincerely, [REDACTED]</div>			
2025-09-14	16:48	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>THERE IS AN OLD ADAGE THAT ONE CANNOT FIGHT CITY HALL. PLEASE PROVE THAT WRONG MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS.</p> <p>I am opposed to the rezoning proposal at 45 E16th as currently structured, a resident of Mount Pleasant nearby the proposed tower (at 415 W 14th Ave).</p> <p>The proposed tower is 17 stories although at the south boundary of the Broadway Plan. With the Broadway plan principal of decreasing heights of residential buildings as one moves away from the denser centres, a 6 to 11 story building would be more in keeping and would transition to the non plan low rise area across 16th to the south.</p> <p>The frontage requirement for a tower of this height has been waived--an inconsistent application of the rules of the Broadway plan, particularly in view of the immediately adjacent property, 35 E16th, where the property was considered too small for a tower. Such a precedent will only increase pressure for towers on narrow properties.</p> <p>A tower of this height will affect the sunlight exposure of the nearby Mount Pleasant park and community garden. One only need to go to the park on a spring, summer or fall day to see the consistent use of the space and garden. Sunlight is at a premium in Vancouver.</p> <p>Council will have heard over and over again arguments around tower developments and the Broadway plan and amenities being inadequate for the population pressure with no plan for addressing. This is real folks. Take schools--the nearby Simon Fraser school is predicted to be 213% capacity by 2039 and is currently over 190%. This reality cannot be punted to the province or the VSB-- council must REQUIRE this overcapacity to be addressed NOW. It is projected that 100 family units will be added to the neighbourhood by this project when combined with the rezoning application for 14th and Yukon.</p> <p>67% of the mature trees on the property will be removed for this development. The Urban Forest Strategy of the city looks to increase the forest canopy, not decrease. Again, an issue that must be addressed NOW and not punted to Parks and Recreation.</p> <p>Ontario street at the adjacent intersection is one of the busiest bike lanes in the city and the intersection has been identified already for safety upgrades. Traffic from the tower parking, presumably exiting and entering from the lane which empties on to Ontario will only compound the problem.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT BE SUBJECT TO THE ADAGE YOU CAN'T FIGHT CITY HALL.</p>	Doug Webber	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-14	18:58	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This project is so out of step with the vibrant, live-able neighbourhood of Mount Pleasant. A new 17 story tower will become the tallest building by far. Much taller than anything on King Edward, which is much closer to the Canada Line station. This project is away from mass transit and not located on a major street. Build more townhomes, and low level buildings (5-8 stories). This is not downtown, nor is it a major thoroughfare. Please save our neighborhoods and communities.</p>	Chris Zatzick	Mount Pleasant	
2025-09-14	22:00	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing to express strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of 45 East 16th ave. This rezoning proposal will decimate the neighbourhood character and have numerous negative impacts on local infrastructure. This rezoning application is being considered under the Broadway Plan yet completely contradicts numerous principals of the plan. The purpose of the Broadway Plan was to create conscientious densification, transit oriented development</p>	Hannah Cherniawsky	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1

