

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-19	20:31	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Why doesn't the city build there stupid hotels on the flats behind the train station on or around the Main Street and Terminal avenue area on all the flats behind it and build as many as crooked Ken Sim says we need and in the meantime clean up all the dreary big box stores like the Dream Carpets place. It's not a great entrance to the city currently and it's a boon being close to the train station and sky train station taking people into the heart of Vancouver and other places as well. West of Denman is a special neighborhood that is very quiet and to have a hotel with a couple of bars where drunks will spill out of late at night disrupting the peace and a rooftop pool and restaurant is definitely not adding any pluses of any kind not to mention the added traffic of guests cars and tour buses and uber and taxi services. Ken as I'm is completely in the pockets of developers and the corruption at city hall needs to come to a grinding halt before the city faces even more disastrous and disgusting choices by a mayor that I did have high hopes when he was elected and it didn't take long for him to show his horrible true colours filling citizens with the foul taste of regrets</p> <p>Brian Becker West of Denman resident of 40+ years Vancouver B.C.</p>	Brian Becker		
2026-02-19	20:54	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>You passed an application about residential units for healthcare workers and the need for these facilities. So why are you placing a huge commercial building in the heart of a quiet community based neighborhood as opposed to residential facilities. Particularly considering that many hotels and short term rentals and restaurants in the west end are not sufficiently utilized and struggle to make it through the quiet winters.</p> <p>The building and it's construction will adversely impact the community, our enjoyment of life, and the wildlife that reside less than one block from the proposed development.</p>	Darlene Behnke	West End	
2026-02-19	22:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I completely oppose this application for the following reasons: A commercial business west of Denman that includes a large number of hotel rooms and a restaurant would add a massive number of people travelling to and through a quiet area of the neighbourhood. This would mean the addition of large numbers of huge and noisy delivery trucks and large tour operator buses, numerous hotel and restaurant guests all driving through the neighbourhood 24/7 which would add a lot of noise, congestion and pollution to what is essentially a small residential street. I've lived in the West End for over 30 years and as a renter I lived next to the old Coast hotel. The amount of noise from tour buses picking up and dropping off passengers early in the morning and late at night along with groups of people standing on the street and having loud conversations was unbearable and I had to leave the area. My current home is a block away from the proposed site on Barclay street and the number of garbage trucks that create a massive amount of noise pollution are bad enough without adding more trucks/buses and cars to this area. There has been no exploration of the potential impact on the fauna that rely on Stanley park nor has there been consultation with First Nations. This is the wrong location for this type of development due to the negative impact on the residents and another location that is far more suitable should be sought.</p>	Tina Tsobanis	West End	
2026-02-19	23:05	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>There is no reason why this development can't both be a hotel AND respect the West End Community plan that limits height to 58m in the express concern for livability and neighbourliness.</p>	Angela Hopkins	West End	
2026-02-20	07:35	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Please don't build this here. Traffic on Denman is already terrible. And this is a sensitive area for wild life. Please consider the herons that nest nearby.</p>	Judith Boenke	West End	

2026-02-20	13:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	West of Denman is already very high density and traffic is often very congested to get out on Nelson. There is no capacity for this type of structure. The suggested building height is far too tall in this close proximity to Stanley Park and environmentally sensitive area and too close to Blue Herons/bird airways.	Angela Higgs	West End	
2026-02-20	13:36	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I whole heartedly do not wish to see this hotel being built. We have a need for seniors housing more than hotels. How can we support visitors if we cannot take care of ourselves? We have a huge growing population of seniors. Coal harbour already has many hotels. We do not have any indigenous identified housing in the westend, except buildings with indigenous art painted on to it. How dare this company t try to build a tall hotel onto ceded land. Stop gentrifying our neighborhoods and making up excuses the city is short on money. We know you lie. Take the community amenity contributions from data centres and crypto companies perhaps.	Katie Percival		Attachment 1
2026-02-21	13:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>PUBLIC HEARING STATEMENT: 2028-2038 Barclay Street Rezoning</p> <p>Good evening, Mayor and Council. My name is Mark Jan Vrem and I am a 20+year resident of the West End.</p> <p>I am here to speak in opposition to the rezoning. and I'm not alone: the response has been overwhelming negative. a 6,000 name petition and thousands of public comments against the project. And I see comments submitted for this hearing are running about 8 to 1 against it.</p> <p>So - We are not a fringe group; we are a community of voters who value the integrity of our neighbourhoods, our streets, and Stanley Park.</p> <p>The Hotel Development Policy is working - by last count there are more than 58-hundred new hotel rooms in the pipeline - in locations that make sense - like downtown and commercial corridors. I'm not against hotels but I am against this hotel in this location simply because does not make sense.</p> <p>The hotel industry agrees - The BC Hotels Assn. and Destination Vancovuer say large commercial hotels belong downtown and the commercial corridors ... and recommends a 6 - 8 story boutique hotel would be perfect for this site. Now THAT makes sense.</p> <p>The Hotel Development Policy is a guide, not a mandate. It does not require you to approve this project - you can say no - or defer but make no mistake, MARCON is using the policy to its own full advantage and in turn gets approval for massive height and density.</p> <p>The Referral report admits this proposal fails to meet the area's zoning requirements and they are only recommending approval to "enhance project viability."</p> <p>I must ask When did 'project viability' become the city's problem? If a 25-storey commercial tower is the only way to make a hotel profitable on this specific, narrow lot, then MARCON has a bad business plan. That is a private risk for MARCON to manage.</p> <p>Let's talk about the site. The Planning Department notes the sight it too narrow. 99 feet instead of the required 130 feet. Because the lot is so narrow, the building - as Staff notes - strands the neighbouring properties at 2010 and 2040 Barclay, which robs them of their own development potential. Planning asked MARCON to work with those owners to their mutual benefit....but apparently that didn't happen. So much for being good neighbours. And there's more ... the problem of the shared driveway with 2010 Barclay still hanging out there with no resolution in sight.</p> <p>The size of the lot is not the only problem. City Engineering does not support the plans for passenger drop off and deliveries. With 248 rooms and no proper passenger drop-off or loading space, Barclay Street and dead-end ted northe lane will become even more of a traffic nightmare.</p> <p>Engineering also warns that some construction methods will put City utility lines at risk.</p> <p>And now we learn the Park Board is about to consider a Notice of Motion asking the city to hit the brakes - pending a formal briefing on the impact the project will have on Stanley Park.</p> <p>Council needs to know how this tower affects the park's entrance, traffic and emergency vehicle access and the sensitive heron colony. Rushing this through before the Park Board provides its findings is a serious oversight....and doesn't make sense.</p> <p>Wrapping up: I'd like to thank the council members who met with us over the past few weeks for a walking tours of the site so we could show you exactly why a big hotel on the site</p>	MARK JAN VREM	West End	

