

CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-07-17	16:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION OF 2110 W. 5th Ave.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 2110 W. 5th 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> <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 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>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.</p> <p>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>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

			<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.</p> <p>This is inhumane.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>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</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and they will be SIGNIFICANTLY smaller as well.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And why can’t the city give essential information clearly? Why hide the actual living space measurements in this floor space ratio 6.8 gobbledygook? Why can’t you just simply say how many square feet an apartment and a room is? Why so deceptive?

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

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

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

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

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

THIS IS NOT LIKE-FOR-LIKE.

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

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

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

And this tower is UTTERLY 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.

			<p>The City claims there are excellent Tenant Relocation and Protection Policies.</p> <p>This is pure fantasy, and an insult.</p> <p>Where will The City put all these Vancouver residents who are made homeless when their affordable homes are destroyed for these luxury towers to be built go? – it most certainly will not be in the same neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It does not say where these displaced tenants will go for the years that it takes to tear down their homes and build these towers.</p> <p>And that the tenants who are forced out of their beautiful, affordable homes for these towers will be able to move back in to them at below-market value.</p> <p>As I have already said, this will STILL BE HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS MORE than the rent they are paying in their already affordable homes, and the space will be much, much smaller too.</p> <p>People live here because they love it and because it is ALREADY AFFORDABLE. People with low to middle income, healthcare workers, seniors, people with disabilities and essential healthcare needs.</p> <p>Do we all need to apply under with The Registry for Social Housing? So that we are not forced out of our neighbourhoods by these unaffordable towers? So, is it a case of, Register for Social Housing or be homeless?</p> <p>Also, many people live here because THEY HAVE TO - I am just one of those people. And there are thousands more here like me. And if I cannot afford to live here, because of losing my affordable housing to these luxury unaffordable towers, I’m completely SCREWED.</p> <p>Rezoning projects like this force residents out of their homes and communities; taking them away from the essential, life-sustaining, healthcare that they need to have access to.</p> <p>And forcing people who live here because they also work here is going to result in them all having to driving in to the area (as they will be forced to live in the Suburbs and there is no transit infrastructure to here from most suburban areas – another reason why I am such a proponent of building OUT – NOT UP - and creating proper infrastructure there and between there and the city); so more cars, more traffic, and more pollution.</p> <p>Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.</p> <p>I refer you to the GRENFELL TOWER FIRE IN LONDON IN 2017.</p> <p>This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.</p> <p>But the fact remains that BECAUSE IT WAS A TOWER IT WAS A SIGNIFICANT RISK FACTOR; as people were not able to get out in time due to limited stairwell space and access, and seniors and people with disabilities being unable to use or get down the stairs in time.</p> <p>TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.</p> <p>This was a 24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured. There have been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.</p> <p>THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.

Hundreds of people died both in those towers and died by being trapped in the debris of those towers - even more reason to stop and proper think about the (non)safety of towers. We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOUHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.

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

Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.