			<p>and improve access to affordable housing. Rezoning 45E 16 to accommodate a 17 storey tower does not accomplish these goals and should be opposed by the city.</p> <p>The development destroys neighbourhood character The proposed development of a 17 storey tower contradicts the character of the neighbourhood. Mount Pleasant is populated by converted, multifamily heritage homes and low rise apartment complexes. It is graced by a canopy of mature trees and arguably one of the most “character filled” neighbourhoods in Vancouver. The Broadway Plan has a directive to “maintain the green and leafy character” of areas and this cannot be accomplished through the removal of 8 mature trees and forcing a 17-storey glass and concrete monstrosity at the southern border of the Broadway plan. Redevelopment is already occurring in single family dwelling conversions to multifamily units and laneway homes. Though densification is inevitable the City explicitly stated in its report published July 8 2025 that “The [Broadway] Plan envisions buildings that complement the character and qualities of the surrounding neighbourhood”. If you were to walk down 16th from Cambie to Main you would encounter no building higher than 6 floors. It is impossible to see how at 17 storey tower is congruent with the neighbourhood feel. This was clearly voiced by the folks who actually live in the neighbourhood. In the city’s report from July 8 as well as the Q&A forum public commented that the proposed rezoning and development “takes away from the neighbourhood character”. As elected officials it is imperative you take into consideration the needs of your constituents. Specifically those who actually live in the area and not just developers looking to profit off turning a neighbourhood abound with character and history into a sea of concrete and glass.</p> <p>The lot does not have adequate frontage for a building of this size The proposed development does have adequate frontage to meet the Broadway Plan’s requirements. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). The building site on 45E 16th ave could measure 40.4 m (132 ft) which would be more appreciated for a mid-rise building. The July 8 2025 report uses a great deal of interpretive stretch to say the dept compensated for the lack of width. Reasoning which is not found in the Broadway Plan. The frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. The city is inconsistent in applying this rule. In the same report the city says 35E 16th cannot accommodate a tower of this size due to inadequate frontage. Yet both lots are of equal depth. The proposed solution was land assembly of 35E16th and 3150 Ontario but as 3150 Ontario directly borders the park further development of this site is less likely. As such 35E 16th is essentially left orphaned. These rules exist for a reason, to protect residents and the city from predatory development. An exception should not be made for 45E 16th to accommodate CD-1 rezoning.</p> <p>Focus: environmental impact (solar, trees, drainage) This rezoning dramatically impacts the surrounding environment with respect to the mature tree canopy, nearby park, specifically the community garden, and the drainage. The Plan specifies word for word that developments should maintain features “such as green and leafy streets” and “enhancing neighbourhood environmental systems”. The proposed development plan removed 67% of the trees on the property. The developer has also left out that there are another 12 cedar trees that will be removed as well as the entire lawn. This directly contradicts the Urban Forest Strategy set out in The Plan to preserve Vancouver’s tree canopy. Furthermore, this will also inevitably impact drainage and could impact geologic integrity of the surrounding building. Particularly as much of Mount Pleasant is built on a peat bog. The proposed development includes no survey about the impacts on surrounding buildings and drainage in the area. Additionally, the solar impact of this building will impact many people as the area of the park it is overshadowing park as well as the community garden which has been tender to by the community for over a decade. There has been no signage posted in Mount Pleasant park of garden about this leaving folks who use</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>these community areas blissfully unaware of their potential fate. Shadowing out the park and garden sends the message that the city seeks to shadow out its citizens in favour of developers seeking to earn a profit. Do not let this be your legacy as Vancouver City Council.</p> <p>Focus: Bike safety & existing infrastructure</p> <p>Infrastructure in Mount Pleasant is not poised to accommodate residents of a 17 storey tower. There are at least 2 other large scale redevelopments proposed in Mount Pleasant and it is ludicrous to think that a thinly stretched infrastructure can accommodate these redevelopments. The proposed development for 45E 16th ave includes 63 underground parking stalls. These would exit onto Ontario Street, one of the city's most heavily used bike routes. The City's 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Adding more cars to this street will only increase danger to cyclists and goes against Vision Zero and contradicts a transit focus development strategy. The local elementary school, Simon Fraser, I has no ability to accommodate any of these families as the Vancouver School Board's 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates numerous rezoning applications in the neighbourhood. While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. By approving this rezoning the city is haphazardly densifying a neighbourhood while completely overlooking any support for the infrastructure to support its residents. This shortage in childcare and school space means families will have to drive to schools or child care facilities with space completely undermining transit focused development. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan's stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Without a proactive expansion of existing infrastructure new residents will move into a neighbourhood without access to basic services creating both unsustainable and exclusionary environments.</p> <p>I implore you, Vancouver City Council, to deny the proposed rezoning of 45E 16th to CD-1. Densification and housing is needed in Vancouver. But it must be done in an intentional and intelligent manner. Selling out to developers trying to put massive towers on tiny lots just to line their pockets is not the legacy you want to leave. You are in a position of power to protect the people of Vancouver from predatory redevelopment. I humbly ask that you take the logical step of saying no to rezoning 45E 16th.</p> <p>Sincerely, Hannah Cherniawsky</p>			
2025-09-15	12:29	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>I oppose this project. I live in the area and understand the impacts the size and scope of this building will have on liveability in the area.</p> <p>it also is another example of a low rise, currently affordable rental building being targeted by developers. So many of my neighbours who rent in the area are being disproportionately affected. All under the guise of "helping" them. Once again, tenants are the collateral in this developer profit driven scheme. Tenant protections have yet to be tested and track records from previous mass evictions, like at Little Mountain do not elicit much confidence from most renters. The units they will be offered on return will be much smaller and may not accommodate the numbers of people who live in the home as most older units have larger layouts.</p> <p>As to the plan itself, what is the point of having a Broadway "plan" if developers can constantly apply to overbuild and then have council rubber stamp the design and scale that exceeds what is in the plan? Every time council approves this, they do so for the benefit of the developer and at the expense of the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>	Stephanie Von Dehn	Mount Pleasant	