				<p>does not fit. I'm not against hotels but I am against this hotel - in this location because it does not make sense. The Hotel Policy is a guide, not a mandate to approve a project that even the hotel industry calls misplaced, A project that Engineering warns is flawed, and that Planning admits violates zoning to ensure "the project's viability." That should be MARCON's problem - not the city's. It simply doesn't make sense to jam a 25-story tower onto a narrow lot and in the process risk stranding neighbouring properties, paralyzing local traffic, and perhaps threatening the safety of Stanley Park. It just doesn't make sense. At the end of tonight's process - you will vote on the rezoning and thus future of the neighbourhood. A needless reminder - On October 17th, the community will vote on yours. Please vote NO or Defer this rezoning. Thank you.</p>			
2026-02-21	14:33	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed commercial development planned for 2030-2038 Barclay St. As a long-term resident of this neighbourhood, I—along with many thousands of my neighbours—am deeply concerned that this development will irreversibly alter the character of our community and cause a wide range of negative impacts that have not been adequately addressed. First and foremost, the introduction of a large-scale commercial facility in the heart of a residential zone will inevitably increase noise levels, traffic congestion, and garbage production. Our streets, which are currently safe and quiet, were not designed to accommodate the volume of delivery trucks, customer vehicles, and waste management operations that such a project would require. The added strain on public resources such as water and electricity as well as increased traffic to Stanley Park, will only exacerbate existing burdens, particularly during peak usage periods. These changes will erode the quality of life for residents who chose this neighbourhood precisely for its calm, family-oriented atmosphere. Moreover, this project raises serious concerns about public safety and structural integrity. The proposed deep excavation required for the commercial foundation poses a significant seismic risk to the surrounding area. Many of the nearby buildings are older and were not constructed with modern seismic standards in mind. Vibrations and shifting soils from heavy construction could result in lasting damage to these homes and potentially endanger residents. It is unacceptable to place local families in harm's way to facilitate a project that does not serve the community's immediate needs. Equally troubling is the fact that this development does not include any housing units—affordable or otherwise—despite the ongoing housing crisis in our city. At a time when working families, seniors, and young people are struggling to find places to live, dedicating prime urban space to non-residential, non-essential commercial ventures is a glaring misstep in policy. This land could—and should—be used to help address the urgent housing shortage rather than increase commercial square footage that benefits private developers more than local residents. In conclusion, I urge the Council to reject this proposed development in favour of projects that align with the character and needs of this neighbourhood. The people who live here deserve to have their voices heard and their environment respected. Please take a stand for the integrity, safety, and livability of our community.</p>	Tracy Urban	West End	
2026-02-21	21:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>The neighborhood is already very dense. There's hardly any space to even drive a car. Adding a hotel will be a nightmare for the residents as it will add more cars on the street in this neighborhood and cause more congestion in the area. There are also ecological impacts to Stanley park.</p>	Ankit Trivedi	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-24	19:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>As a local West End resident opposed to the above, I was appalled to hear at the Public Hearing on 19 Feb. that the Vancouver Parks Board had been given insufficient notice of this large hotel that City Council is considering shoehorning into a grossly undersized lot, just one block from Stanley Park.</p> <p>Appalled, but not surprised—given the lack of public transparency and general disregard shown to the neighbourhood residents and for the West End's own policy guidelines. And now it seems, little regard has been shown to the Vancouver Parks Board, either.</p> <p>Like many long-term West Enders, I am very concerned about the impact an ill-planned project of this size will have on our beloved Stanley Park. The possible negative impacts I can specifically think of include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pollution impacts on plants and animals caused by far too much traffic congestion on these narrow residential streets - Car, taxi, über and delivery van collisions with wildlife, caused by same - Disturbance to wildlife as a result of increased noise and litter - Lost Lagoon: it's not in good shape now; what happens when a large hotel is erected a mere block away, with its runoff of phosphates from laundry facilities and heaven knows what else <p>Dubious "letters of support for the hotel" notwithstanding, our West of Denman community is strongly opposed to this development, on this particular location. If it isn't possible to deny the rezoning application right now (which would be our preference)—then doesn't it make sense to at least put the decision on pause until objective impact reports can be done? To my knowledge, no proper research has, in fact, been done—which just sounds crazy to me, given the potential damage that could be done to our beautiful park and community.</p>	Anita Boomer	West End	
2026-02-24	20:24	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>The Rosellen was rental apartments from when it was built in the 60's until Expo 86 when the tenants were displaced for tourist needing short stay accommodation. It was NEVER a hotel, so how could it be considered under the "hotel development policy" in the first place? And to say it is "a unique situation" makes it even more of a mistake. Send back this rezoning and demand Marcon follow the "West End Plan".</p>	Maureen Wilson	West End	
2026-02-24	22:26	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>We need to abide by proper and established zoning restrictions in this neighbourhood. The street is narrow and will not be able to accommodate hotel traffic of this volume in a residential district.</p>	Philip Holden	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-25	14:48	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.</p> <p>While I recognize that the revised proposal has reduced height and density compared to the previous submission, I remain concerned about its impacts on neighbourhood character, access, environmental sensitivity, and housing priorities.</p> <p>The West End is a historic, primarily residential neighbourhood with relatively calm local streets. A 27-storey hotel and long-term stay building is likely to increase vehicle traffic, ride-hailing activity, tour buses, and service vehicles. This may affect the livability of the area and create congestion challenges, including for staff accessing the Park Board office at 2099 Beach Avenue and for residents and visitors accessing Lost Lagoon and Stanley Park.</p> <p>Given the site’s proximity to Stanley Park and Lost Lagoon, there are also environmental considerations. Heron nesting areas and other sensitive habitats could be affected by increased traffic, noise, and visitor activity. Further assessment and mitigation should be considered.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the opportunity cost of using this site for a luxury hotel rather than residential housing. Vancouver is facing an ongoing housing affordability crisis, and centrally located residential areas like the West End are particularly valuable for long-term housing supply. Long-term tenants in older rental buildings often pay below current market rents because annual rent increases are provincially capped during a tenancy. Older purpose-built rental buildings are typically more affordable than new developments because they do not carry the “new build” premium associated with luxury finishes and high construction costs. Units are often more modest in size and design, and the building’s original development costs have long since been absorbed. As a result, these buildings frequently offer comparatively lower rents than newly constructed projects, making them an important part of the city’s more attainable housing stock. While this does not guarantee lasting affordability, preserving and expanding residential housing options remains critical to supporting both aging residents and younger Vancouverites seeking stable housing.</p> <p>Rezoning from RM-5B to CD-1 to permit a large hotel represents a significant shift from the intended residential character of the area. I encourage the City to carefully consider whether this proposal aligns with neighbourhood context and broader priorities before approval.</p>	Eve Middleton-Meyer	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-02-26	09:17	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Barclay is a little street in a little neighbourhood. I’m sure this builder doesn’t care, but we certainly do. Barclay is not built for cars and Denman Street, which is the only way in and out, is often at a standstill, especially in the summer months. These few streets between Denman and Stanley Park are a quiet lovely buffer, a rare urban tree lined enclave that the whole city can be proud of. Please stand up to this crass inappropriate commercial intrusion. Thank you.</p>	Barbara Fairchild	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	10:08	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am a West end resident and strongly oppose the proposed hotel on the 2030 Barclay site. It is not an appropriate use of this site and will negatively impact our neighbourhood.</p> <p>These are just a few of the reasons the hotel should not be built as proposed: The site is only 99 feet wide, failing the city's own 130-foot requirement for a tower this size.</p> <p>A 248-room hotel at this gateway will create traffic gridlock and potentially block emergency vehicles.</p> <p>It does not fit current zoning And breaks every rule: frontage, separation, and loading for example.</p> <p>The neighbourhood does not support this permit application. Please vote no and support local citizens vs. The developer's lobbyists.</p> <p>Regards Patricia Russell <small>FOIA Freedom of Information and</small> [Redacted]</p>	Patricia Russell	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	10:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Dear people at City Hall</p> <p>I'm aware of the controversy over the new high rise hotel proposed for Barclay street in the West End</p> <p>I am firmly OPPOSED to this project.</p> <p>I live in the neighborhood, which is densely and fully populated, has difficult but adequate (barely) parking, is settled and peaceful. It is a gem along with Stanley Park, in Vancouver's neighborhoods.</p> <p>Back in the day there were several factors mitigating against continuing the 1960's hi rise boom heading for the West End - overcrowding,;shadows from high rises buildings risking greenery in Stanley Park to the west of the neighborhood; cutting down beautiful old trees on the street to accommodate super dense and over dense hi rise building footprints; changing the genteel as well as low cost nature of the neighborhood, where old folks on limited incomes as well as young people with the same, could live in safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>It is so obvious why this project, one sponsored by large non local investors want to pervert this charming historic area. MONEY MONEY. MONEY !</p> <p>If they can get a variance approval for this hi rise building, it will be the thin edge of a wedge to promote the razing of other buildings, and building other anti community eyesore hi rises - to take over the West Ends charm, utility and affordability.</p> <p>I'm old, on a fixed income, and can see myself and my wife being forced out economically as an over dense, overpriced private residence set of huge buildings take over our fine community.</p> <p>Don't Do it ! Dont allow it !</p> <p>Peter Williamson. West end resident</p>	Peter Williamson	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	10:21	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I would like to make three points, here they are as follows:</p> <p>1. Square peg, round hole: The site is only 99 feet wide, yet the City’s own policy requires a minimum frontage of 130 feet for a tower of this scale. That is not a minor variance. A 31-foot shortfall represents nearly one quarter of the required width. It is a substantial discrepancy, not a technical rounding error.</p> <p>If the frontage requirement exists to ensure adequate spacing, livability, light, and urban fit, then reducing it by such a significant margin undermines the intent of the policy itself.</p> <p>Approving a tower that so clearly fails to meet the stated criteria raises an obvious question: if a 31-foot deficiency can be set aside so easily, what meaning does the requirement hold at all?</p> <p>2. Stanley Park Access and Neighbourhood Impact: This proposal places a 248-room hotel at one of the primary gateways to Stanley Park, in a part of the West End that is widely known for its narrow, residential streets. West of Denman in particular is a quiet neighbourhood where some streets are so tight that vehicles can barely manoeuvre when cars are parked on both sides. Most on-street parking is permit-only and intended for residents.</p> <p>Even conservatively estimating that only one quarter of hotel guests rent vehicles to explore the city, that would translate to approximately 61 additional cars seeking parking in and around the area. There is no realistic capacity for that volume within the existing residential street network. The likely outcome is spillover into the already limited parking areas near the Park Board and Stanley Park, reducing availability for park users and families who rely on those spaces for public access.</p> <p>Developers seeking to maximise profit should not be permitted to rely on infrastructure that was built and funded for the broader public. Public park access and residential livability should not be compromised to accommodate private commercial gain.</p> <p>3. Policy vs. Wisdom: The existence of a policy does not obligate Council to approve a proposal that conflicts with the spirit and substance of its own rules. This project clearly and reportedly falls short on multiple fronts, including frontage, separation, and loading requirements. Granting broad exceptions simply to make a development financially viable sets a troubling precedent.</p> <p>What is technically permissible is not always what is prudent. Sound planning requires judgment, restraint, and a commitment to long-term community wellbeing. Approving a project that stretches or disregards established standards risks eroding public trust and weakening the integrity of the planning framework itself.</p>	W.Y. Hamilton	West End	
2026-02-26	11:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>We need affordable housing, not a hotel in a residential quiet street. We the residents of Barclay street unequivocally oppose this project being supported by this corrupt mayor Sims. No one wants this except for the wealthy friends of the mayor.</p>	Shukoo Belland	West End	
2026-02-26	11:26	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>This is too large a building for the location. It will disrupt the character of the street, interfere with the tranquil beauty of Stanley Park in that location and create significant and unacceptable traffic congestion.</p> <p>A lower rise building would be okay - maximum 10 stories.</p>	Patricia Graham	Downtown	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	11:28	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Hi, I am a senior who lives very close to this proposed development. I'm already struggling to cross at Nelson and Guilford because there is so much traffic coming down Nelson from both directions. This project is going to increase car traffic in our area. I moved here because of its walk ability. I don't understand why our community plan is getting changed to accommodate such a giant project. I also don't understand how the developer can talk about "long stay rooms "as being an important aspect of this, as being a reason why there will be less traffic. According to your own planning department once this rezoning goes through the developer can do whatever they want with the hotel rooms plus it could change hands. There is no guarantee at all that they will stay "long Stay "rooms. Plus, just to clarify what the developer is calling "long stay "rooms is just rooms with kitchenettes. They may very easily be used for short stays. The size of this project is wrong for this area. I don't know how it is even being considered. The developer needs to go back to the drawing board and come back with something that fits our neighbourhood plan and our community. We are not against development here, but this is unreasonable. Please stand up for us.	Monica Edl	West End	
2026-02-26	11:31	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	It's not a fit: Square Peg, Round Hole: The site is only 99 feet wide, failing the city's own 130-foot requirement for a tower this size. Traffic disaster: Stanley Park Access: A 248-room hotel at this gateway will create traffic gridlock and potentially block emergency vehicles. Rule breaking not OKPolicy vs. Wisdom: Just because a policy exists doesn't mean Council must approve a project that breaks every rule (frontage, separation, and loading) just to make it profitable for a developer.	Jill Schroder	West End	
2026-02-26	11:35	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I live across from the proposed Macron development on Barclay St. My concern is with service vehicles,guest parking and tour buses,shadow to neighbors and noise from the proposed patio restaurant.There already is a lot of traffic flow from the park. The site application is for 130 foot requirement on a 99 foot wide lot. An Invasive 25 story tower and all the unwelcome traffic and noise on a residential street is not acceptable. Removes the harmony and quality of life living here. No objection to keeping the size of the boutique hotel as is.	Elizabeth Chase	West End	
2026-02-26	13:29	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I am a resident of the West End, and I wholeheartedly oppose Macron's plan to build a high rise hotel at 2030 Barclay St. I am one of thousands of residents who know the West End like the backs of our hands. We know how damaging the scope & nature of this project would be. We deeply value the priceless gifts of community health, safety, diversity & connectivity; thoughtfully planned neighbourhoods; & our truly unique & deeply cherished Stanley Park. We already struggle to cope with traffic on our streets & sidewalks; are already concerned with vehicles speeding, ignoring stop lights & signs as they travel through our neighbourhoods and park to get over the bridges to other destinations; already cope with all of the short & long term consequences of increasing density. A low rise boutique hotel to replace or update the Rose Ellen makes sense in this quiet neighbourhood. Macron's high rise does not. Vancouver is NOT London, is NOT New York. Our natural beauty, heritage, character & charm should be honoured and preserved, not disregarded and destroyed. We will never recover what we lose if we approve a project like Macron's that does not make sense.	Deborah Phelan	West End	
2026-02-26	15:17	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Few disagree the City needs more hotel rooms. That is not the conversation we are having about this application. This location is NOT the correct site for a tower of this size - doesn't it break your own rules? Please find a way to build a hotel on Denman, Robson or Davie St....	David Love	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	15:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>This development is not consistent with the West End plan. Alternative hotel developments opportunities exist in areas of the west end that contemplate such development. See below as an example a low rise hotel on Robson street at the corner with Broughton street that is for sale and ripe for a 25 storey redevelopment: https://goodmanreport[.]com/active-listings/greenbrier-hotel-1393-robson-street-vancouver/</p> <p>The West End plan was a result of full consultations with residents and resulted in very large part of the West End being open to high rises, while protecting other areas that are dear to the heart of Westenders. We did trust that the document was "binding" at least as far as the social contract between elected officials and voters stand. Breaking that social contract would have lasting consequences in the trust West Enders have towards elected officials.... Is it really worth it when immediately actionable and acceptable alternatives exist???</p>	Marie-Liesse Marc		
2026-02-26	15:55	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Hello, Council.</p> <p>I live at 2035 Barclay Street, directly across from the proposed 25-story Tower Hotel. This rezoning application in West End area does not make sense because building such a gigantic hotel has exclusively negative consequences.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is too tiny and completely unsuitable for such a multi-story building which entails serious safety violations. It has 99 feet of frontage instead of the required 130 feet. Will the building be able to withstand seismic shock waves? 2. The constant delivery of guests will lead to traffic congestion that will block emergency vehicle access. There is not enough room for loading, parking on a narrow street at a dead end location. 3. A quiet residential area is for living in peace and calm. This is not the place where commercial buildings should be built. The noisy construction will negatively impact the quality of life in this neighborhood. The hotel will cause severe privacy impacts later. 4. Four levels of underground parking pose a serious threat to the structural integrity of older adjacent buildings. 5. Reduced of sunlight due to building's height. <p>I urge the City Council to reject this rezoning application.</p> <p>Regards, Yuliia</p>	Yuliia Rybina	West End	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	17:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>13 Red Flags and 1 Green Light</p> <p>[1] RED FLAG – Devastates the hard won compromise between the genuine need for development and neighbourhood preservation as hammered out in the West End Plan. Why stomp on GOOD city planning?</p> <p>[2] RED FLAG – Exceeds height limits per code and per what the neighbourhood feels like if you stand there.</p> <p>[3] RED FLAG – Extremely inadequate set back per code, and per common sense for hotel loading.</p> <p>[4] RED FLAG – Public consultation cancelled claiming security concerns (right....)</p> <p>[5] RED FLAG – 6000 signatures objecting, and I was working abroad for 4 months and didn’t get to add my name. Please note, at least 6001. Verifiable by the e-mails I submitted to each councillor and each posted city rep. on this topic.</p> <p>[6] RED FLAG – Planners stuttered and stammered on Feb19 about the traffic issues. The parking is already a very hard West of Denman. Volume of double parked delivery vehicles is exhausting and unsafe already. The alleys are packed in biz hours with garbage trucks and maintenance trucks at least 6 days a week.</p> <p>[7] RED FLAG – Ted North Alley behind the proposed hotel is a DEAD END!!!! Hello!!!! Hello!!!! Hello!!!!</p> <p>[8] RED FLAG – The other neighbourhood hotel (Sylvia) has road access on 3 sides. As did Coast Plaza. Best Western has 2 sides plus its own underpass. This lot will have through access ONLY on one side, and that side dumps into the Park!</p> <p>[9] RED FLAG – The Hotel Plan repeatedly touted by Marcon and City Planners says specifically, MODESTLY priced hotel rooms are needed. Please get Marcon to put on record they are planning MODESTLY priced hotel rooms in accordance with the hotel plan – and insist that they deliver such.</p> <p>[10] RED FLAG – The transportation links to West End are inadequate and crowded already.</p> <p>[11] RED FLAG – The developer claimed there is a need for restaurants in the area. With over 40 restaurants on the bottom of Robson, the bottom of Davie, and the length of Denman, plus The Stanley Park Brew Pub, Sylvia, the one by the Buchan – who is doing the math? Many of those restaurants struggle to survive. Has anyone asked those businesses if they would welcome more competition?</p> <p>[12] RED FLAG – The shadow impact from a thick 25 stories is HUGE!</p> <p>[13] RED FLAG – Is it possible that a developer who glosses over all of the above claiming that he ‘respects the neighbourhood texture ‘ (in the Feb 19 presentation) is not being entirely honest?</p> <p>[1] GREEN LIGHT – If this gets through council, there is a reasonable chance that the prosperous Marcon family could well make a great deal of money.</p>	D. Brisbin	West End	Attachment 1

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-02-26	19:16	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Square Peg, Round Hole: The site is only 99 feet wide, failing the city's own 130-foot requirement for a tower this size.</p> <p>I live West of Denman and plan to retire and live out the rest of my life in this neighbourhood. This neighbourhood is full of seniors and a very vibrant part of the West End. We do not need a 27 story Hotel smack in the middle of our residential neighbourhood. It is a healthy location to walk about, grocery shop, and a real community minded neighbourhood. We care about each other and take care of each other.</p> <p>Stanley Park Access: A 248-room hotel at this gateway will create traffic gridlock and potentially block emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Policy vs. Wisdom: Just because a policy exists doesn't mean Council must approve a project that breaks every rule (frontage, separation, and loading) just to make it profitable for a developer. This is a huge residential area and not a commercial area. Build Hotels in areas where Hotels are welcome. The Granville area, Robson, etc. We need more housing co-ops where people can afford to live in Vancouver and work where they live.</p>	Mya Alissandra	West End	
2026-02-27	09:33	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I am a local resident at [REDACTED] street and had previously submitted reasons for my opposition to this rezoning application. My reasons are mainly because the scale of this project is inappropriate to the local area, and because of a concern for increased parking, deliveries, traffic and noise.</p> <p>I attended the Public Hearing and now have a concern that the developer is soliciting support for the project by paid supporters and people not within the community. The supporters that called in felt like they were reading from a scripted letter. It makes me wonder if sufficient checks are done on where these voices originate from or if there are some controls on soliciting support in this manner.</p> <p>Robert Lange <small>§14 Freedom of Information and Protection</small></p>	Robert Lange	West End	

