

Vancouver Official Development Plan and Regional Context Statement Amendments for Former Molson Brewery Site - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-18	21:41	Vancouver Official Development Plan and Regional Context Statement Amendments for Former Molson Brewery Site	Oppose	Oppose	Lewis N Villegas	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-19	23:16	Vancouver Official Development Plan and Regional Context Statement Amendments for Former Molson Brewery Site	Oppose	I oppose the amendments as presented. While industrial use is likely no longer appropriate for these lands, I do not support more towers, particularly in view of the towers that are already being built at Senakw, bringing unprecedented density to an area that has neither the infrastructure nor the public amenities, parks and community centres to support it. Before proceeding with this change the City needs to address these gaps . The Senakw density should be assimilated before more is added. The City promotes densification and high-rises but we hear little about improving infrastructure such as roads, public transit and water infrastructure. In just one small example the City is allowing the ponds at Vanier Park to go dry because of water shortages, at the expense of public enjoyment and nature habitat. Summer water restrictions are earlier than in the past. Traffic congestion in the City is increasing and in particular and can be expected to worsen in this area with the build-out and occupancy of the Senakw development given the lack of any real planning for that development. Is there a comprehensive traffic plan for the area? Buses on local routes are already full during peak periods and we hear nothing about additional service even though occupancy of Phase 1 of Senakw is underway. The City has tremendous focus on up-zoning for density but efforts to address infrastructure and amenity needs created by the new density appear absent. These are all issues that should be analyzed and planned for before this kind of a use change is made. Even if heavy industrial use is not appropriate, land areas for employment and the arts should be preserved. As to any residential component, the focus needs to be placed on building the type of housing that people, particularly families, want to live in: ground oriented housing. I would further say that there simply has not been enough community outreach, information and consultation to proceed with this land use change at this stage. There is an opportunity for something special on such a large parcel but I am not confident of the outcome given the lack of planning in the areas discussed above.	Eve Munro	Kitsilano	