			<p>This project fails to meet the plans frontage requirements which only serves to make the scale of this tower even more imposing (whatever happened to incorporating inviting outdoor patios and spaces in front of buildings, especially those with retail on the ground floor?). It also reduces walkability and affects neighbouring properties adversely.</p> <p>It also serves to make an orphan lot of 35 East 16th.</p> <p>Given that this site is on the most southern boundary of the plan, sensitive density should be considered instead of having the tallest possible building with low density across the street. There are also shading considerations for the well used park at 16th and Ontario and the community garden that will be in shade for part of the day from the sheer height and scale of this building.</p> <p>There are also serious infrastructure concerns with the local school being already well over capacity with and in catchment lottery. The plans to build a new school in Olympic village (if it ever happens as we have been waiting since 2007 when the plans for this began) will still not alleviate the capacity issues due to the huge influx in the area of proposed towers. I can't even keep up with the number of proposed developments just within a few blocks of my home. I am grateful my kids had an opportunity to go to a neighbourhood school, that is a luxury many in my neighbourhood will not have. We also have a shortage of day care, community centre spaces and parks. Good luck ever getting your kids in any programming in this city with this huge increase in population.</p> <p>The removal of trees and vegetation every time these towers are built will lead to an expansion of the concrete jungle in what has been a lovely greenway for so many residents.</p> <p>Safety for pedestrians and cyclist will also suffer with this scale of development. Ontario street is a well used commuting route and with the added car traffic from all these tower occupants, it will negatively impact safety.</p> <p>I have been involved in Shape your City for many years now and I am despondent regarding the direction our current council is going in regards to community engagement and planning in general. It seems planning is not being made for density, instead for congestion and endless frustration for your citizens.</p> <p>I urge you to follow the Broadway plan guidelines here otherwise the plan is meaningless. I urge council to require a more appropriate form at this site -one that repeats tenants, frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity and provides housing while also retaining the qualities of this neighbourhood that we know and love.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-09-16	11:06	CD-1 Rezoning: 45 East 16th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>Please consider advocating for the preservation of our park spaces by voting against the rezoning application going to Council on the evening of September 18th.</p> <p>This rezoning application for a tower at 45 E 16th Avenue is non compliant as it would permit the new building to cast shade on Mount Pleasant Park, which is in a Solar Protected area of the Broadway Plan, with no exceptions permitted.</p> <p>Much needed housing in Vancouver should not negatively impact our treasured park spaces, and the policies of the Broadway Plan should be adhered to in these designs.</p> <p>Although the shaded area appears to be fairly minimal on the shade impact study, the shade encroaches near the community garden in the north east corner of the park.</p> <p>If this application is approved, it will open the door for the two buildings west of 45 E 16th Avenue to also seek non compliant rezoning applications that similarly and more severely disregard the Solar Protection Policy, further encroaching on the solar protected zone of Mount Pleasant Community Park.</p> <p>This could have a significant impact on Mount Pleasant Park, the community garden, the potential for solar energy to heat the future outdoor swimming pool, as well as impacting the trees in the park.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Margery Duda Mount Pleasant Community Centre Association Parks Committee, Pool Committee</p>	Margery Duda	Mount Pleasant	

APPENDIX A

Dear Vancouver City Council,

I am writing to express my **strong opposition** to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. While I support thoughtful densification in line with the Broadway Plan (here within referred to as the Plan), the current proposal is incompatible with the Plan's community-driven goals. In its present form, the project introduces preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, neighbourhood character, and community safety.

1. Frontage and Height Inconsistency

The proposed development does not meet the Plan's requirements for tower frontage. According to the Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a minimum frontage of 45.7 m (150 ft). This site, however, measures only 40.4 m (132 ft). Sites of this size are intended for mid-rise buildings in the range of 6–11 storeys.