2026-02-27	14:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Date: February 27, 2026 To: Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver Re: OFFICIAL OPPOSITION – CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street (RTS 18406) I am writing to formally submit my opposition to the proposed rezoning of 2028-2038 Barclay Street. While the City’s Planning Department has framed this as a necessary expansion of hotel stock, a review of the Referral Report reveals a "stack of relaxations" that prioritizes private developer viability over the long-term integrity of the West End Community Plan (WECP).</p> <p>1. A Fundamental Policy Conflict The WECP was established to provide clarity and certainty, specifically stating that the West of Denman area is not anticipated to undergo significant change. This proposal uses the Hotel Development Policy as a discretionary override to achieve a 430% increase in density and a 350% increase in height over base zoning. This is not "clean alignment" with City policy; it is a total abandonment of the neighbourhood’s 30-year roadmap.</p> <p>2. Engineering Rejection and Public Safety It is highly irregular for a rezoning to be recommended for approval when Engineering Services explicitly does not support the relaxations for passenger and delivery loading. A 25-storey hotel with 248 units and a rooftop lounge cannot function safely within a narrow residential lane without these spaces. Approving this before a functional loading solution is found is a failure of planning due diligence.</p> <p>3. Impact on Neighbouring Rights (2010 & 2040 Barclay) This site has a frontage of only 30.1 m—far below the 39.6 m required for tower sites in the West End. To force a tower onto this narrow lot, Planning is allowing a 6.1 m side-yard setback, exactly half of the 12.2 m required. This "externalizes" the building's impact, forcing neighbours at 2010 and 2040 Barclay to absorb the deficit and effectively stripping them of their own future development rights under the WECP.</p> <p>4. Procedural Failures: UDP and Shadowing The decision to bypass the Urban Design Panel (UDP) review prior to the Referral Report is a significant procedural shortcut. Council is being asked to approve a massive density increase without the expert architectural feedback normally required. Furthermore, the report acknowledges increased shadowing on Stanley Park and the Pooh Corner Daycare, yet provides no confirmation of consultation with the Park Board regarding childcare licensing impacts.</p> <p>5. Engagement vs. Notification The applicant’s claim of "40+ touch points" misrepresents the quality of engagement. The fact that an information session in February 2026 saw zero attendance—while over 1,500 written submissions and a 6,000-signature petition oppose the project—is proof of a failed outreach strategy. Silence from local seniors is not consent; it is the result of an inaccessible process.</p> <p>Conclusion A durable planning decision respects established guardrails. If a project requires a total override of frontage standards, engineering bylaws, and area plans to be "financially viable," it is simply the wrong building for this site. I urge Council to reject this application or refer it back to the applicant until it can meet the minimum urban design and engineering requirements of the West End Community Plan. Sincerely, Mark Jan Vrem</p>	MARK JAN VREM	West End	Attachment 1
2026-02-27	15:38	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Comments to City Council re March 5 Barclay 2028-2038 Re-Zoning Proposal (B. Sullivan)</p> <p>I rent on Stanley Park, three blocks south of the proposed re-zoning. I support hotel expansion in the West End that is of a scale and form compatible with the neighbourhood. The proposal and Bylaw before you are not. I do not support it as currently set out and propose several actions Council can take to strengthen the proposal</p>	Brian Sullivan	West End	

Why not? Three main reasons.

First, the Proposal:

As detailed in the many written submissions, including mine and the City's own referral letter, and the oral presentations at the Feb 19 hearing where I was scheduled to present, the site is poorly situated and severely constrained for the scope of what is proposed. Chief among them are the non-conformance with baseline current baseline zoning and the West End community plan, major concerns expressed by City Engineering Services about even the technical feasibility of providing the infrastructure required in support of the proposed scale of activity, and the brutal accommodations regarding tower separation that will cripple the ability of the neighbouring properties to build out their residential capacity.

Meaningful renderings have not been made available but the main image is an undistinguished tower not in keeping with the architect's reputation. There has been no detailed consideration of the enormous traffic demand and expense that will be generated at this main gateway to the Park, nor of the endangerment of children and their families utilizing the non-profit child care centre only 70 metres away but across from what will become a congested Lagoon Dr.

Second, Consultation Process:

There has not been meaningful consultation. The whole thing has been a series of announcements, with the proponent talking at people. The scheduled public hearing was cancelled, replaced by a series of poorly publicized one-way presentation sessions. The proponent was also allowed to defer the Urban Design Panel review typically scheduled before Council receives the referral, when there is substantial community engagement evidenced, because they persuaded the City that any concerns could be "worked out" with the UDP in discussion post-approval. In addition, the neighbourhood area identified for required notification was astonishing limited given the wide-ranging impacts.

The confusion evident in the proponents's presentation at the Feb 19 public hearing about the age of the building and circumstances giving rise to the hotel "designation" (a stop gap for Expo), lack of any mention of the proposal for a condominium development by the same proponent (that had an approved permit) being suddenly withdrawn in advance of the Hotel Development policy being promulgated, and the unremarked concurrent removal of hotel beds in the area, particularly along Robson, is typical of the very selective information sharing that has characterized this process and left community members and groups with no confidence in the consultation process, up to the Feb 19 meeting. At that hearing, the due diligence questions asked by most of the Councilors attending in person illumined the muddle and gyrations that have beset this process from the outset and were an encouragement that the necessary time would be taken to properly assess the case for this rezoning and identify how the Bylaw proposal can be strengthened if it does proceed.

Thirdly, Prospects for Success:

The proposed Bylaw does not provide clear or effective criteria to address the thorny issues of scale, form, and impact that come with this particular proposal. It is full of "we can work it out" assurances. Enormous latitude is left in the hands of the Director of Planning and the Development Permit Board to adjudicate significant relaxations to existing policy (e.g, exclusion of certain common areas from the computation of floor area and exceptions to the maximum building height.)

In closing, I urge Council to mandate that the proposed Bylaw receive additional review before a decision is taken on whether to approve it.

To that end, it is recommended Council direct that:

The latest renderings be made available.

An explanation be prepared about tower separation in the current plan and resulting impacts.

A formal consultation be undertaken with the Parks Board. No approvals to this rezoning request should occur until that has occurred and the report has been tabled.

A formal consultation be undertaken with the Board of the Pooh Corner Child Care Society

An initial review be undertaken by the Urban Design Panel prior to any approval of the proposed rezoning and Bylaw.

A daytime and evening open house be offered where the latest plans are presented and representatives from City staff and the proponent are present to offer information and receive input.

Following these steps, the Planning Dept prepare a report recommending potential revisions, if any, to the amended Bylaw currently before Council.

Marcon has a newly fashioned "Building for Life" vision statement. In it they commit to "focus (their) projects on delivering lasting value to communities," "reimagining and strengthening the connection between people and the places where they spend time," and "supporting thriving communities." Their stated intent is to be "measured in growth and highly selective in approach, in order to focus (their) attention on the best outcomes."

May it be so. A 'NO' vote from Council now and adoption of these recommendations would help the proponent honour their own stated values and support this neighborhood's uniqueness and livability, instead of eroding it.

Thank you for your consideration.

				Brian Sullivan			
2026-02-27	16:27	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Please see attached letter.	Sharon Cohen	West End	APPENDIX A
2026-02-28	11:26	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Hello, I live at [REDACTED] and chose this neighborhood for so many reasons. Moved in 2023. Love it. As a former CEO of a large Real Estate board, I understand development, but this Hotel project on Barclay street, makes zero sense whatsoever, sorry but true. Extra, chaos, traffic, congestion etc. Before you vote, come and actually live here for a few days, stay overnight and actually understand the magic of the neighbourhood (even with the traffic problems now as well). They you will understand, and you will vote NO to this project. This is not an area for such a massive hotel project. Thank you.	Robert Philipp	Downtown	
2026-02-28	19:49	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Hello there,</p> <p>I am categorically against the construction of a multi-story hotel in a quiet West End residential area because it is inappropriate location for a commercial building. This is not a right development for this area.</p> <p>Main concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Given the extremely small and unacceptable distance between the proposed construction site of the giant hotel and the adjacent residential buildings, it's safe to say that the tower crane will be working above the roofs of the neighboring buildings. If an accident occurs involving a crane fall, it will result in casualties. Who will be responsible for the deaths of West End residents? 2.Due to the four-story underground parking, there is a risk of subsidence of neighboring buildings, which could lead to an emergency situation. 3.Violation of the permissible level and duration of noise leads to the development of a stressful state of affairs among residents of a quiet residential area.This will definitely disrupt the microclimate of the West End neighborhood that has been established for years. 4. Pollution of the atmosphere with dust and harmful substances will have a negative impact on the environment, in particular on the health of people living near the proposed construction site. 5. The streets between which the hotel is planned are not designed to accommodate the large number of cars. This will lead to a traffic gridlock, which is unacceptable for emergency vehicles. <p>I urge the City Council to reject this rezoning application. Thank you.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Liubov</p>	Liubov Baranova		
2026-02-28	21:59	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street ruins quality of live for current residents	Denise Santano		

2026-02-28	22:27	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I live in the neighbourhood and my children attend a daycare within Stanley park which is about a block away from the proposed site.</p> <p>Our daycare Pooh Corner is the closest enterprise to the proposal. As a registered childcare charity operating since 1972, we are not a standard business. We serve a highly vulnerable population of toddlers and children who rely on the specific safety and tranquility of this unique setting.</p> <p>Severe Traffic & Child Safety Risks: Every morning and afternoon, 40+ kids walk, cycle, and run to and from Pooh Corner. Replacing a 29-room building with a 248-room hotel half a block away will turn Lagoon Drive into a busy commercial thoroughfare. The 24/7 introduction of commercial laundry trucks, garbage trucks, food delivery, Ubers, taxis and tour buses trying to navigate our roads and narrow lanes poses a direct physical risk to our children and a nightmare for parent drop-offs.</p> <p>Overshadowing & Loss of Daylight: One of Pooh Corner's key features is its beautiful, natural surroundings. A 25-storey tower will permanently overshadow neighboring buildings and have a significant negative impact on the daylight and warmth of our play area. The developer has offered no mention of mitigation or compensation to Pooh Corner for this permanent degradation of our environment. This was expressly mentioned by the Park Board (see point below)</p> <p>The 2018 "Bait and Switch" Precedent: In 2018, the developer had an approved 10-storey residential building for this exact site that was specifically designed not to cast shadows on the surrounding area. City Planners praised that approved plan for adhering to the West End Community Plan's strict "solar envelope regulations." Overriding those protections now for a commercial hotel is unacceptable.</p> <p>The Construction Nightmare (Threat to Licensing): During the multi-year demolition and construction phase, Pooh Corner will be subjected to dump trucks, cranes, severe noise, and dust from deep excavation. This directly threatens our childcare licensing. If Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) inspectors deem the outdoor play area unsuitable due to the environmental hazards of construction, we will be forced into a complex "Off-Site Play Space Plan," dramatically impacting our liability and staffing requirements.</p> <p>Lack of Stanley Park Ecology Assessment: The first public speaker at the Public Hearing on the 19th of February was Commissioner Brennan Bastovanszky from the Parks Board noting their opposition of the project. There has been no impact assessment done for Stanley Park. How will a 25-floor hotel impact the trees, the heron nesting grounds, and the ecology of the park right next to our yard? The Parks Board also explicitly mentions Pooh Corner as being impacted by this development.</p>	Anna Shevchenko	West End	
2026-03-01	08:32	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>To: Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver Re: Barclay Hotel Proposal – Submission Regarding Inadequacy of Public Consultation</p> <p>I am writing to formally challenge the "Outreach Summary" provided by the applicant, Marcon, regarding the proposed development at 2030 Barclay Street. While the applicant touts "40+ touch points" as evidence of a robust community dialogue, a closer examination of the timeline reveals a strategy rooted in passive notification rather than meaningful engagement.</p> <p>The following points highlight the fundamental failures in the applicant's outreach process:</p> <p>1. Conflating Notification with Engagement</p> <p>The applicant's tally of "40+ touch points" is artificially inflated by counting statutory requirements and one-way broadcasts as active consultation.</p> <p>The "Papering" Strategy: The letters delivered in Dec 2024 and Dec 2025, and the posters placed in the West End Community Centre (WECC), are passive notifications.</p> <p>The Reality: Posting a flyer on a bulletin board does not constitute a "touchpoint" for</p>	Mark Jan Vrem	West End	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3

dialogue. It is a one-way broadcast. To frame these as successful community "engagement" misleads Council on the level of actual neighbourhood buy-in.

2. Disproportionate Stakeholder Prioritization

The timeline reveals a clear bias toward industry groups over the residents who will live in the shadow of this 25-storey tower.

The Nine-Month Gap: From February 2025 to October 2025, the applicant focused almost exclusively on the "Tourism Industry" and "BIA." These are pro-development stakeholders with no lived interest in the block's livability.

The "Afterthought" Residents: The actual neighbourhood group (Stop 2030 Barclay) was not engaged until November 2025—nearly a year after the process began. Engaging the most impacted neighbours at the eleventh hour is not a consultation; it is a presentation of a finished product.

