

**CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-01-20	11:47	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>The Housing Reset Group supports the staff recommendation to refer this application back to staff.</p> <p>We oppose the rezoning at 320-360 West Second Avenue.</p> <p>Please see attached letter.</p>	Christina DeMarco	West Point Grey	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-01-20	12:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I have no problem with residential/industrial mixed use and market rentals. I have a problem with a 25-storey building with all the traffic it will attract for residents, employees, residential visitors, customers, deliveries, trades and services, etc. That particular block of West 2nd Ave is already overloaded, with turning to/from side streets only making it worse. My family lives in the 300 block of West 1st Ave and it is a nightmare to get in and out of our neighbourhood every morning and afternoon. We like the use but we do not like the scale. The neighbourhood is overloaded and cannot support this level of daily traffic. Please deny the application.</p>	Darren Stone	Mount Pleasant	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-01-20	15:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>Letter to Mayor and Council attached.</p>	Sean McEwen	Kitsilano	APPENDIX A
2026-01-20	19:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>Vancouver City Council has long defended retention of our small industrial land base for employment and service uses. This application should be rejected to ensure this site, already excavated for an appropriate multi-storey light industrial project, is used for its intended purposes. There is no need for another residential rental tower here when so many residential rental projects have been approved and proposed throughout the city, so many that most developers are not even proceeding to actually build them. There are many more sites for residential towers available in the city than demand to develop them.</p>	Peter Reese	Mount Pleasant	
2026-01-20	20:45	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>this spot rezoning flies in the face of decades of industrial land protection and stewardship of the precious jobs and services provided by the City's industrial lands. I advocate for the right kind of housing in the right place and this is simply a speculative land grab taking advantage of lower priced industrial land.</p> <p>Approval of this development could drive up land and rent prices and force businesses out of a location because of affordability and to be close to customers and employees. While modern industry is much cleaner and less dangerous than traditional industrial processes, operational difficulties could occur for existing and future businesses, due to incompatibility of residential and industrial uses.</p>	Barbara May	Mount Pleasant	

2026-01-20	23:31	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>Over the past five decades I have proudly developed new residential communities on former industrial lands. They include South Shore False Creek, Coal Harbour, and the Steveston Waterfront.</p> <p>At the time, I was not at all concerned about the loss of industrial lands. However, times have changed. While we now have plenty of land zoned for higher density residential uses, I agree with those who argue we are running out of industrial zoned lands.</p> <p>I am therefore writing in support of the staff recommendation that this proposal not be approved.</p> <p>I am taking this position despite the fact I have a great deal of respect for this developer. Moreover, under certain circumstances I believe residential uses should be permitted in industrial zones.</p> <p>However, when residential use is combined with industrial use on industrial zoned lands, it should not be the primary use; it should be a secondary use. That is not the case with this proposal.</p> <p>For all the reasons set out in the staff report and the letter that I co-signed with 23 other urban planners, I hope you will support the staff recommendation and reject this development after the public hearing.</p> <p>While I have often disagreed with staff recommendations relating to new development proposals, in this case they are right. I hope you will take their advice.</p>	Michael Geller	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-01-21	11:01	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am writing in support of staff's recommendations. I believe Recommendation A is the best path for looking after the City's multiple civic interests both in the short run and the long run.</p> <p>Here is my rationale:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Council asked staff to carry out investigations of the industrial areas so that they would be able to make evidence-based decisions on the future of the City's industrial areas.</li> <li>2) Staff was not able to carry out the requested work in time for this first spot rezoning decision.</li> <li>3) Current policy at every level, from the region to the City's Vancouver Plan and Draft ODP, to progressive zoning schedules, all call for the protection of the Mount Pleasant Industrial Area. In the absence of any new information, this policy needs to be upheld.</li> </ol> <p>Having the Backs of our Businesses in Industrial Areas</p> <p>I noticed an important letter from a number of businesses in our industrial areas. We need to listen to them; this is their future at stake. They stated the following.</p> <p>"Upholding Staff's recommendation is necessary to maintain policy integrity, protect employment lands, and ensure Vancouver remains a city that can function, build, service, and sustain itself."</p> <p>This is such a fundamental point with the business community. They are counting on Council to have their backs and let them get on with their busy work lives. You do not want your trust with the business community to be broken.</p> <p>Focusing on Central Decision Criteria: Sorting Out the Key Questions</p> <p>What is the best way to frame this policy decision? It cannot be framed by looking at the attributes of this spot rezoning in isolation.</p> <p>Strand, like many developers, around the world and including several cases here in Vancouver have the unfortunate circumstance of high vacancy offices rates, or planning a proposed industrial/office building project in a post-pandemic world. Unfortunately, It is going to take</p>	Christina DeMarco	West Point Grey	

many years yet to recover from this situation. Thankfully Strand has many fine residential projects in progress around the region, as described in a recent Globe and Mail article.

There is nothing exceptional about the Strand site- it is similar to many other industrial sites nearby. If approved, it will set the precedence for other residential projects here and in other industrial areas.

The decision before Council requires a much wider frame. Here are three key questions to help bring the City-wide context in focus:

1. Would it be in the public interest to rezone industrial land if there was a proven long term demand for industrial/business uses requiring industrial land?