Staff have argued that the site's extra depth compensates for its lack of width, but this reasoning is not found in the Plan and represents an interpretive stretch. The 150 ft frontage requirement exists specifically to prevent oversized towers on undersized sites, ensuring appropriate tower separation and avoiding negative impacts on neighbouring properties. Allowing this exception weakens the Plan and sets a precedent for other narrow sites to demand towers as well.

The inconsistency in applying this rule is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, "flexibility" has been invoked to approve a tower on a substandard frontage, while the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th has been held to the rule and deemed too narrow to proceed on its own. Staff suggest assembly with 3150 Ontario as a solution, but because that corner site directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Plan's requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower form there highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this manner would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it trapped between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic redevelopment pathway consistent with Plan principles and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. This outcome directly undermines the stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, and it calls into question both the fairness of the process and the credibility of the Plan itself.

Given that this site sits at the **southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area**, it would be reasonable to expect development at the lower end of the permitted height range to provide a sensitive transition to the surrounding 3–4 storey neighbourhood. Instead, the proposal seeks one of the tallest possible forms, creating an abrupt and inappropriate scale contrast. A 6 to 11-storey building would be consistent with the Plan's intent, provide significant new housing, and respect both frontage limits and neighbourhood context.

2. Public Services Already Over Capacity

The Vancouver School Board's 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan projects Simon Fraser Elementary School at 176% capacity by 2031. This figure predates the current wave of rezoning applications. The proposed tower would add 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented

units, while the Yukon and 14th Avenue proposal would add another 134 units in the same catchment. Together, these two projects alone could introduce around 100 family-oriented units, potentially bringing dozens of new children into a system that is already overcrowded and reliant on portables.

While the referral report notes nearby childcare centres, waitlists at these facilities already range from one to three years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, undermining the Plan's stated goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods. Suggesting that neighbouring schools can absorb this growth is misleading, as it would require children to travel significant distances outside their community.

Without a proactive plan to expand schools and childcare, new residents will move into a neighbourhood where the basic services they rely on are not available. Growth must be inclusive and sustainable, not reactive and short-sighted.

3. Environmental Impacts and Neighbourhood Character

Mount Pleasant is defined by its tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments, heritage conversions, and community gardens. This project would fundamentally erode those qualities.

The Plan's **Urban Forest Strategy** seeks to expand and protect the city's tree canopy, yet this proposal removes 67% of the mature trees on site — many taller than four storeys — that currently provide shade, privacy, wildlife, and environmental benefits. In addition, there are 12 cedar trees that are 5 meters tall on the southwest corner of the lot that were not accounted for in the referral report. Replacing this natural green buffer with concrete contradicts the Plan's vision of preserving "green and leafy streetscapes."

The project's solar studies also show significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, reducing access to natural light for residents who have cared for these plots for decades. Although the shaded area may seem small on paper, the impact on this valued community asset is large.

4. Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists

The development abuts Ontario Street, one of the city's most heavily used bike routes. The City's 2040 Transportation Plan already identified the Ontario and 16th intersection for safety upgrades. Additional vehicle traffic from the building's lane exiting onto Ontario will worsen conflicts between cars and cyclists. Unless safety improvements are made — and funded by the developer — this rezoning risks compromising the safety of current residents and new ones alike.

Conclusion

The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on selective flexibility that benefits developers at the expense of neighbourhood standards. This project fails to meet the Plan's frontage requirement, overburdens already stretched schools and childcare, eliminates mature trees and greenspace, and creates safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.

Approving the rezoning as proposed would set a precedent that undermines both the credibility of the Broadway Plan and the extensive community engagement that shaped it. I urge Council to require a more appropriate form development at this site — one that respects frontage limits, supports infrastructure capacity, and provides housing while maintaining the character and resilience of the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood.

Sincerely,
Catherine Kalke

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

APPENDIX B

Dear Vancouver City Council

This letter outlines my strong opposition to the proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue. We believe the current design is incompatible with the community-driven goals of the Broadway Plan which introduces unacceptable and preventable erosion of public services, environmental health, and the safety of our neighborhood. Our concerns focus on the project's failure to align with key principles of appropriate building scale and contextual design.

Frontage and Height With Broadway Plan:

The proposed development does not have adequate frontage to accommodate a tower of this size, it implements the frontage requirements inconsistently and contradicts the Broadway Plans emphasis on smooth design between building heights.