3. Negligence of High-Impact Neighbours: Pooh Corner Daycare

Perhaps the most egregious omission in the applicant's outreach is the total lack of engagement with the Pooh Corner Daycare Center, located on Lagoon Lane just steps from the proposed site.

The Safety Conflict: The daycare's peak drop-off and pick-up times coincide directly with the hotel's standard check-in and check-out windows. This creates a dangerous "perfect storm" of peak traffic where commercial hotel shuttles and guests will be competing for road space with parents and small children.

Zero Outreach: Despite the daycare's proximity and the obvious safety implications of increased traffic on a narrow lane, the applicant made no attempt to contact the centre or the parents.

The Result: By failing to engage this specific stakeholder, the applicant has ignored a critical public safety assessment. A developer cannot claim "robust outreach" while simultaneously overlooking the safety of children on their immediate doorstep.

4. Proof of Failure: The "Empty Room" Briefing

The most telling evidence of an outreach failure is the February 2026 information session.

Zero Attendance: Despite the claim of 40+ prior touch points, the applicant's recent briefing saw a total lack of community attendance.

The Conclusion: This is a clear indicator of ineffective communication. If the community felt their voices were being heard or that the session was accessible, the room would not have been empty. This session was a "box-ticking" exercise held too late to influence the proposal.

5. Failure of Civic Integration (Stanley Park)

As of late February 2026, the Vancouver Park Board has expressed public frustration regarding a lack of formal briefing on the project's ecological and shadow impacts on Stanley Park. If a major civic body feels excluded from the "40+ touch points," the process has fundamentally failed to address the most significant neighbour to the site.

Conclusion and Recommendation

A developer can send 1,000 letters, but if those letters do not result in a two-way dialogue that shapes the project's massing, safety protocols, or shadow profile, the "outreach" is merely marketing.

I urge Council to vote NO.

Thank you,
Mark Jan Vrem

Additional comments submitted on March 1, 2026:

To: Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver Re: Strategic Submission Regarding the Barclay Hotel Proposal – A Critique of Policy Stretching and Procedural Failure

This submission outlines significant technical, procedural, and policy-based concerns regarding the proposed development at 2030 Barclay Street. While the applicant frames this as a "unique" and "compliant" project, a review of the record reveals a stack of relaxations and a strategy that prioritizes private economic viability over public planning durability.

1. The Outreach Failure: Notification is Not Engagement
 The applicant's claim of "40+ touch points " misrepresents the quality of community dialogue.
 The "Papering" Myth: The majority of these touch points were one-way, passive notifications (letters and posters). To count a statutory requirement as "engagement" is to conflate marketing with consultation.
 Barriers for Seniors: The applicant admitted that meetings were canceled due to "tensions" or "security concerns," and that seniors' groups were difficult to reach. Absence should not be mistaken for indifference; it reflects a failure to create an accessible, safe, and inclusive environment for our most vulnerable residents to participate.
 The Proof of Failure: The February 2026 information session saw zero attendance. If the 40+ prior touch points were successful, the community would have been informed and present. This "empty room" is the ultimate indictment of an ineffective outreach strategy.

2. Lack of Guardrails: Policy Stretching vs. Compliance
 Staff have admitted that the current Hotel Policy contains no size parameters and no geographic lens, resulting in a "case-by-case" interpretation.
 The Discretion Trap: Without scale limits, Council is the only remaining guardrail. Approving a 25-storey tower on a site this narrow invites arbitrary interpretation of policy that will inevitably serve as the "reference point" for all future applications.
 Conflict with the West End Plan: Staff admitted this project "bumps up" against the RM5B and West End Plan expectations. This is not clean alignment; it is a discretionary override of an established community plan.

3. Technical Failure of Fit: The "Stack of Relaxations"
 This project only functions through a series of significant urban design and engineering shortfalls:
 Frontage Deficiency: The policy anticipates a 130 ft frontage; this site is only 99 ft.
 Tower Separation: The site cannot achieve the standard 80 ft tower separation, forcing adjacent sites to absorb a 60 ft setback—externalizing the project's impact onto its neighbours.
 Unresolved Engineering: Engineering staff do not currently support the passenger/drop-off relaxation. To recommend approval while traffic and loading solutions are "still under discussion" creates an unstable and non-durable planning decision.

4. Private Viability vs. Public Planning
 The applicant has stated that the current 10-storey residential zoning "would not be compatible with our ability to redevelop."
 The Core Issue: A 10-storey building is physically and legally possible under the West End Plan. The move to 25 storeys is driven by private economics, not public necessity.
 If a project's viability requires a total override of design metrics, frontage standards, and area plans, that is a private business challenge—it is not a public planning obligation for Council to solve.

Conclusion: A Non-Durable Decision
 A durable planning decision is one that respects established guardrails and maintains public trust through genuine engagement. This proposal fails on both counts. It relies on a "stack of relaxations" that compromises the very urban design standards the City worked for years to establish in the West End Plan.
 We urge Council to protect the integrity of the West End Plan and either refer this application back to the applicant or vote "no" now.
 Discretion must be exercised with caution, and in this case, the scale of the override far outweighs the public benefit.

Additional comments submitted on March 3, 2026:

Submission Brief: 2030 Barclay Public Hearing
 Subject: Discrepancies in Applicant Testimony vs. Official Records

1. Introduction

The purpose of this presentation is to highlight significant inconsistencies between the oral testimony provided by the applicant and the documented facts regarding two critical liveability issues: Acoustic Impact and Public Amenity Access.

Acoustic Impact & Neighbourhood Disturbance

The Claim: The applicant testified that acoustic studies of a nearby restaurant patio (Robba Da Matti) showed noise levels were lower than ambient neighbourhood noise. He asserted the project would not only meet bylaws but outperform the attenuation of surrounding residential buildings.

The Reality: A Freedom of Information (FOI) request tells a different story.

Official Record: Over two dozen (24+) formal noise complaints have been filed specifically against the "successful" neighbour used as the applicant's benchmark. (FOI response attached)

Contradiction: The applicant's "sound study" suggests a silent operation, yet the city's own records indicate a chronic history of neighbourhood disturbance and resident complaints about the noise coming from Robba Da Matti.

Public Access vs. Exclusive Use

The Claim: When questioned about community benefits, the applicant suggested that wellness facilities, pools, and gyms would be accessible to the broader community, stating:

Nic Paoella: "Meaning that a restaurant could be used by guests. It can also be used by people in the community and so too that can mean access to wellness facilities, pools, etc."

The Reality: The Referral Report (Pg. 27) explicitly contradicts this "community benefit" narrative.

Livability concerns: The development planning staff have noted:

This food and beverage area is exclusively intended to serve the hotel guest at the outdoor amenity space Neighbour concerns regarding noise and privacy will be addressed through Rezoning conditions.

4. Conclusion

There is a fundamental "Trust Gap" in this application.

The applicant presents the noise profile as negligible, despite 24+ formal complaints at their own benchmark site.

The applicant promises "community access" to amenities that Planning's Referral Report has designated as "exclusively" for hotel guests.

So, which is it? Is it a public amenity used to justify density, or is it a private hotel facility used to satisfy noise bylaws? It cannot be both."

"This isn't just a minor 'confusion.' If the restaurant is open to the public, the noise impact will be far higher than the 'guest-only' model the City evaluated.

If it is restricted to guests, then the 'community benefits' claimed by the Applicant do not exist.

I ask Council to require the applicant to clarify these contradictions. Are we getting the 'community hub' promised in the application, or the 'exclusive hotel' described in the Referral Report? And why was a restaurant with more than 24 noise complaints used as the gold standard for acoustic safety?

We ask the Councillors to consider whether the project's impacts have been accurately represented to this hearing as you consider the rezoning application.

Additional comments submitted on March 4, 2026:

"The developer is 'gaming the system' by proposing 220 'long-term stay' units while classifying the entire building as a hotel. This allows them to bypass the higher parking requirements that apply to 'Dwelling' uses. If these units are intended for extended residency, they should be regulated as apartments with the appropriate on-site parking to prevent neighbourhood overflow."

				By classifying 81% of the building as "long-term hotel stay" rather than residential, the applicant is dodging the parking minimums required by the West End Plan. This creates a de facto apartment tower with only 55 stalls, offloading the parking burden onto the community's limited street capacity.			
2026-03-01	09:06	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>It's common sense that when there are already problems, it's counterproductive to add more problems on top. This is the case with the 2030 Barclay issue: top of which, besides added extreme density, is lack of parking. The hotel allows for only 70 parking spaces for the 248 rooms (only 28% of guests will have parking), with none extra for staff or restaurant patrons. And when there is no parking space available on the street, without a permit, even current residents have to park blocks away. Marcon has claimed that people won't arrive at this hotel with their own cars, which is an unsubstantiated and illogical claim. The lack of parking will be a permanent major irritant between the hotel and residents.</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 1, 2026:</p> <p>My apartment looks out at the entry to the alley on the backside of the proposed hotel. Hourly I see vehicles coming and going into the alley, and even without the enormous hotel proposed, vehicles are often stuck. Garbage trucks are seen backing into the alley from Chilco Street, as it is a dead end alley (ending at Stanley Park), and there is barely space in the alley for them to turn around. If 2 trucks that size are in there, they have to dance around each other to get out. Imagine adding this: all the hotel's parkade traffic coming and going will also be handled from the same back alley. What about the tractor-trailer food and drinks delivery trucks? The laundry, cleaning and other service trucks? Fire engines, ambulances, and tour buses?? [At the Feb.19 Public Hearing, Marcon stated the ludicrous, unsubstantiated statement that there will be no tour buses as the hotel's long term residents wouldn't be interested in taking tours]. Surely, the alley being a dead end, must have major logistical and safety issues. There also is completely inadequate space at the front on the street, as stopping and parking there is impossible without a permit, and current residents already often have to park blocks away. Please stop this rezoning and hotel.</p>	Jane Murphy Thomas	West End	

<p>2026-03-01</p>	<p>14:17</p>	<p>CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Dear Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>Please vote "no" on this rezoning application. Regardless of party affiliation, surely you can see the political liability of approving a rezoning application that has raised so much community opposition. All you will achieve, in this election year, is a flashing spotlight on your reputation as a developer-run Council that is not only out of touch with constituents, but recklessly acts against their best interests (while in this case, also setting up problematic accessibility conditions for Stanley Park.)</p> <p>Consider this: the very Hotel Policy that is responsible for this panic states that "consideration will be given to the APPROPRIATENESS, necessity, and supply of sites for hotel uses. The wording is "rezoning applications CAN be considered for hotel use", not that they MUST be.</p> <p>Voting "no" to this rezoning application will demonstrate that you care about livability, community vibrancy and safe streets. That you value the West End's unique character and understand the delicate nature of its proximity to an internationally beloved urban park. Don't blow this opportunity to be a good egg! You do have an "out" here. Several, in fact:</p> <p>Surely, you do not want to be associated with needlessly damaging one of the main entrances to one Vancouver's premier destinations with not only a massive luxury tower that does not suit the location, but untenable traffic conditions on Barclay St and along Lagoon Drive (and at all hours). Currently, this particular location epitomizes why people are attracted to live in and visit the West End: this is a world-famous, well-planned gem of a neighbourhood that balances population density with a deep sense of community and closeness to nature, and that prioritizes walkability and safe cycling. Why put all that at risk?</p> <p>Importantly, the West End already is, and always has been, welcoming to visitors with boutique hotels as well as hotel towers on the high streets where they belong and make sense from a transportation, massing and commercial point of view. Appropriately, the Council-approved West End community plan supports "revitalization of commercial areas along Davie, Robson, and Alberni." It does not mention commercialization within small residential streets. The same plan also says development should "recognize the history and core values of West Enders." Given the massive response by residents opposing the proposal, this stipulation will also not be respected with a decision to rezone.</p> <p>And oh the irony of receiving the Neighbourhood Slow Zone card in the mail this week, declaring the intention to "improve safety for everyone, make streets more comfortable, and promote people-friendly streets" west of Denman. How does that square with this hotel proposal that is destined to create a sharp increase in traffic in our, um, neighbourhood, as well as unsafe turnaround conditions for large delivery vehicles in a laneway with a dead end?</p> <p>Finally, per the staff report, as you know, this project has several significant design and engineering issues (including that it is physically too big for the site) that should not be ignored for the sake of a single developer who has discovered an unexpected opportunity to build a luxury high-rise where it does not belong rather than the 10-storey project already approved (basically, the hotel policy is a bank error in their favour). The hotel "business plan" as proposed is not fully realized, and in short order the building may well be converted to apartments for the very wealthy. This is conjecture, yes, but not out of the question, and if so just a "back door" contravention of the community plan. Again, surely something you do not want to be part of, right?</p> <p>Please vote no. Seriously, it is in your best interests almost as much as it is ours, as members of the West End community who are passionate about protecting what is precious about this corner of Vancouver.</p>	<p>Liesl Jauk</p>	<p>West End</p>	
-------------------	--------------	--	---------------	---	-------------------	-----------------	--