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

Yours sincerely,

Very concerned and very proud Fairview, Vancouver resident,

				<div>Fiona O’Connell</div> <div><div>§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential</div><div></div></div>			
2025-07-17	21:56	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	This is wildly out of scale with the existing local residential buildings. Since this is NOT a social housing project, it should follow the Broadway Plan’s guidelines and clear intention to ensure new developments match existing buildings unless it provides social housing with deep affordability.	Kate Wilson	Kitsilano	
2025-07-20	20:18	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	My primary concerns, are what is going to happen to our neighborhood in Kits... Please consider not approving the referral report. Have it brought back in September for a full presentation to Council and more, to the public please!	Eileen Hoeter	Kitsilano	
2025-07-21	17:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I understand a report is going to council on July 22. The name of the report is “Standardized Apartment Districts and City-initiated Zoning Changes to implement the Broadway Plan and Cambie Corridor Plan.”</p> <p>This report came out June 30th and the public has not had sufficient time to review this. Please do not approve amendments immediately, rather, refer the report to a public hearing in the fall to ensure an open and transparent process.</p>	Laurie Moffitt	Kitsilano	
2025-08-28	13:42	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Ugly building with clearly very little thought gone into the design and ensuring it fits in with the neighbourhood aesthetic.</p> <p>The roads in the area are busy enough without yet another high rise building planned and parking is already a struggle. Getting a family doctor is impossible and this will add further strain on the already over stretched local amenities</p>	Ellen Codling	Kitsilano	
2025-09-03	13:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	I oppose this development not because it's not needed, but because no provision has been made for the people who live on that property now. And until steps can be taken to ensure that they will have another suitable place to live, I will continue to oppose it.	Nicholas Read	Kitsilano	
2025-09-03	15:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	Where will the occupants park? Very busy intersection and close to 4th. Public parking will be negatively impacted.	Deborah Davidson	Kitsilano	
2025-09-04	19:46	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>-Building Height and Density: A 20-storey, 65.2m (214 ft.) building is out of scale with the surrounding neighbourhood. West 5th Avenue and the adjacent areas are characterized by low- to mid-rise buildings, and this proposed tower would drastically alter the character and livability of the community.</p> <p>-Strain on Infrastructure and Services: The proposed 160 rental units, along with commercial space, will add significant pressure to already limited parking, traffic capacity, green space, and local services. The area is not equipped to handle this scale of densification without further infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>-Below-Market Units Are Insufficient: While the inclusion of below-market rental units is positive, the proposed 20% is inadequate given the scale of this project and the affordability crisis in the city. This rezoning would primarily benefit developers, not the existing or future residents who need genuinely affordable housing.</p> <p>Incompatibility with Neighbourhood -Character: This development would overshadow nearby homes, reduce sunlight, and diminish the overall livability of the neighbourhood. The proposal does not respect the established character and scale of Kitsilano.</p> <p>For these reasons, I urge Council to reject this rezoning application. Development must balance growth with livability, affordability, and respect for the existing community — this proposal fails on all counts.</p>	Paige gueldner	Kitsilano	

2025-09-05	09:46	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	There are WAY too many of these massive building proposals suddenly popping up all over this neighbourhood, and it needs to slow down or be stopped completely. It will ruin this relatively quiet area and create infrastructure issues and displace a lot of people already living in the existing buildings that are still in decent shape. I strongly oppose!	Tessa Carry	Kitsilano	
2025-09-05	10:23	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	Its far too large for the neighborhood, the height and architecture are disruptive and do not fit into the community. Also there are no units for sale, only rentals, which contributes to an unstable transient population that does not foster community in this neighborhood	Andrew Paul	Kitsilano	
2025-09-05	13:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION OF 2110 W. 5th Ave.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 2110 W. 5th 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> <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 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>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.</p> <p>Now the City wants to build all these super tall towers and bring in 64,000+++ (one of the</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

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 put up fancy, ugly, high rise, show-box sized apartments, fire hazard, earthquake hazard, monstrous luxury towers.

If you want to bring in more people – you need way more infrastructure and community buildings and needs!!!

			<p>We need:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Which is to “scorch earth” it all, for wealth and the wealthy.</p> <p>The city and developers happily demolishing historical, aesthetically pleasing, fire and earthquake safe, low-rise buildings and homes,</p> <p>The city and developers happily displacing thousands of people and</p> <p>The city and developers happily destroying thousands of lives,</p> <p>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????</p> <p>Not Vancouver and it’s people</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This neighbourhood is NOT a Downtown. It is NOT a City Centre.</p> <p>It is part of Vancouver’s rich history, being one of its oldest; with beautiful, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, low-rise buildings that compliment the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>There is no place for luxury towers. These towers will not enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and community. They will destroy it.</p> <p>It makes ZERO sense to destroy already affordable housing for these monster towers, which will, no matter how much The City continues to claim, NOT be affordable.</p> <p>If these proposals were actually building the much needed, and more, affordable housing, then people would be absolutely on board – but not in the form of towers.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>And these towers are not going to be affordable housing any way.</p> <p>Even having apartments in these towers at 20% bellow market rate, they are still going be at least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and 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 having to driving in to the area (as they will be forced to live in the Suburbs and there is no transit infrastructure to here from most suburban areas – another reason why I am such a proponent of building OUT – NOT UP - and creating proper infrastructure there and between there and the city); so more cars, more traffic, and more pollution.</p> <p>Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.</p> <p>I refer you to the GRENFELL TOWER FIRE IN LONDON IN 2017.</p> <p>This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.</p> <p>But the fact remains that BECAUSE IT WAS A TOWER IT WAS A SIGNIFICANT RISK FACTOR; as people were not able to get out in time due to limited stairwell space and access, and seniors and people with disabilities being unable to use or get down the stairs in time.</p> <p>TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.</p> <p>This was a 24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured. There have been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.