According to the Broadway Plan, towers of 12–20 storeys require a site frontage of at least 45.7 m (150 ft). The subject site, however, has only 40.4 m (132 ft) of frontage, making it too narrow to support a tower of this scale. Sites of this size are more appropriately suited to mid-rise forms in the range of 6–11 storeys. Staff have argued that the narrower frontage can be “compensated” by the site’s greater depth and by careful placement of the tower to preserve future tower separation. However, this reasoning is not found in the Broadway Plan itself and represents an interpretive stretch. The 45.7 m frontage rule was established precisely to avoid narrow sites forcing oversized towers into established neighbourhoods. Allowing this exception weakens the policy framework and invites further erosion of the minimum standards through similar discretionary interpretations.

The inconsistency is particularly concerning. At 45 E 16th, “flexibility” is invoked to permit a tower on an undersized lot, while for the neighbouring property at 35 E 16th, staff have applied the frontage rule strictly, concluding that it cannot redevelop without assembling with the corner lot at 3150 Ontario. Yet because that corner directly abuts Mount Pleasant Park, the Broadway Plan’s requirements for sensitive transitions and sunlight protection make a tower on that site highly implausible. In effect, approving 45 E 16th in this way would orphan 35 E 16th—leaving it stranded between a tower and a park-constrained corner, without a realistic pathway for redevelopment consistent with Plan principles. This undermines the Plan’s stated goal of equitable and orderly growth across blocks, while raising serious concerns about fairness and credibility in its implementation.

This double standard highlights the weakness of relying on discretionary interpretations rather than adhering to the Broadway Plan’s clear 45.7 m frontage requirement. According to the intent of the Plan, the appropriate scale for a tower on this lot should therefore be limited to a maximum of 11 storeys.

The Mount Pleasant South Apartment Area is intended for mid- to high-rise development, generally ranging from 12 to 20 storeys, which depends on lot size as stated above. Given that 45 East 16th Avenue sits at the southern boundary of the Broadway Plan area, it would be reasonable to expect a development at the lower end of this range, not the maximum.

Furthermore, the surrounding area has buildings that are predominantly 3 to 4 stories tall. Permitting a 17-storey tower would create a dramatic and inappropriate scale contrast in a neighbourhood of predominantly low-rise homes. Restricting the building height allows for an emphasis on contextual design, smooth transitions between taller and lower buildings and frontage requirements as is laid out in the Broadway Plan.

While the Broadway Plan acknowledges “flexibility in interpretation,” using this flexibility to override clear requirements such as frontage and height ranges erodes the credibility of the Plan and the community engagement that shaped it. It sets a precedent for other undersized sites to demand towers, undermining both the intent of the Plan and the purpose of having minimum standards in the first place. Moreover, approving a tower at 45 E 16th would effectively orphan the neighbouring lot at 35 E 16th, leaving it without a realistic redevelopment pathway and disrupting any coherent east-west transition in building height. Therefore, an 11-storey building would respect the location at the southern border of the Broadway Plan, adhere to frontage limits, avoid stranding neighbouring parcels, and still provide the necessary housing and increased densification while upholding the intent of the Plan.

Overcapacity of Public Services:

According to the Vancouver School Board’s 2020 Long Range Facilities Plan, Simon Fraser Elementary School is projected to operate at 176% capacity by 2031. The school already has to rely on portables to support its superfluous student body. This alarming figure does not account for the cumulative impact of multiple tower developments in the area. The proposed tower alone adds 145 rental units, including 35% family-oriented units, which will significantly increase demand for elementary school spaces. Furthermore, the Yukon and 14th Ave proposal will add another 134 units, with a similar family-oriented mix. Both sites have Simon Fraser as their catchment school. These two developments alone could introduce approximately 100 new family-oriented units, potentially adding dozens of additional children to the local school system—pushing enrolment far beyond projected capacity and further straining an already underfunded and overcrowded network of schools and childcare services. Suggesting that local demand can be absorbed by “neighbouring” schools is misleading, as it would require children to travel well outside their community. Such a reactive approach to growth undermines the Broadway Plan’s goal of creating walkable, complete neighbourhoods, where families can access schools and childcare close to home.