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-01	15:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I have a PhD in City & Regional Planning (University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill, 1980) for for a while taught at the UBC School of Community Regional Planning. My focus, however, was admittedly not on community development, and my career has been in computer systems, not planning.</p> <p>I moved to the West End (Chilco St) in September 2024.</p> <p>I have long been critical of the "NIMBY"s who want to keep others out of their neighbourhood. I support high densities in cities for environmental and social reasons. I would probably support a residential tower of this size in this location.</p> <p>However, I cannot support a busy commercial enterprise, a hotel and restaurant, with high traffic *and* inadequate parking, here. It would be quite disruptive to a quiet residential neighbourhood.</p>	Howard Cherniack	West End	
2026-03-01	15:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I absolutely do not support this reasoning application. There is a place for this type of building in the neighbourhood and it is not at the edge of Stanely Park. This type of development belongs on one of the major streets, Robson, Denman or Davie. The application has in no way addressing the potential negative impacts to the park, the herons or the many, many people who live in the West End.</p> <p>Approving this project will just go to show the municipal government is only servicing its interests and not the interests of the public.</p> <p>Julie Guffei 20 year neighbourhood resident.</p>	Julie Guffei	West End	
2026-03-01	17:32	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I am writing to respectfully ask Council to reject the rezoning application for the proposed Barclay Tower development.</p> <p>The West End Community Plan identified this block as an area not anticipated for significant change. That plan was developed through extensive community engagement and represents a covenant between the City and its residents. Overriding it to accommodate a 25-to-27-storey hotel sets a troubling precedent - one that undermines the value of community planning processes going forward.</p> <p>I also ask Council to consider whether this is the right project for this moment. Vancouver's housing crisis is acute, and rezoning residential land for hotel use does little to address it. When density is routinely justified as a tool to house people, it's worth asking whether this application truly serves that purpose.</p> <p>Finally, I would ask that Council not rush to a decision. Public consultation was limited, tower separation relaxations are being requested, and Park Board commissioners have raised unresolved concerns about impacts near the Stanley Park boundary.</p> <p>These are not minor procedural details - they are substantive issues that deserve thorough answers before a vote is taken.</p> <p>I trust Council to weigh these concerns carefully and to honour the planning commitments made to West End residents.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service to our city.</p>	Yasmin Pirani	West End	

2026-03-02	13:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Dear Vancouver City Council,</p> <p>Terra Crest Property Management is the property manager/owner of the following rental apartment buildings located all in West of Denman:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Diplomat - 950 Gilford Street; 38 units 2. Evergreen – 1872 Barclay Street; 21 units 3. Park Bay – 1010 Gilford Street; 41 units 4. Esplanade – 1872 Nelson Street; 35 units <p>We are strongly opposed to the above-mentioned rezoning application. Your Staff Report (January 20, 2026) has indicated that the “proposed form of development does not meet the baseline expectations of ...the West End Community Plan, it does meet the intent of the Hotel Development Policy...”. We submit that if this proposed development is approved by the City, it will indeed be the “tail” (i.e. Hotel Development Policy) wagging the “dog” (i.e. West End Community Plan).</p> <p>As to our tenants, this would lead to significant loss of neighborhood character and livability in West of Denman, the most-prized area in the whole of West End, and perhaps, even in the whole City of Vancouver.</p> <p>Sincerely, Raymond Heung President Terra Crest Property Management</p>	Raymond Heung	West End	
2026-03-02	14:55	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>My partner and I strongly oppose this hotel development proposal.</p> <p>We recently moved back to our home city and the wonderful West End neighbourhood after several years on Vancouver Island. Whenever we visited the city, we would stay at The Rosellen, a small boutique hotel that, for the most part, seems to work well in the quiet west of Denman/Stanley Park neighbourhood. However, this proposed new hotel is too massive for the area and will create numerous and negatively impactful issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increased traffic, noise and parking issues 2) Safety concerns for walkers, cyclists and daycare families 3) Environmental stressors within the Stanley Park ecosystem. <p>We urge Vancouver City Council to work with the city residents, VPB and the tourism sector to find better & innovative ways to address the need for visitor accommodations.</p>	Erin Cathro	West End	
2026-03-02	15:50	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>The west end does not have the necessary infrastructure to support the proposed hotel planned at 2028-2038 Barclay Street. In addition the noise, extra congestion and increased traffic will alter the character of the neighborhood.</p>	Fred Huston	West End	
2026-03-02	16:05	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>This hotel and commercial building does not belong in the West End. The traffic on Nelson, west of Denman, is already too much without this mammoth building. This is a quiet residential area and not at all suited to a hotel. I implore the city to deny this building going forward.</p>	Holly Macdonald	West End	
2026-03-02	16:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Re: CD-1 Rezoning RZ-2024-00065 2028-2038 Barclay Street</p> <p>Mayor Sim, Councillors - my name is Aneesh Shivaneekar. I am a long-term resident of the West End and I am writing in opposition to the rezoning application at 2028-2038 Barclay Street. I ask that this statement be entered into the public record.</p> <p>I want to be clear: I am not opposed to development. We certainly need it - but it needs to be thoughtful, pragmatic, and for the people who live here. I am opposed to this development, on this site.</p>	Aneesh Shivaneekar	West End	

1. The City's own staff say it fails the rules.

The West End Community Plan was built through years of public consultation. It is a binding commitment between this City and its residents. What this proposal asks you to do is override that commitment using the Hotel Development Policy as a loophole to achieve an FSR of 11.84 - over 430% of the 2.75 permitted in this residential zone. That is not a variance. That is a de facto rewrite of the neighbourhood plan for the benefit of a single developer.

The Referral Report (RTS 18406) makes this explicit. City Planning staff acknowledge non-compliance on height, density, lot frontage, tower separation, solar access, and land use - six separate violations. Their own words: "the proposed form of development does not meet the baseline expectations of the RM-5B zoning nor the West End Community Plan." Council is being asked to approve what its own planners say is non-compliant.

2. The policy justifying this application was written after it was filed.

The Hotel Development Policy - the sole mechanism being used here - did not exist when Marcon filed in 2024. It was created after, then amended twice with no public explanation. Policy is supposed to precede applications, not be engineered around them.

3. Engineering Services formally rejected this proposal.

The report states: "Engineering Services does not support the proposed relaxation for passenger and delivery vehicle loading spaces." Barclay Street is a designated AAA cycling corridor. A 248-room hotel with insufficient loading will push service vehicles, tour buses, and taxi turnover directly onto a residential street designed to protect pedestrians and cyclists. That is a safety failure, not just a planning one. Council approving this over its own Engineering department's formal objection demands justification.

4. The applicant cancelled public consultation.

Over 5,700 residents signed a petition in opposition. The applicant cancelled the open house, citing "safety and crowd control," and consulted only select groups of their own choosing. This project has never faced an open, uncontrolled public forum.

5. West End Community Plan

The West End Community Plan explicitly designates this area as one "not anticipated to undergo significant change." Approving a 430% density increase here tells every developer in Vancouver that any community plan can be bypassed with the right workaround and the right timing.

This Council has an obligation to defend the plan its residents built.

Finally, I want to speak plainly about the political reality. The West End is a dense, engaged, high-turnout community. The residents here are watching this vote closely - and so are communities across the city who are asking whether their community plans mean anything at all.

A vote to approve this application - to override years of public consultation in favour of a hotel developer - will be remembered in October. The voters here will remember who stood with their neighbourhood, and who did not.

I ask you to vote no, and I ask you to do it without hesitation.

Respectfully,

				Aneesh Shivaneekar <small>2011 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</small>			
2026-03-02	16:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I am completely against this zoning change and having a 25 story hotel on Barclay St. and I want my opposition counted as such. It is one thing to put up an apartment building that suits the neighbourhood but a hotel and restaurants, no way! Count my vote as no.	David MacDonald	West End	
2026-03-02	16:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	While I appreciate there needs to be more hotel space in Vancouver, building a hotel monolith is not the way to go. The noise pollution and traffic congestion is not fair to the West End. Please reconsider. M	Mike Edwards		
2026-03-02	21:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I do not support this particular application for a number of reasons I'm concerned about the impact on Stanley Park and the increased traffic, congestion and parking shortages in the area I'm concerned about the noise during construction and ongoing operations of a large hotel operation of this nature I'm concerned about the strain on local infrastructure and public services As a person born and raised in Vancouver and now a resident of the West End, I am particularly concerned about changes to neighbourhood character and community feel And finally, I'm concerned about the potential safety and pedestrian concerns	Karen Cardiff	West End	
2026-03-02	22:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Concerns include: - increased traffic congestion and parking shortages noise during both construction and ongoing operations - strain on local infrastructure and public services - changes to neighbourhood character and community feel - potential safety and pedestrian concerns	Alana McFarlane	West End	
2026-03-03	10:32	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	As a Canadian citizen and a resident of this community, I recognize that urban development is a part of a thriving city. However, this progress must not come at the cost of losing our natural environment and the unique character of our neighborhoods. I strongly oppose the proposed 25-storey hotel development at 2028-2038 Barclay Street. Our neighborhood, situated right next to Stanley Park, is defined by its tranquility and proximity to nature. Replacing a 4-storey building with a massive high-rise will not only destroy the aesthetic beauty and community feel of the area but also completely shatter the peace and quiet we value. Architecturally, a tower of this massive scale is entirely disproportionate for a location so incredibly close to Lost Lagoon and the beach. It will introduce severe visual, noise, and environmental pollution to an otherwise quiet and delicate area. Furthermore, adding a 248-unit hotel will create unsustainable traffic congestion, exacerbate parking shortages, and put immense strain on our local infrastructure and pedestrian safety. I urge the City to reconsider this proposal. Please prioritize the livability of our neighborhood, protect our natural surroundings, and reject a project that so clearly disrupts the harmony of the West End.	Sajad Nasri	West End	
2026-03-03	10:40	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I totally oppose the CD-1 Rezoning 2038 Barclay Street site to a 25 storey hotel. It does not belong in this residential neighbourhood. I am very concerned about this development as is everyone I talk to in my West End neighbourhood. Please do not give this the green light.	Ann Debeurs	West End	

2026-03-03	13:34	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Marcon pulled a bait and switch on their last slide on Feb 19th.</p> <p>They showed the tower was now 3 stories lower BUT quickly glazed over the fact that the first 3 stories (podium) was also heavily redesigned. This means all previous material and renderings are no longer relevant.</p> <p>Having read through the package I am also shocked to see imitation material being used on the lower facade. Although it was rendered as wood, it is specced as wood grain pattern aluminum cladding.</p> <p>This fake material always looks cheap and has no place in this authentic neighbourhood. Please Vote No</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 3, 2026:</p> <p>Marcon claims to have held a public information session that no one showed up too.</p> <p>6000 signatures and no one showed up Marcon? hmmm....</p>	Joshua D	West End	
2026-03-03	15:42	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I am NOT in favour of this rezoning in my local neighbourhood, which you have spoiled already with unlivable glass towers with no parking facilities, the bike lanes and one way traffic that has increased the traffic and pollution in my alley and on Barclay Street, taken away our street parking with the bike and scootie parking, ruined the intersection of Robson and Bute, as well as the decimation of Stanley Park.</p> <p>I will NOT VOTE for this Council in Oct 2026</p> <p>Supporter of Stop 2030 Barclay Team</p>	Shainul Kassam	West End	
2026-03-03	16:17	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I make these comments after attending the Public Hearing Feb 19th. These are some of my conclusions after hearing the Planning Department speak.</p> <p>1. Lack of Clear Size Parameters in the Hotel Policy At the Public Hearing, staff acknowledged that the Hotel Policy contains no defined size parameters and is applied on a case-by-case basis without a geographic lens.</p> <p>This raises a fundamental concern. A policy without scale guidance, when applied to a constrained mid-block site, becomes discretionary interpretation rather than policy compliance. The proposal is therefore not a straightforward application of policy, but an expansion of it.</p> <p>2. Failure to Meet Anticipated Urban Design Standards Staff confirmed that: The policy anticipates approximately 130 ft of frontage. This site provides 99 ft. The project cannot achieve the anticipated 80 ft tower separation. The proposal forces the adjacent property to absorb a 60 ft setback. "Urban design concerns" were identified. These are not minor variances. They indicate a structural misfit between the policy expectations and the physical realities of the site. Approval in spite of these deficiencies suggests a willingness to override core design metrics rather than adhere to them.</p> <p>3. Unresolved Engineering and Loading Concerns Engineering staff indicated: They do not support the proposed passenger/loading relaxations as submitted. Shortfalls remain. Discussions are ongoing. Key issues would be addressed at the Development Permit stage. This means that traffic and loading impacts are not resolved at the rezoning stage. Rezoning establishes use and scale. Approving before resolving engineering feasibility creates uncertainty and shifts risk forward.</p> <p>4. Conflict with the West End Plan and RM-5B Intent. A councillor stated that the proposal does not meet the baseline expectations of RM-5B or the West End Plan. Staff acknowledged that sometimes policies "bump up." The West End Plan identifies this area as one not undergoing significant change. The proposed hotel form exceeds what could be built as rental under existing zoning regulations. Staff confirmed that a rental building could proceed</p>	Margaret Chisholm	West End	

