

CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-16	18:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	MAYOR AND COUNCIL PLEASE REJECT THIS APPLICATION AS MT. PLEASANT IS ON OVERLOAD FOR BUILDING. MANY PEOPLE HAVE BEEN RENO/DEMOVICTED AND THIS NEEDS TO STOP.	Leona Rothney	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-16	19:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	This city can’t allow for the displacing of residents for a hotel. This is beyond cruel. Please vote against this project. There are no amendments that can make this ok. Please vote against this.	Matthew De Marchi	Renfrew-Collingwood	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-17	14:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	Dear Mayor Sim and Council, If this is approved, I would like the staff recommendation to be amended. I do agree that Vancouver has a severe hotel shortage and a severe housing shortage. The referral report states: "The applicant has offered to provide additional support to help all existing eligible tenants find new housing if the project is approved and relocation is required. This will include assistance with identifying appropriate housing in consideration of tenant priorities as identified in the tenant needs survey and additional one-on-one conversations, at rental rates that do not exceed 20% below city-wide average rents, subject to tenant income eligibility." I did not hear any statements at the hearing that contradict this. My understanding is that if a rental building is replaced with another rental building, the evicted tenants can return at the same rent or 20% below CMHC average, whichever is lower, regardless of their income. It does not make sense to treat tenants evicted from other buildings due to redevelopment any differently. I raised very similar concerns with planners in consultations before the Broadway Plan was approved. My perception was that developers did not want to treat all of the below market rentals created in the area as a common pool because they do not trust the City to coordinate filling vacant apartments expeditiously. I do not see that as an insurmountable problem. Simply removing the income eligibility requirements for "demovicted" tenants from other buildings for BMR ("below market rental") apartments everywhere would help a lot, and seems relatively simple. Better would be to require a right of first refusal for tenants in buildings awaiting demolition. I think facilitating single moves to homes in new buildings within the Broadway area would be better in general than the current system of temporary moves with rent top-ups followed by a move back, and it cannot hurt as a voluntary option. It is also unclear to me if tenants who meet income eligibility requirements are entitled to be offered a BMR apartment in another building, or if only a "best effort" on the part of the developer is required. Will demolition permits be held up if moderate income tenants have not been offered an affordable apartment? Finally, if there were an option to build secured rental on top of light industrial in addition to, or instead of, the proposed hotel use, would the developer take it? As the first speaker last night indicated, it seems this is an option in line with recent actions by Council regarding other industrial-zoned lots. I think this avenue should at least be fully exhausted before proceeding. It is not clear to me what problem general unfunded below-market rental, as opposed to tenant right-of-first-refusal at previous rents, is expected to solve. In principal, and comparing other cities, I believe that, in the absence of overriding zoning constraints, the BMR requirements should be expected to make housing generally less affordable due to the knock-on effect of less new housing causing higher rents in already existing buildings. It is like a lottery with a few lucky winners where most of the money from the "tickets" goes to existing landlords and is paid by tenants with similar incomes to the few winners. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Sincerely, Owen Brady	Owen Brady	Hastings-Sunrise	

CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-17	17:08	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	I oppose this proposal because I do not believe any hotel could provide greater public value than preserving people's homes, housing security, and long-standing communities. No projected economic benefit can justify prioritizing tourist accommodation over the fundamental need for people to have a stable place to live.	Kiera Harkins	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-18	12:18	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	I am appalled that we are considering developing hotels on existing rental housing and displacing tenants, including vulnerable families and senior citizens, some who have called 75 E 8th Ave their home for decades. The long term stay model is akin to an airBNB, high profit, low employment model. I don't understand how you state on this very website that the tenants will be protected under the Tenants Act when they will not be offered anywhere to move back to. Regardless, this is unacceptable. The World Cup has exposed there is no shortage of hotel rooms. There is no hotel crisis. Vancouver's housing crisis drags on and on and ABC has this opportunity to show the people of Vancouver whose side they are on: profit and developers, or working class people?	Nadia Turanski-Gauthier	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-07-18	21:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	Opposed	Lewis N Villegas	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-19	19:53	CD-1 Rezoning: 75 East 8th Avenue	Oppose	We're in a housing crisis. I am not in favour of removing affordable housing stock for an "extended stay hotel" . A vote for this up-zoning means prioritizing short term rentals over long-term, affordable housing. It seems in this economic downturn it is imperative to support residents who want to stay in their affordable homes. Building an extended stay hotel will provide lucrative profits for developers while displacing people on fixed incomes, including seniors. I'm also concerned about tenants' right to return as their homes are not being replaced with housing to return to. The justification that Vancouver is facing a critical hotel shortage has been proven false, as occupancy dropped sharply this summer, even with the FIFA World Cup.	Rachel Burns	Grandview-Woodland	