The referral report notes nearby childcare centres, but according to the Vancouver Society for Children’s Centres current waitlists range from 1 to 3 years. This shortage disproportionately affects working families and single parents, and risks pushing residents to commute to care in other parts of the city, completely contradictory to the Broadway Plan’s vision for vibrant, transit-oriented communities.

Without proactive infrastructure planning, we risk creating vertical neighbourhoods with horizontal gaps in services. City Council needs to consider the size and scope of these developments and provide a clear, funded plan for school and childcare expansion. Developers need to be held accountable by Vancouver City Council to evaluate the cumulative community

impact to proactively and objectively evaluate if massive increases in density can be accommodated. Agreeing to large-scale densification without a clear plan for supporting infrastructure is short-sighted and undermines community trust. The Vancouver City council is elected by the people for the people. Allowing this proposed rezoning will bring in new residents without ensuring the services and infrastructure that they rely on are in place. The lack of planning is an issue and a proactive and responsible approach to densification must take place to ensure growth is inclusive and sustainable, and community-driven so that new residents benefit from the Broadway Plan.

Environmental Issues Within the Neighbourhood Context:

The proposed development at 45 East 16th Avenue contradicts core principles of the Broadway Plan including environmental sustainability, neighbourhood character, and contextual design. Mount Pleasant is known for its mature tree-lined streets, low-rise apartments and community gardens. Buildings within the boundaries of Cambie, Main, 12th and 16th are predominantly 3-4 stories. The neighbourhood is composed of low-scale forms of densification such as heritage homes converted into multiplexes and townhome complexes, which maintain the character and integrity of the area, while allowing for thoughtful growth. The proposed tower's footprint and height directly contradict this established neighbourhood character and are inconsistent with the intent of the Broadway Plan.

The Urban Forest Strategy outlined in the Broadway Plan seeks to protect and expand the city's tree canopy. The proposed building footprint eliminates 67% (8/12) mature trees on the lot. These trees proposed for removal have heights over 4 stories and provide significant shade and protection to the neighbouring building. Furthermore, the referral report has not included the 12, 2-storey cedar trees on the south west section of the lot. It is impossible to view this as congruent to the City's commitment to "recognize and enhance the area's distinctive neighbourhoods and places," which includes preserving "green and leafy streetscapes" as it set out in the Broadway Plan. Replacement of the lot's green yard and garden with concrete eliminates important drainage and greenspace while narrowing the street feel. In constructing this massive tower at the expense of the mature tree canopy the city is building an "Urban Forest," but one made of concrete and glass.

The solar studies included in the referral report reveal significant shadowing impacts on neighbouring buildings, rooftop patios, and the Mount Pleasant Community Garden, limiting access to natural light and undermining the Plan's goals for contextual design and environmental resilience. Although the relative area of the park impacted is small in area, it will have a large impact by shadowing the Community Garden. There has been no signage or information distributed to the gardeners who have tended to that plot for decades.

If the City is to "demonstrate leadership in sustainability and resilience," as the Plan mandates, then developments must enhance—not erode—neighbourhood environmental systems and climate resilience. The omission in the referral report and failure to fully account for all existing

trees on side (including the 12 cedar trees not listed) shows a complete lack of commitment to the Broadway Plan should this rezoning go ahead as proposed.

Community Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists:

While the recent speed limit reduction on 16th Avenue is a welcome change, the proposed tower will introduce new and specific hazards for pedestrians and cyclists on the Ontario Street bike street. The city's **2040 Transportation Plan** already identified this intersection for its **Cycling Spot Improvement Program** due to existing safety concerns. Although the intersection was reconstructed recently, the project did not account for the new vehicle traffic that will be exiting the development's lane directly onto Ontario Street. This new traffic flow will create unsafe conditions for cyclists. Therefore, the separated bike street must be extended and redesigned to protect cyclists from cars exiting the lane. The costs for this necessary redevelopment should be the responsibility of the developer, ensuring the community's safety is not compromised by new growth.

Conclusion:

The integrity of the Broadway Plan depends on its consistent application, not on flexible interpretations that benefit developers at the expense of community standards. Approving this project in its current form would set a precedent that undermines the consistency of the Broadway Plan and diminishes the value of the extensive community engagement that shaped it. We urge you to reconsider the zoning application as written and to limit the height to a building 11 storeys or less.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Scott Mullen
Mount Pleasant Resident