				<p>under RM-5B without rezoning. In effect: Residential use aligns with the existing plan. Hotel use requires override of that framework. That distinction is material.</p> <p>5. Financial Viability vs. Physical Fit. The applicant stated that redevelopment under 10-storey zoning "would not be compatible with our ability to redevelop." This is an economic argument, not a physical constraint argument. The site can accommodate development under current zoning. The request is for additional scale to improve financial return. Public form should be guided by policy and fit, not solely by private pro forma requirements.</p> <p>6. Precedent and Cumulative Effect. Staff stated that "there is no such thing as precedent in planning." While technically each application is considered individually, approved form and massing inevitably become reference points in future applications and appeals. This is particularly relevant where: Tower separation standards are relaxed. Frontage expectations are reduced. Scale exceeds what the Plan anticipates. Cumulative effect is a legitimate planning consideration.</p> <p>7. Geographic Diversification Rationale. The Hotel Policy seeks geographic diversification beyond the downtown core. This site is: Two blocks from Stanley Park. On the downtown peninsula. Within the established tourism and hospitality catchment. It represents expansion of the core, not diversification beyond it.</p> <p>8. Narrative Framing of Community Opposition. At the Hearing, staff referenced "tension" in community engagement. Community skepticism does not invalidate planning concerns. It reflects the scale and impact of the proposal. Public trust depends on transparent policy alignment, not characterization of residents' responses.</p> <p>9. Historical Use and Stability of the "Long-Standing Hotel" Narrative There was public uncertainty during the Hearing regarding: The exact timeline of hotel operation. Rental conversion history. Eviction context. If the justification for expansion rests on "replacement or expansion of an existing hotel," then clarity on historical continuity matters.</p> <p>Conclusion The record of the Public Hearing reveals multiple areas of instability: Policy applied without scale guardrails. Urban design metrics unmet. Engineering issues unresolved. Clear departure from the West End Plan framework. Financial viability presented as justification for increased form. Dismissal of precedent and cumulative impact. Taken together, these issues suggest that the proposal does not represent a clean alignment with adopted policy. Please say no.</p>			
2026-03-03	17:07	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Please add this to our 6000 signed petitions bringing our total to 6087</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 4:</p> <p>This rezoning goes completely against the West End Plan set out to ensure the West End grows while keeping our neighbourhoods liveable. I am shocked city hall would even accept this rezoning "loophole"</p> <p>I have been a renter in the West End for almost 40 years. This hotel rezoning has not been approved by engineering due to it's size, The Parks Board have noted no "due process". And the public, seniors network and daycare were all not consulted for feedback in a proper way. Do the right thing for the people you work for, say no to this rezoning.</p>	Maureen Wilson	West End	Appendix B
2026-03-03	17:24	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>The proposed hotel would be totally out of character with the existing long established and quiet neighborhood. As a resident of the area, I have concerns regarding construction noise and that of hotel operation afterwards. Increased traffic would bring safety and noise concerns.</p>	Allan Harris	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-03	20:00	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I am strongly opposed. The west end of Vancouver is already a great example of density done right; this will poison the well and undermine that initiative. We already have a severe traffic and parking problem, with a lack of parking for residential permit owners and drivers using Denman Street as an alternative to W Georgia. The city needs to be focusing on development, especially public transit, outside of the downtown core.	Theresa Robertson	West End	
2026-03-03	20:06	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Strongly opposed. This goes against the west end community plan and would be a slippery slope towards the destruction of the neighbourhoods character. We need housing that fits the current zoning, not hotels that don't. Instead, we should be focusing on rezoning the areas of Vancouver that don't allow for mixed-used development.	Jeremy Vandervelde	West End	
2026-03-03	20:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Yes more hotel rooms are allegedly needed. Great. However, Barclay Street is not the right location. Do not destroy the vibrant neighborhood. There is no infrastructure to support such a building. Proper studies have not been conducted. Is the old Coast hotel at full capacity? Can we not have this space be both rental and hotel?	Deborah Ebenal	West End	
2026-03-03	23:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor Sim and Councillors,</p> <p>I live a block away from the proposed development at 2028 - 2038 Barclay Street in Vancouver and I am strongly opposed to the rezoning application. I implore the council to vote no on this rezoning.</p> <p>I've lived in the West End at this location for almost 20 years. As the population has grown and parking rules have changed it is almost impossible to find parking for residents, visitors and workers. It's extremely difficult to find home services or property maintenance professionals, friends or family who will come to the neighbourhood because they can't find a place to park. Transit service doesn't support the current population and late night bus service to the West End was cut years ago when the night bus was cancelled. There are not enough buses for the area and I often have to wait for 2 or 3 buses to enter or leave the West End because the buses are full. It's even difficult to get around as a pedestrian and sometimes I wait several minutes just to cross a street because traffic is so busy. The library, community centre, stores, buses, beaches, parks and infrastructure can barely accommodate the number of people living here already. I can't afford to move to a quieter neighbourhood due to the high cost of housing and I know many neighbours in the same position.</p> <p>The site is too small for a tower with 99 feet of frontage instead of the required 130 feet. It's my understanding there has not been a formal impact study. How will you protect the environment of Stanley Park and the neighbourhood from the impact of a large scale project like this?</p> <p>Building a 25-story commercial hotel tower with 248 rooms, guests, staff, workers, visitors and deliveries will make parking impossible, add to traffic congestion, block emergency vehicle access, increase garbage, litter and noise pollution, degrade our beaches and parks and make this neighbourhood unlivable. It will also threaten the environment. It's extremely unfair to those of us who live and work here.</p> <p>Please vote no to this project and protect the residents, locals and environment.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Megan Thomas</p>	Megan Thomas	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-04	00:31	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>As I'm sure you know, there is major neighbourhood opposition to a planned 25-storey hotel at 2030 Barclay. The opposition is witnessed by a petition of over 6,000 signatures, and a ratio of "opposed" vs. "support" of approximately 6:1 (and perhaps more, as it has recently come to light that many messages in support appear to be inauthentic.)</p> <p>Many of us in the neighbourhood are puzzled by the apparent determination of the City to go through with the rezoning of 2030 Barclay St. against the communities' wishes--and despite the proposed hotel being so greatly at odds with the City's own policies. Our concern is amplified by recent media reports of scandals, ethical transgressions, accusations of secret dealings, and land management bungling on the part of certain Council members. It makes us wonder: what really underlies the City's seeming desire to impose the Hotel Development Policy on a site so ill-suited to a large hotel? A site where the long-term benefits to the City are very uncertain (i.e. the failure of the Coast Hotel on Denman Street; wasted opportunities in the development of Vancouver House, "serious mismanagement of public funds" re. False Creek South, etc.), and the risks are so high (irreparable damage to a cohesive, well-established residential community)?</p> <p>I don't think anyone denies that Vancouver could use more hotels. But! A good project in the wrong location, is, after all, still the wrong project.</p> <p>We trust that City Council will do the right thing. We will all be watching!</p>	Anita Boomer	West End	
2026-03-04	08:51	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>This hotel right next to Stanley Park on a small but busy street with a dead end lane behind is a VERY BAD IDEA. This area just cannot support a massive hotel and the business it will generate.</p> <p>Hotels of this size are supposed to be on main traffic corridors. There are is no transit support and this will make taxis and other pick up services a problem.</p> <p>It is too close to sensitive ecological areas.</p> <p>The back alley will be plugged constantly.</p> <p>It will hinder emergency services with the traffic.</p> <p>Please do not allow this to go through it is totally wrong.</p>	Gary Durban	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-04	08:54	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>This hotel development will make life much more difficult for all residents of the West End. With the greatest concern for those west of Denman Street. This is a residential, working class area. The added vehicle and human traffic in the area will cause insufferable congestion, noise and add to the already, very difficult street parking situation in the area. The noise, not only during construction but by vacationers that will be brought to the area, at all hours, will interrupt much needed sleep for the already stressed work force living here. Infrastructure is already stressed in the West End. Denman Street is virtually grid locked throughout the summer and every sunny day in all seasons. This hotel will increase this problem immensely. The added personal cars, delivery trucks, Ubers, Lyfts, taxis, buses, scooters and bicycles will make the area almost impassable and there is no sky train or subway to service the West End. Barclay Street cannot handle this congestion. There are already too many high rises in the West End. Surely you can find another location more suitable before the sun never touches the ground north of Beach Avenue. The congestion alone will create safety concerns far beyond what the pedestrian traffic already deals with. Then there is the irreparable harm to the ambience and character of the West End itself. The very character that the hotel owners want to exploit will forever be gone.</p> <p>Please decline this application. This hotel development is in the wrong place and ignores the needs of the local residents on behalf of a developer that has no qualms about destroying the very nature of the area they hope to benefit from.</p> <p>Sincerely, Michael Coates <small>§ 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy</small></p>	Michael Coates	West End	
2026-03-04	09:10	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>World class cities are made up of neighborhoods. The West End is one of Vancouver’s most special neighbourhoods-made up of long time residents many of whom are historically elder and also queer, families, small businesses, tourists and a wonderful boutique style hotel in the Sylvia. Rezoning the west end to 27 + stories of hotel takes away the special, community feel. It’s okay to want a neighbourhood to retain what makes it special! That doesn’t mean we aren’t growing as a city. It just means we are acknowledging that some neighborhoods are not for sale.</p>	Sara McLaren	Downtown	
2026-03-04	09:18	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>This so-called hotel proposal is smoke and mirrors -- a trojan horse application to secure a high-rise apartment building on this block.</p> <p>The hotel "business" proposed -- with so many long-term stay suites (eg apartments), a tiny lobby, a room number ratio that simply is not financially tenable -- is designed to fail. If approved and built, after a short period of operation that demonstrates that the business does not work, the owners will be back to Council requesting that they be able to convert to (luxury) apartments.</p> <p>Bait and switch.</p> <p>Additional comments submitted on March 4:</p> <p>Marcon is using the hotel policy NOT to add more hotel rooms to the city but to circumvent existing planning/zoning to build a luxury high-rise on this block. The hotel business is designed to fail so that they can come back to council to have it converted to residential.</p> <p>Council should look carefully at the viability of the business, not just the transparent promises of the developer.</p>	Liesl Jauk	West End	

2026-03-04	09:33	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I have lived at Robson and Chilco for fifteen years. The neighbourhood is a safe and quiet area for people of all ages . The parklets, shady streets, bicycle safe lanes and lack of through traffic are important factors .</p> <p>A large hotel with heavy vehicle traffic so close to Stanley Park on an already narrow street compromises years of careful planning and decision making by city staff and elected representatives.</p> <p>Please vote no.</p>	Ann Cowan Buitenhuis	West End	
2026-03-04	09:50	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Putting a high story hotel with retail is un expectable in this quiet peaceful Westend neighbourhood . Why would we need a massive hotel in this neighbourhood on a dead end street? I'm sure there are better options than the Westend to go ahead with this project.</p>	Jill Warkentin	West End	
2026-03-04	11:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>The proposed development is wildly inappropriate for the site and neighborhood.</p>	Doug Whitfield	West End	
2026-03-04	11:25	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>See attached file on behalf of 1960 Robson Ltd.</p>	Michael Francis McCarthy	West End	Appendix C
2026-03-04	11:29	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Honourable Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>I write once again as a longtime West End resident and President of 1960 Robson Ltd., a 26-member co-op west of Denman, urging you to reject the rezoning for 2030-2038 Barclay Street.</p> <p>In early September we sent you, via Canada Post, our petition against this proposal that threatens our neighbourhood's low-rise character, livability, public views near Stanley Park, and opens the door to further speculation. We didn't hear back from any of you at that time.</p> <p>Now it is crunch-time — the critical period when decisive action is needed in a high-pressure setting with competing interests. Planners and developers versus the people.</p> <p>Public opposition to this proposal is overwhelming and record-breaking.</p> <p>The City's referral report shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,570 total submissions received. • 882 online comments, with 736 (83%) opposed — citing neighbourhood fit, traffic, parking, and livability. • 189 Q&A submissions and 499 emails/letters (=480 opposed). • A petition with about 5,700 signatures. <p>This far exceeds typical opposition — engagement was reportedly five times the previous Shape Your City record. Other major initiatives drew strong pushback, but nowhere near this volume.</p> <p>As you know, The West End Community Plan (2013) is a 30-year vision for balanced growth, calling for six-storey scale and neighbourhood fit. This proposal seeks over 12 FSR — four times the current limit — and adds no housing.</p> <p>This and prior councils have enabled Vancouver to become one of the world's most favourable cities for transnational elites, who treat our real estate as "safety deposit boxes,"</p>	Gary Tagalog	West End	

driving up prices and displacing locals.

When that speculative boom faltered in the early 2020s, the City pivoted to rentals via policies for six-storey buildings along arterials. But with rents now falling sharply (down 7.9% year-over-year, averaging \$2,630, and vacancy rates at 30-year highs), developers and the City have shifted to the new Hotel Development Policy (approved April 2025, amended July) targeting 10,000 rooms by 2050.

The Marcon/Henriquez proposal exemplifies this opportunism: The site began as the 1959 four-storey Rosellen Suites hotel. In 2018, Marcon secured 2022 approval for a 10-storey luxury condo tower (19 units) amid the elite investor boom. As condo market softened, they scrapped it (2022-2024) and pivoted to a 29-storey hotel (292 rooms, 100.3 m) in July 2024, revised to 27 storeys (270 rooms, 88 m), with staff now recommending 25 storeys (248 rooms, 83 m) — chasing the latest trend as rentals weaken.

As your planners continually tell you, the Hotel Policy overrides the West End Community Plan for existing hotel sites, granting extra density and height. Yet, the city’s website states: “This application is not consistent with Council-adopted policies.”

As if that were not enough, a last-minute amendment by ABC Coun. Sarah Kirby-Yung — despite staff warnings that it would diminish revenue for public facilities — allows private amenities (gyms, pools, conference spaces, etc.) in such hotels to count toward Community Amenity Contributions, reducing public benefits.

While the proposal aligns with the Hotel Policy’s goal of increasing hotel supply, it overrides the 30-year West End Community Plan — shaped by extensive community input — with limited transparency or justification. This creates a fundamental tension: short-term hotel expansion trumping long-established neighbourhood protections.

Retired architect and former Vancouver City Planning Commission member Rob Grant* stated:

> “I think the fact that a developer is getting such an uplift in land value is almost unconscionable. What are the negotiations? It’s all behind closed doors. What kind of community amenity contributions are going to go with this thing, the up-zoning of this land?
...
>
> You’re getting clever architects and developers who really know how to game the system ... and it’s got nothing to do with what we need in the West End, which is affordable housing...
>
> If the planning department was so serious about these hotels, what about the Empire Landmark — the tallest building in the West End, on Robson Street. It was a hotel. It took two years to demolish, and then they put up two condo towers.”