Hundreds of people died both in those towers and died by being trapped in the debris of those towers - even more reason to stop and proper think about the (non)safety of towers. We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOUHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.

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

Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.

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

				<p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Very concerned and very proud Fairview, Vancouver resident,</p> <p>Fiona O’Connell</p> <p><small>§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p> 			
2025-09-06	13:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This rezoning/redevelopment will result in the eviction (demoviction) of many tenants. The new building will be far less affordable. Where are the existing tenants supposed to go? Contrary to the Broadway Plan's stated aims, this and other similar rezonings remove affordable housing. They do not create it.</p>	Dave Webb		
2025-09-08	22:46	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>--There is a rezoning application for towers on every corner in Kits, and it is already a high density area</p> <p>-not even close to any Broadway new stations!</p> <p>-There is already a perfectly good apartment building in this location, with current residents</p> <p>-Proposed 21-storey tower is too much for the area, what a waste of resources!</p> <p>-Can this City preserve anything??</p> <p>-How is this good for the environment??</p>	Iwona Erskine-Kellie	Kitsilano	
2025-09-09	11:21	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I don't know why you ask for public opinion because it doesn't make a difference. Having developers build rental high rises will not improve affordability in Vancouver. Even below market rentals will be too expensive for most renters and they will get very little space for what they pay. Already the price of land where most of these proposals are has gone way up and developers will want to recoup the cost on the backs of renters!</p>	Janine Bond	Kitsilano	
2025-09-13	08:57	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>he citywide rezoning strategy facing council’s vote is fatally flawed. Here’s what to do instead.</p> <p>Patrick Condon, September 12, 2025, The Tyee</p> <p>University of British Columbia professor emeritus Patrick M. Condon is the author of Broken City and other books.</p> <p>The Vancouver City Hall building, lit up at dusk.</p> <p>The transit-oriented area rezoning report would strip citizens of input while ignoring that boosting development hasn’t worked.</p> <p>Vancouver’s council faces a momentous decision on Tuesday when it weighs in on scores of planning changes embedded in the citywide transit-oriented area rezoning report. If passed, the plan pre-zones vast tracts of the city for market-favoured building types.</p> <p>Gone will be neighbourhood input.</p> <p>Repealed will be design and planning guidelines embedded in scores of neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Now speculators will be further incentivized to replace affordable walk-up housing with necessarily more expensive housing stock.</p> <p>The report stakes its claim on a seductive but flawed premise: that streamlining zoning through city-initiated rezoning and standardized district schedules will unleash a torrent of housing supply sufficient to tame the city’s runaway affordability crisis. By shaving 12 to 15</p>	Laurie Moffitt	Kitsilano	