You have asked staff to study future industrial land demand and inform your decision-making. We do not know the answer to this question yet and it is prudent to wait for an answer from staff.

It is useful to think about a few of the many factors that could affect industrial land demand in the future:

City- Serving Industries: A lot of the functions in industrial areas are not all that glamorous but essential to a well-functioning city. They include city-serving industries/businesses and range from car repairs to washing linen for hotels and restaurants. The activities in the industrial areas enable the high-density uses in the downtown and in our residential areas to thrive. Think of them as a giant refrigerator, storeroom, repair workshop for the City. Many business owners in Mount Pleasant locate here to be close to their clients. They often say, " I don't want to be on the wrong side of a bridge when I need to make an urgent repair downtown." This proximity will become even more valuable as the city and region continue to grow.

Significant Future City Growth: As the city grows, so will the demand for these city-serving uses. The Draft ODP shows a population of around 660,000 now and forecast to grow by another 260,000 residents by 2050, a 40% increase. City-serving industrial space demand grows with the population and the other sectors of our economy. For example, as hotel and entertainment space expands the demand for a range of services in industrial areas will also increase.

Gathering Intel: What does Invest Vancouver say about the future demand for industrial land? What about the Board of Trade studies, regional studies, the BC Business Council, and surveys of industrial users, both tenants and owners? All of these sources will need to be investigated by staff to figure out future industrial land demand.

2. Is there an alternate land use that produces a higher community value than industrial land for the City?

Sometimes there is- St Paul's is the most recent example. The new communities created on False Creek and Coal Harbour are great examples from our past. Protecting industrial land provides resilience and flexibility for unknown futures. Staff, after their careful investigations, will be able to answer this question.

3. Is combining residential and industrial uses in the same building a progressive idea?

Staff will need to look at the latest best practices. Combining residential and industrial uses is not a new idea and has been proposed for decades here and in other hot real estate markets. The City had one failed experiment from the early 1990s with what was thought to be a progressive policy to allow artist live work studios in industrial areas. It became quickly apparent that these condos had turned into con-artist studios, impossible to enforce the livelihood of the occupant, and were creating housing speculation in the industrial areas. The policy was rescinded in 1995-96.

				<p>We can have our cake and eat it too                  Council and staff have worked hard in recent years to put the City in a position to not have to worry about zoned land capacity for housing supply for at least a decade, if not longer. This makes it the opportune time for staff to do the important investigations you have asked them to do.</p> <p>By saying yes to the staff's recommendation, you are asking for a careful investigation of the best way to steward the future of our small but precious industrial land base, home to hundreds of city- serving activities and ten's of thousands of jobs .                  We can have both abundant housing and abundant industry.</p>			
2026-01-21	11:05	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	Please see attached letter.	Susan Haid	Dunbar-Southlands	APPENDIX B
2026-01-21	13:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I oppose this rezoning due to the concerning implications for the industrial land base in that area.</p> <p>I support referring this proposal back to staff for further work.</p>	Craig Ollenberger	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-01-21	13:46	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	Please see attached Co-signed Letter from local, industrial businesses and organizations in SUPPORT of Staff Recommendation to NOT approve re-zoning of this site.	Louise Schwartz	Hastings-Sunrise	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-01-21	14:22	CD-1 Rezoning: 320-360 West 2nd Avenue	Oppose	<p>Comments in opposition to the application to rezone 320-360 West 2nd Ave., and in support of the staff recommendation to send it back to staff for more comprehensive study or, alternatively, to reject it outright .</p> <p>Dear Mayor Sim and Councillors,</p> <p>My name is Ned Jacobs; I have lived and worked in Vancouver since 1975. I am a son and lifelong student of the urbanist Jane Jacobs. These comments draw heavily on her knowledge and insights regarding city land use and the nature of economic development and growth.</p> <p>It is crucial now for Vancouver to preserve our remaining industrial lands in order to enable business startups and spinoffs—the new ideas that are necessary to ensure that our economy can diversify and replace work that is inevitably lost. Cities that fail to do this, or overly rely on too few industries or on attracting outside investment at the expense of local startups—cars in Detroit; luxury housing in Vancouver (or ordinary housing at luxury prices)—fall into decline. It is also necessary to maintain both diversity and redundancy in the supply of basic goods and services, many of which are located on land zoned for industry and provide a web of support for other enterprises.</p> <p>The fact is that every big-city developer in Canada must be dreaming of getting a bailout of one sort or another: bailouts to remedy a problem that is largely of their own collective making. They have ignored the precautionary principle en masse, resulting in unsustainable inflation of land costs, which has drastically reduced demand, because most residents simply cannot afford to purchase or rent space in new developments as the development proformas were based on over-exuberant assumptions. This is commonly known as a real estate 'bubble'. The truth, though, is that rescuing them from their self-inflicted wounds, in vain attempts to re-inflate the bubble, is a road to civic ruin—whether by shifting the entire burden of new public infrastructure and amenities onto taxpayers, or—as is the case here—inflating the value of land by shifting it from one permitted use to another, without regard for why those uses were designated in the first place.</p> <p>Whether this particular proponent is in difficulties or not, they are, in effect, asking council for a bailout. The development industry is watching closely, and a consequence of granting them this bailout is that many others will have reason to argue that their property is also exceptional, and demand that they be gifted similar treatment—and why not? Because of the reasons that are clearly stated in the staff report: concern “that development sites in the broader area will begin trading at higher values with landowners and developers speculating that residential will be permitted throughout the area, potentially precluding the ability for employment /industrial developments to move forward while impacting rents.”</p> <p>The proponent is proffering a CAC valued at \$5.5 million. CAC's are not normally required or negotiated for rental housing; but in this instance is being dangled in exchange for the rezoning, and no doubt was carefully calculated to not threaten a handsome return on investment. A win-win? Not at all. It may be a win for the proponent, and it may be spun as a win for Vancouver taxpayers; but this is a slippery slope that leads to an avalanche and the loss of capacity to fulfill crucial economic functions, including replacing imports with domestically produced alternatives, and providing jobs for a more diverse and stable economy, and a greener, more sustainable future. Protecting the Industrial Land Reserve is arguably even more crucial than protecting the Agricultural Land Reserve.</p> <p>In closing: If you vote to approve, you might as well fire the entire planning department 'without cause', and gift Vancouver's future to the schemes of private developers; because that is the signal you will be sending.</p>	Maryann Code	Riley Park	