We support more hotel capacity, but not at the expense of established community plans. Approving this would erode trust, set a harmful precedent for residential areas, and prioritize short-term developer gains over long-term liveability.

Councillors, which policy truly overrides the other: the publicly-approved 30-year West End Community Plan or this rushed developer-friendly Hotel Development Policy that bends rules for industry?

The numbers are clear: massive opposition, 83% in comments, thousands of petition signers.

				<p>Respect the community's voice. Reject this rezoning and protect the West End.</p> <p>I close with a phrase my friend uses as his email signature: "Your vote is your voice."</p> <p>Saturday, October 17, 2026: Civic Election in Vancouver.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Gary Tagalog, Secretary On behalf of the Shareholders</p> <p>1960 Robson Ltd.</p> <p>P.S. We invite you to visit our unique neighbourhood before you vote. The herons have once again returned to their nests.</p>			
2026-03-04	11:34	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>Strongly oppose to this development, for the following reasons: The West End character, neighborhood qualities, and life quality are clearly a product of the previous and existing Zoning rules and regulations. This development clearly deviates from those rules, as exposed in their "Application Booklet". Among other inaccuracies, and embellishments within their "Application Booklet" : - There appear to be errors in the "Pooh Corner Shadow Analysis". The shadow areas on the child care are larger than presented in the report. (Section 3.8) - It can clearly be seen that the for the West End zone, the max permitted building heigh is 58m. The proposed height is 88m. 51% increase over max permitted. The max FSR area (measure of how "full" the lot will be) permitted is 3.6k (m2) while the proposed is 15.3k (m2). 366% increase over max permitted. (Section 4.2)</p> <p>The surrounding lanes and streets, are already at maximum capacity with permit parking. The hotel will need to remove street parking in order to ensure passenger drop off. Making it even more difficult for current residents to find parking. Local traffic will be considerably increased in Barclay, Nelson, Haro, and Lagoon Drive. Some of these streets already see pretty heavy traffic. Hotel + restaurant supply vans and trucks, will need to transit and park in the area. The proposal includes 20 bicycle stalls for 290 units... yet claims to support the Transportation 2040 Plan.</p> <p>I believe that the West End is more in need of livable affordable housing, than high end hotels.</p> <p>Regardless of the lot use, the proposed development should be closer (if not within) to existing maximum zoning limits.</p>	Carlos Montoya	West End	
2026-03-04	11:56	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	<p>I oppose this application for the following reasons: risks to the wildlife at the Park increase traffic congestion and parking shortage strain on local infrastructure and public services changes to neighbourhood and our community potential safety and pedestrian concerns</p>	Ruth MacNeill		

CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-04	11:59	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	Project is not consistent with West End Community Plan. Traffic on Barclay Street has been greatly increased by traffic pattern changes on Haro and Robson and at times is almost gridlock. New high-rises on Robson are compounding the problem.	Donna Knox	West End	
2026-03-04	12:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I still completely oppose this proposed project. This is not a an area that should be used to have a 25 storey hotel building. It would change the character and community feel of our neighborhood with increased traffic congestion, noise and potential safety concerns. Nelson street which is parallel to Barclay street has had a large increase in traffic with cars exiting Stanley Park. This hotel project would also increase the traffic on Barclay Street. The streets in this area are narrow, so even more traffic would cause further potential safety and pedestrian concerns. I'm not against development and growth, BUT this is not the right place to add a 25 storey hotel building. We should also consider this city's beautiful Stanley Park. A hotel so close is absolutely not needed. There are so many other places for new hotels to be built. I don't even understand why the owner of the building thinks that this is such a great project. I understand that money and development are important but not when it just doesn't make sense..The city should be thinking more about how to keep our beautiful Vancouver beautiful and come up with projects that go that way... Thank you, Viviane Bedard	Viviane Bedard	West End	
2026-03-04	13:10	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I vehemently oppose this development! It does NOT belong in a residential neighbourhood, nor does it belong that close to Stanley Park. The infrastructure is already strained with other developments and it will increase the traffic and other noise around the neighbourhood exponentially. Stop catering to the developers and start cetering to the people who elected you!!	B. Milligan	West End	
2026-03-04	13:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	I write to oppose the application that would allow the construction of a high-rise hotel in the 2000 block of Barclay Street. The existing regulations protect the character of the neighbourhood, which is long-established residential area, quiet and tree-lined. A large commercial enterprise will significantly alter, for the worse, the quality of life for local residents. I rely on the Council to act in the best interests of West End residents, rather than the commercial ambitions of hotel developers. We are taxpayers and voters who will be in Vancouver long after the developers have moved on.	Kathleen Rittenhouse	West End	
2026-03-04	13:50	CD-1 Rezoning: 2028-2038 Barclay Street	Oppose	The word (based on good authority) is that the developer is misusing the hotel development policy here to scam the City. Building a 25-storey hotel they know will fail (as did the Coast Plaza before it), so they can appeal to the City to permit its conversion to luxury apartments on a site where a residential building of that size would otherwise not be permitted. So, the project is wrong on both counts! Wrong to wedge a hotel of that size on an undersized lot surrounded by narrow residential streets. And wrong as a scam to do an end-run around existing city policy.	Anita Boomer	West End	

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

Vancouver BC

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

February 24/2026

To whom it may concern,

Re: Re-Zoning: 2028 – 2038 Barclay St

I'm writing to express my concern over the proposed development on Barclay St. I fully realise that neighbourhoods need to evolve and cannot remain static, and that development is inevitable. However, I firmly believe that affordable housing should be the priority, not high-rise temporary accommodation for visitors, as opposed to new builds that benefit locals.

Building hotels seems counter intuitive. Hotels on Robson St have been demolished in favour of building residential units. Why demolish hotels on Robson in favour of residential, then demolish residential in the West End in favour of hotels? Hotels are going out of business worldwide, Airbnb has killed that industry. It makes no sense to introduce accommodation for tourists, foreign visitors and business people (as opposed to Vancouverites) in a neighbourhood that boasts such a wonderful community spirit. Vancouver thrives and succeeds as a city largely because it has distinct neighbourhoods with distinctive "personalities". Erecting a giant hotel (and successors to it as well, in a worst case scenario) will irreparably damage the fabric of the unique "west of Denman" area that's a source of pride and pleasure to those of us privileged to live there.

As a layperson, I'm not sure what the designation "Comprehensive Development District" implies, but it sounds bad! I know that other areas of Barclay St, close to Burrard, may be decimated in order to build unaffordable mega towers. It would be extremely distressing if "west of Denman" were to meet the same soulless fate.

Please consider the immense losses that West Enders will experience as a result of "new yorking" our precious neighbourhood. Instead, focus on finding ways to create genuinely affordable homes (modular, low rise as opposed to prestigious condo palaces) that will benefit our local community and the city as a whole.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

Sharon Cohen



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Home Address				
	Signature	Apt.#	# & Street	City	Postal Code
E. WALLACE	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"				Vancouver
J Hood					Vancouver
E. DALGLEISH					Vancouver
Bev Ferguson					Vancouver
Karin Kumovz					Vancouver
Nicole Nanton					Vancouver
Hunter Lemmings					Vancouver
Jim Elliot					Vancouver



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
Graham Best	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Mohak Mehta				Vancouver	
Megha Sharma				Vancouver	
Suzanne Murphy				Vancouver	
GERAY MURPHY				Vancouver	
Wahid Ben				Vancouver	
Helen Babalos				Vancouver	
TONY POWERS				Vancouver	

648



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address			
		Apt.#	# & Street	City	Postal Code
MEAGHAN KENNEDY	[Redacted Signature Column]	[Redacted Apt.# Column]	[Redacted # & Street Column]	Vancouver ✓	[Redacted Postal Code Column]
JACK TAYLOR				Vancouver	
A LESLIE REEKIE				Vancouver	
Rick Gyles				Vancouver	
Diane				Vancouver	
James Bryce				Vancouver	
JOSE INOENCIO				Vancouver Var	
Brian Mackinnon				Vancouver	

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
Eva Iglesias Gómez	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Chris Lane				Vancouver	
Gravin Thompson				Vancouver	
Mitra Mayer				Vancouver	
David McEwen				Vancouver	
Laurel Santa				Vancouver	
Steen Chrones				Vancouver	
TOM FORD				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
J M HANSON	[Redacted Signature Area]		835	Vancouver	[Redacted Postal Code Area]
Rachael Fisher				Vancouver	
Alex Zetino				Vancouver	
Tania Gutierrez				Vancouver	
[Signature]				Vancouver	
WILFREDO ORTIZ RICO				Vancouver	
GWEN McMILLAN				Vancouver	
Lisa Mohammed				Vancouver	

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
BE HOUTMAN	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver BC	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Liam Wilkins				Vancouver Vancouver	
SARA JOHNSON				Vancouver	
MONIKA HILSON				Vancouver	
MARY ANN VICKERS				Vancouver	
Sophia Estraya				Vancouver	
Farnaz Estraya				Vancouver	
Kanako Hayashi				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
Rick Leouyer	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver E11	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Suksham Shan				Vancouver	
Lynn Reiter				Vancouver	
Bruce Bolour				Vancouver	
JIRINA JUDAS				Vancouver	
Rajus Sirkunas				Vancouver	
Ronnie Seppala				Vancouver	
BK				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
Devil Johal	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver BC	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Craig Befus				Vancouver BC	
MIKE COSGROVE				Vancouver ✓	
Zachary Bora				Vancouver ✓	
Sebastian M. Sanchez				Vancouver	
SOFIA BEDYNSKI				Vancouver	
Luis Fernando Rivera Carrasco.				Vancouver ✓	
Jean Jones				Vancouver ✓ ✓	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
MATTHEW PATER	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Justin Gourlay				Vancouver	
Prestley Olson				Vancouver	
MARIA PATOSKA				Vancouver	
George Stepanenko				Vancouver	
Brianne Soles				Vancouver	
Amir Singh				Vancouver	
Erin Sheppard				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
Christian Nicolay	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver ✓	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Carla Gray				Vancouver ✓	
ZAN STEFAN				Vancouver ✓	
JANINA MORALES				Vancouver ✓	
Isabella Brittan				Vancouver	
CAROL + PIERRE BEAUREGAR				Vancouver ✓	
Camille Chan				Vancouver	
Hadie Martin				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
T. STRACHAN	"s. 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	"s. 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Ahleh Jaberi				Vancouver	
Leanne Dao				Vancouver	
Eddie Fildp.				Vancouver	
Natalie P.				Vancouver	
Shirley Sidewell				Vancouver	
Alexander Tse				Vancouver	
Jackman				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Home Address			City	Postal Code
	Signature	Apt.#	# & Street		
CONCORDIA JAYME	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Jessica Leclair				Vancouver	
Elske Blom				Vancouver	
A Moller				Vancouver	
Alice Li				Vancouver	
D. MILOSEVIC				Vancouver	
Nina Centola				Vancouver	
Meg Willis				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Home Address				
	Signature	Apt.#	# & Street	City	Postal Code
Buak Kocaturk	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	[Redacted]
Noah M.				Vancouver	
Hussein Shaalan				Vancouver	
Terry Riddinger				Vancouver	
Moham Mahmed				Vancouver	
David Mitchell				Vancouver	
Chris Dawkins				Vancouver	
Anna Kovacevic				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
LISA GAYLE				Vancouver	
RAY BRUNETTE				Vancouver	
TYLER MEAD				Vancouver	
Adarely Mora				Vancouver	
Kalib Starnes				Vancouver	
Bill Black				Vancouver	
Dawn HUBBARD				Vancouver	
CARSON TING				Vancouver	

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
Armando Gomez	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
Cole Taylor				Vancouver	
Max Fardousi				Vancouver	
Aida Galsomanda				Vancouver	
Rob Carter				Vancouver	
CHRIS NEEL				Vancouver	
RON McLEAN				Vancouver	
Sanka Zaleska				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address		City	Postal Code
		Apt.#	# & Street		
SIMONE COLEGNÌ	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"			Vancouver	"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"
CANDIE TANAKA				Vancouver	
STEPHEN MILNE				Vancouver	
DIVYA SHETTY				Vancouver	
Robbie Dahle				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Signature	Home Address			
		Apt.#	# & Street	City	Postal Code
Dana Whelan				Vancouver	
Paul Mija				Vancouver	
Eliza Lee				Vancouver	
Yati				Vancouver	
Katerina Bastarova				Vancouver	
Lenka Antropiusova				Vancouver	
Anakameganu				Vancouver	
Ati Hooshmand				Vancouver	

s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act



PETITION TO REJECT 2030 BARCLAY HOTEL PROPOSAL

We, the undersigned Vancouver residents and supporters of the West End, call on the Honorable Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver to reject the rezoning (file number: RZ-2024-00065) of 2030-2038 Barclay Street for a 27-storey, 270-room hotel tower at 88 m (289 ft.) and 12.75 FSR (four times the allowed density).

This project adds no housing and conflicts with:

- (1) West End Community Plan: New development must fit the neighbourhood's character, maintain a primarily 6 storey scale, and prioritize active and public transit.
- (2) West End RM Guidelines: Required tower separation.
- (3) Council's Hotel Development Policy: 3.5 FSR (density), six-storey, 22 m. limits.

Allowing it would harm livability, worsen traffic on narrow streets with large service trucks and visitor's vehicles, and infringe on residents' right to quiet enjoyment -while setting a dangerous precedent for out-of-scale development.