			<p>months off rezoning timelines, the city seems to assume, developers will reap cost savings that — through some alchemy of market logic — will translate into homes ordinary Vancouverites can afford.</p> <p>This is a familiar refrain, one we’ve heard for decades, and it remains unconvincing. The report’s central (yet muted) assumption — that more supply equals more affordability — lacks empirical grounding, ignores Vancouver’s unique market distortions, and risks doubling down on a developer-centric approach that has yet to deliver for the service worker households who make this city run.</p> <p>Supply alone won’t deliver affordability</p> <p>The report’s fatal flaw lies in its blind faith that increasing housing supply through streamlined rezoning will magically lower costs. This is a tired orthodoxy, unsupported by evidence in high-demand cities like Vancouver.</p> <p>Vancouver’s own history bears this out. Decades of condo tower approvals and a tripling of housing units added within city limits (a feat no other North American centre city has matched) have done little to ease the burden on low-, middle- and even upper-middle-income households, with median home prices still hovering at 12 times median household income, higher than any other centre city in North America.</p> <p>The report offers no data to counter this trend, no analysis of Vancouver’s land price inflation, no reckoning with the global capital flows that treat our city as a safe deposit box for wealth. Instead, it leans on the shaky crutch of trickle-down housing economics, assuming developer savings will somehow, someday, translate into lower rents or purchase prices.</p> <p>We’ve seen this movie before, and it doesn’t end well.</p> <p>Worse, the report is nearly mute on the price of housing this strategy will produce.</p> <p>Will streamlined rezoning unleash a tidal wave of unaffordable market-rate condos and high rent streams for the investor class, or will it deliver homes that teachers, nurses and baristas might afford? The plan calls for 20 per cent of new units to be “below market rate.” Good. But at that price they will still be too expensive for median-income households. The other 80 per cent will be unaffordable by definition, guaranteeing that four out of five units will be unaffordable to many upper-middle-income households.</p> <p>The strategy would need to set much higher mandates for affordable units — say, 50 per cent of new developments reserved for permanently affordable rentals or shared equity ownership — in order to avoid exacerbating the very crisis we all want to address. The absence of such requirements betrays a deeper flaw: a failure to grapple with the structural forces driving Vancouver’s housing market into the stratosphere.</p> <p>The report’s myopic focus on rezoning and approvals sidesteps the broader policy tool kit needed to tackle affordability.</p> <p>It’s silent on curbing speculative demand — no mention of escalating vacancy taxes, cracking down on short-term rentals or restricting foreign ownership.</p> <p>It is too timid to mention the transformative potential of “land lift” taxes, which could capture the unearned value spikes from rezoning to fund non-market housing.</p> <p>And it sidesteps the urgent need for direct investment in non-market housing models that have proven effective in cities like Vienna but remain underutilized here.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>It could be argued that a rezoning document is no place to impose social policy. That might be fair if the document did not instead read like a love letter to developers, promising them speed and savings while offering no guarantees for the public good.</p> <p>A better path: Affordability by policy design</p> <p>To salvage this strategy, the city planning department must pivot from wishful thinking to bold, evidence-based civic action. Here’s how:</p> <p>Ground it in data. Commission rigorous studies to test whether supply increases have ever lowered costs in Vancouver’s speculative market. Stop assuming; start proving.</p> <p>Mandate affordability. Require at least 50 per cent of new units to be permanently affordable, secured through inclusionary zoning or density bonusing tied to permanently affordable rents (to stabilize land price residuals).</p> <p>Tame speculation. Implement aggressive “land lift” taxes to capture rezoning windfalls, redirecting funds to non-market housing.</p> <p>Rethink typologies. Prioritize gentle density — think traditional urban “party wall” buildings on 33- or 66-foot lots — that do not require costly parcel assembly or displace existing communities.</p> <p>Invest in non-market housing. Commit to stronger incentive policies to stimulate co-operative and social housing, ensuring a stock of homes immune to market pressures in perpetuity.</p> <p>Vancouver’s citywide transit-oriented area rezoning strategy, as it stands, is a well-meaning but flawed exercise in supply-side optimism. By pinning its hopes on developer efficiencies without addressing speculation, land costs or the real need for non-market housing, it risks delivering more of the same: gleaming towers for the few, crumbs for the many.</p> <p>The city has a chance to redefine affordability — not as a market byproduct but as a civic priority, built through deliberate policy and grounded in evidence. Until it does, this plan will remain a mirage, promising relief while leaving Vancouver’s dumpster-fire housing crisis to perpetually burn.</p>			
2025-09-13	15:57	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Affordable rentals in 3 storey walkups are Gold for providing human scale liveable housing. To bulldoze them into the landfill so developers can build towers is crazy. Where will all the displaced tenants go? Densify the huge single family lots in Shaughnessy.</p> <p>Kitsilano is famous for its many years of organic densification.</p> <p>In my block not far from there, are many old houses with 3 to 4 suites and the owner living in one.</p> <p>Some of the tenants have been here 15 to 20 years. Lots of trees, bike paths, grocery stores and great walkability.</p> <p>Don't ruin Kitsilano!!!</p>	Valerie Clark	Kitsilano	
2025-09-14	19:40	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	<p>This is a ridiculous height for a building in this area. Highrises don't fit in the neighborhood. The beauty of Kitsilano be gone.</p> <p>With all the high rises going into the area it will be very congested. There already not enough parking in the area.</p> <p>The city will be taking away affordable housing we don't need or want highrises in Kitsilano.</p> <p>#savekits</p>	Sarah Rogers	Kitsilano	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-09-16	08:54	CD-1 Rezoning: 2110 West 5th Avenue	Oppose	We need affordable housing, and building a 21-story apartment in kitsilano with only 20% floor units below market value is not the answer. Either make it 50-60% below market value so that the monstrosity of the building can be justified with affordable living, or do not develop. We need affordable homes, not luxury high rises that destroy the neighbourhood and put more money in the pockets of developers.	Roxanna Koohgoli	Kitsilano	