Sean R. McEwen



20 January 2026

**Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver  
453 W 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver B.C. V5Y 1V4**

**Re: Proposed Rezoning of 320 – 360 West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue**

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a long-time Vancouver resident and wish to voice my strong opposition to this proposed rezoning of Industrial lands in our City.

Industrial lands are a lynch pin for the delivery of a diversified economy for our City, and the existing industrially-zoned lands east of Cambie Street in the Mt. Pleasant Industrial zone, presently play a vital role in providing stability for existing industrial businesses, and jobs and livelihoods for thousands of our citizens. Preserving these lands for industrial use also means that sites can be reserved for new industrial uses and employment for Vancouverites in the burgeoning industrial sectors of our new [green] economy.

It would be a serious mistake to erode the existing industrial land base, with the kind of high density residential development that is envisioned by the subject rezoning. These kinds of development not only drive up the cost of land, making new industrial development on adjacent sites less viable, but they also create potential conflict between industrial business and new residents in the area, since invariably new residents will complain about the nuisance factors associated with some industrial operations. For these lands, preservation and encouragement of industry should be paramount, and high density residential or mixed-use residential development must be discouraged.

Council has to date already re-zoned significant parcels of the City for high density residential, and there now exists significant unbuilt capacity for high density residential available in the City, that makes the inclusion of yet more capacity on industrially zoned land generally superfluous.

Industrial lands are a precious commodity, let's not erode our highly valuable industrial land base. Please refuse this proposed rezoning and development.

Yours truly,  
Sean McEwen



Dear Mayor Sim and Members of Vancouver City Council,

**Re: CD-1 Rezoning 320-360 West 2nd Avenue**

I am writing to express my opposition to the rezoning application for 320-360 West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to enable future residential use at this site. I support recommendation “A” in the staff report to refer this application back to staff to undertake planning work for the Mount Pleasant Industrial Area as an “exceptional site” per the previous Council motion. Overall, I do not support future residential use at this site for the reasons outlined below.

The site is protected for industrial and employment uses consistent with the *Regional Growth Strategy, Metro 2025* and the aligned City of Vancouver policies including the *Regional Context Statement, The Vancouver Plan* and the draft *Vancouver Official Development Plan* underway. These policies and plans recognize the critical role industrial and employment lands play in developing complete and sustainable communities and provide long-term protection for these uses. Industrial lands are in extremely scarce supply in Vancouver and we should not lose the associated jobs capacity.

The Mount Pleasant Industrial Area is a highly successful industrial and employment area within the heart of urban Vancouver. It has substantial proximate residential areas and capacity including that enabled through the *Broadway Plan*. Recent developments in Mount Pleasant include biotech and technology companies with intense job space supporting high quality employment. The area and supporting policies have evolved well to the changing nature of work and should continue to do so. Provision of high-quality job space close to rapid transit, diverse residential uses, parks and amenities is exactly what supports complete and healthy communities.

In response to major housing and economic challenges, the City of Vancouver continues to advance policy such as the *Broadway Plan*, Social Housing strategies, the Jericho Lands ODP, regulatory reform, etc. Council has also approved recent incentives for development (deferring DCLs, ACCs) to respond to the current economic challenges. Enabling residential use on this site at the edge of the Mount Pleasant Industrial area will only encourage more residential development and the loss of strategic job space in this successful employment hub. Please do not make short sighted decisions and lose important industrial/ employment sites such as this to respond to current development economics.

As a former senior member of CoV Planning staff and a professional planner with 35 years of experience at the municipal and regional level and in the academic space, I encourage Council to support the excellent, comprehensive planning work and advice of staff on this application.

Thank-you for your attention to this matter.



Susan Haid MCIP, RPP, CSLA