We urge City Council to uphold zoning rules, respect community plans, and reject this proposal.

NAME (print please)	Home Address				
	Signature	Apt.#	# & Street	City	Postal Code
SUZANNE WALKER.	[Redacted Signature]	[Redacted Apt.#]	[Redacted # & Street]	Vancouver	[Redacted Postal Code]
Isabel Hanes				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	
				Vancouver	

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"

Mar 1, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260597661405058/sign_docu	William Runge
Mar 1, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260595329279066/sign_docu	Alison Maher
Feb 27, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260578493364064/sign_docu	Blair Galston
Feb 24, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260548623746060/sign_docu	Anita Hansen
Feb 23, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260536479578069/sign_docu	Josie Pang
Feb 22, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260526920662053/sign_docu	Susan McNicol
Feb 22, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260526860123048/sign_docu	Sara Hajduk
Feb 21, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260520938834057/sign_docu	Chantel Bennett
Feb 21, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260518373775061/sign_docu	Sarah Chester
Feb 21, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260515326290048/sign_docu	hudson darling
Feb 20, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260503962379059/sign_docu	Tracie Miles

https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/648222117979925
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/648194690129525
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/648053821282836
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647804542701234
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647695383731322
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647613518126482
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647611695911259
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647552816138507
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647540812942626
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647511106411901
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647409790731737

Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260501208205038/sign_docu	Angela Fearn
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260497765494070/sign_docu	Sharon Bell
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260498151916059/sign_docu	Bob Pospiech
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260497423903056/sign_docu	Scott Bourgeois
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260495214005045/sign_docu	Morgan Kolic
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494083629060/sign_docu	Dar St Louis
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494273309056/sign_docu	Bonnie Bowen
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494299522061/sign_docu	Katherine La Pla
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494187478067/sign_docu	Bonnie Bowen
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494122537052/sign_docu	Dave Pixley
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494272275057/sign_docu	Jonathan Ireson

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"

https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647379562217177
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647362979601862
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647361490918124
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647353519031134
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647333506901675
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647325498111253
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647323276001585
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647323121011160
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647322993001254
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647322807744448
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647322074862322

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"

Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260493889800064/sign_docu	Lena Darling	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647320656411197
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260494020373047/sign_docu	Robin Goldfarb	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647319134451853
Feb 19, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260492229546058/sign_docu	Marilyn Grace	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647306286678588
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260490618560054/sign_docu	Margaret Hume	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647289715661247
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260490468663061/sign_docu	Bretton Lewis	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647288530941457
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260489304835059/sign_docu	Ezra Poplove	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647283447501785
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260488542539063/sign_docu	Hannah Skolrood	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647283183501540
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260488344675064/sign_docu	Calder Funk	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647282462362846
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260487678711064/sign_docu	Stephanie Dudul	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647274281671880
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260487083230050/sign_docu	Tuija Seipell	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647270731281856
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260485561443055/sign_docu	Mike Greig	ps://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/2523775658067/647246149841216

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"

Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260485180336053/sign_docu	Ed Kopera
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260485282457060/sign_docu	Colleen Busby
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260485000588053/sign_docu	Bob Pospiech
Feb 18, 2026	https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/signed/260482475617059/sign_docu	Sharron O'Brien

https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647245804702125
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647244685922207
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647244049816638
https://www.jotform.com/uploads/stopbarclay/252377537658067/647221819392215



**PETITION OPPOSING THE REZONING OF 2030-2038 BARCLAY STREET
(ROSELLEN SUITES) IN VANCOUVER’S WEST END**

Rezoning Application: RZ-2024-00065

Address: 2030-2038 Barclay Street, Vancouver, BC

Proposal: Replace the four-storey Rosellen Suites with a 27-storey (289-foot) hotel and long-term stay building (originally 29 storeys, 329 feet) with 270 units (65 hotel rooms, 205 serviced apartments), a restaurant, rooftop amenities, and four-level underground parking, requiring a CD-1 rezoning from RM-5B zoning.

**To: The Mayor of Vancouver
Vancouver City Council
The City Clerk of Vancouver
The Planning Department
The Urban Design Panel**

Date: September 2, 2025

We, the undersigned West End residents and concerned citizens, strongly oppose the rezoning of 2030-2038 Barclay Street.

Marcon Developments’ 27-storey hotel proposal replaces a 2022-approved 10-storey, 19-unit condominium that aligned with RM-5B zoning and the West End Community Plan’s residential focus. By cancelling that permit for a 450% density increase—driven by Vancouver’s projected need for 10,000 hotel rooms by 2050 (Destination Vancouver, 2023)—Marcon prioritises profit over community needs, setting a dangerous precedent for unplanned high-rise development in the West End.

This rezoning violates the 30-year West End Community Plan (2013–2043), shaped by 7,551 residents across 110 consultations to preserve residential character and restrict high-rises to Thurlow, Robson, Davie, and Alberni Streets. The City acknowledges, “This application is not consistent with Council-adopted policies” (shapeyourcity.ca/2030-2038-barclay-st), undermining its partnership with residents. The proposal endangers the Stanley Park Great Blue Heron colony, heightens seismic risks, and disrupts the West End’s liveable public realm. We urge the City to reject this rezoning, honour the 2013 social contract, and pursue developments that support sustainable, residential-focused growth.

**SUBMISSION OF PETITION OPPOSING REZONING OF
2030-2038 BARCLAY STREET (RZ-2024-00065)**

September 2, 2025

Dear Ms. Leckovic, City Clerk:

On behalf of West End residents and Shareholders of 1960 Robson Ltd., we submit the attached petition opposing the rezoning of 2030-2038 Barclay Street (Application RZ-2024-00065).

The proposed 27-storey hotel violates the West End Community Plan (2013–2043), endangers the Stanley Park Great Blue Heron colony, and undermines the neighbourhood’s liveability and residential character.

Our co-op has a history of advocating for the West End, successfully influencing policies like the 1973 traffic calming measures and view corridor protections, with past councils responding to ensure community liveability.

We request that this petition be distributed to the Mayor, Vancouver City Council, Planning Department, and Urban Design Panel for consideration in the rezoning process, including the public hearing for RZ-2024-00065.

Please confirm receipt and provide a written response within 45 days.

Sincerely,

Michael Francis McCarthy, President
On behalf of the Board of Directors & Shareholders
1960 Robson Ltd.

"s.14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act"

Key Reasons for Opposition

- **Broken Commitment to Residential Preservation:** The West End Community Plan limits high-rise redevelopment to four corridors (Thurlow, Robson, Davie, Alberni), preserving areas like Barclay Street for low- to mid-rise buildings (up to 190 feet). This 27-storey hotel violates that commitment, with the City admitting policy inconsistency (West End Community Plan, p. 122; shapeyourcity.ca/2030-2038-barclay-st), eroding trust and the West End's residential character.
- **Threat to Stanley Park's Heron Colony:** Within the 260-metre buffer of a major urban heronry at 2099 Beach Avenue (active since 2001), the site supports 80% of BC's Pacific Great Blue Herons (4,000–5,000 adults). Construction noise exceeding 100 dB may reduce fledgling survival rates, risking colony abandonment—a significant loss for this federally protected species and Stanley Park's ecosystem (West End Community Plan, p. 74; Environment Canada, 2019).
- **Severe Seismic Risk:** The City's November 2024 Seismic Risk Report identifies the West End, west of Denman, as Vancouver's highest-risk area due to water-logged, silty soils prone to liquefaction. Excavation for four-level underground parking may destabilise nearby older buildings housing long-term renters. A magnitude 7.2 quake could impact over 6,100 buildings citywide, costing \$17 billion (City of Vancouver, 2024).
- **Excessive Scale and Precedent:** At 289 feet—52% over the 190-foot RM-5B limit—the tower creates shadows, worsens wind effects, and invites high-rises into residential zones, defying height guidelines. This risks transforming the West End's character into a high-rise corridor, undermining its walkable, human-scaled appeal (West End Community Plan, p. 54).
- **Erosion of Community Trust:** The plan's participatory process, engaging 7,551 residents, promised a stable West End. Approving this rezoning mid-term breaks that commitment, bypassing the collaborative governance residents expect (West End Community Plan, p. 18).
- **Environmental and Social Irresponsibility:** By prioritising profit, the hotel undermines the plan's sustainability goals and Vancouver's need for affordable housing (e.g., 10,000-unit shortage, City of Vancouver Housing Needs Report, 2024). It replaces potential permanent residences with transient accommodations, disregarding inclusive neighbourhood goals (West End Community Plan, p. 19).
- **Noise and Commercial Disruption:** Construction, deliveries, a restaurant patio, and rooftop pool with liquor service will generate noise potentially exceeding 70 dB (violating City bylaws), turning a quiet residential area into a commercial hub and disrupting residents' quality of life (West End Community Plan, p. 85).
- **Public Realm Impacts:** The tower's height and massing will cast shadows, create wind tunnels, and disrupt Barclay Street's pedestrian-friendly character, reducing access to sunlight and green spaces vital to the West End's liveable public realm (West End Community Plan, p. 85).

Precedent-Setting Implications

Approving this rezoning risks enabling similar CD-1 applications across the West End, undermining the 30-year framework of the West End Community Plan (2013–2043). The City has previously rejected non-compliant high-rise proposals in residential zones due to community opposition and misalignment with zoning policies (City of Vancouver Rezoning Archives, vancouver.ca). Allowing Marcon’s significant density increase could embolden developers to target other low-rise areas, eroding the West End’s residential character and displacing long-term residents.

Alternative Development Options

The City should prioritise projects that preserve tenant housing and respect RM-5B zoning. A low- to mid-rise residential project at 2030-2038 Barclay Street could add 20–30 affordable units, align with the plan, protect the heron colony, and maintain neighbourhood stability.

Past Community Advocacy

Shareholders of 1960 Robson Ltd. have long championed initiatives to enhance the West End’s quality of life.

In the 1970s, we successfully advocated to stop Stanley Park Causeway traffic from flowing onto Chilco Street, leading to the creation of North America’s first traffic-calming mini-parks at Chilco and Robson. This effort improved the neighbourhood’s walkability and liveability, reflecting a vision for a pedestrian-friendly urban environment (Viewpoint Vancouver, viewpointvancouver.ca/2020/04/25/where-it-began-the-chilco-cul-de-sac).

In the 2000s, we rallied at an Urban Design Panel meeting to oppose the placement of a tower at 1900 West Georgia Street (“Laguna Parkside”) that threatened a Robson Street view corridor to Coal Harbour. The panel agreed, stating, “Moving the tower back is a public benefit because it creates a visual amenity for the community” (City of Vancouver Urban Design Panel Minutes, March 31, 2004, vancouver.ca/files/cov/urban-design-panel-minutes-mar-31-04.pdf).

The City has historically responded to our advocacy to preserve the West End’s liveability, and we expect the same commitment to reject this rezoning proposal.

Call to Action

We urge the City to reject the rezoning of 2030-2038 Barclay Street, uphold the West End Community Plan’s vision for a sustainable, residential-focused community, and protect the neighbourhood’s unique character for current and future residents.

SIGNATURES:

1. Name: Michael McCarthy
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: 2025-08-30
Signature: [REDACTED]
2. Name: Gary Tagalog
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: 2025.08.30
Signature: [REDACTED]
3. Name: Petra Wright
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: 2025-08-30
Signature: [REDACTED]
4. Name: Jan Wiest
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: AUG 30/25
Signature: [REDACTED]
5. Name: VERNA DUDLEY
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: Aug 30/25
Signature: [REDACTED]
6. Name: PEGGY MONRO
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: Aug 30 2025
Signature: [REDACTED]
7. Name: BRUCE HILLIER
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: Aug 29, 2025
Signature: [REDACTED]
8. Name: Seresia Deveson
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: Aug 30, 2025
Signature: [REDACTED]
9. Name: GABY MAYER
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: AUG 30 2025
Signature: [REDACTED]
10. Name: Kase McKinnon
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: Aug 30/2025
Signature: [REDACTED]
11. Name: CYNTHIA FLOOD
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: 30th August /2025
Signature: [REDACTED]
12. Name: DEAN SINNETT
Address: § 14 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
Email/Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: 30 Aug 2025
Signature: [REDACTED]

13. Name: Ann Marie Bennett
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Aug. 30, 2025 gmail.com
Signature: [Redacted]

19. Name: Bill Pettit
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: AUGUST 31, 2025
Signature: [Redacted]

14. Name: Richard Desrosier
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: AUG 30, 2025
Signature: [Redacted]

20. Name: STACYN YUAN
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Aug 31 / 2025
Signature: [Redacted]

15. Name: Maureen Girvan
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: 30 Aug / 2025 gmail.com
Signature: maureengirvan

21. Name: Don Moore
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Aug 30, 2025
Signature: (for) [Redacted]

16. Name: JACQUEEN HAYES
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: AUG. 30, 2025
Signature: [Redacted]

22. Name: Valda Vidners
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Aug 30, 2025
p.p. Signature: (for) [Redacted]

17. Name: GILBERT BOWLER
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: 30 Sept 2025
Signature: [Redacted]

23. Name: Gordon Drilow
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Sept 1, 2025
p.p. Signature: (for) [Redacted]

18. Name: PHILIP HANSEN
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Aug 31/25
Signature: [Redacted]

24. Name: Chris Green
Address: [Redacted]
Email/Phone: [Redacted]
Date: Sept 1 2025
p.p. Signature: (for) [Redacted]

25. Ann Cowan
202-2060 Robson
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Sept 2, 2025
p.p. Ann Cowan, President
(for) ANN COWAN