

CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-20	15:08	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I am writing to oppose the proposed rezoning of 1905 Ogden Avenue to permit a private floating spa at the Heritage Harbour Marina. This is public waterfront land held for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. A large, three-level commercial spa with access limited primarily to paying customers. It is fundamentally different from a public recreational amenity. It would occupy and visually dominate part of a valued public shoreline and introduce commercial operations, service access and infrastructure into Hadden Park. I am also concerned about the precedent this would establish. The need to generate revenue for the Maritime Museum is real, but it should not be addressed by rezoning public-trust parkland to accommodate a private business. The merits of the rezoning should be assessed according to the long-term interests of the public, including future generations, not according to the financial interests of the proposed operator or the City’s desire to find an alternate source of museum funding. Vancouver’s publicly accessible waterfront did not happen by accident. It reflects generations of advocacy, planning and public investment intended to protect the shoreline from being gradually privatized or reserved for those who can afford to pay. Approving a private, fee-based business of this scale on public-trust waterfront land would move us in the opposite direction and weaken an important legacy that should be protected for future generations. Once public waterfront space is converted to private commercial use, it is very difficult to reclaim. Public waterfront should remain genuinely public, accessible and protected. Please reject this rezoning application.	Lauren Goldman	Dunbar-Southlands	

2026-07-20	15:27	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	My name is Duane Elverum. I am the Tenants’ Representative for Heritage Harbour and the President of the Wooden Boat Society. Although the Heritage Harbour community strongly supports well-designed and appropriately scaled businesses in parks, and we love saunas, we believe the current HAVN proposal is inappropriate in its size, scale, and location, for this small, working heritage harbour. On behalf of the harbour community, I have submitted a set of specific, substantive concerns to HAVN and the Vancouver Maritime Museum (VMM). To date, we have received what can only be described as inadequate responses. Because these questions address serious stakeholder concerns and potential long-term impacts on a valued public space and heritage asset, I believe it is important to reject this development application tied to HAVN. This preferential treatment of HAVN is the opposite of transparency in the public interest, particularly as there are two additional qualified businesses interested in this opportunity who are preferred by the harbour community. Key Concerns Include: -Inappropriate scale and irreversible damage to a unique maritime heritage site -Significant safety, storm and environmental risks in an exposed harbour -Lack of explicit, binding tenant protections -Absence of required federal approvals and technical studies -No RFP for a high profile public site -Superficial tenant engagement -And lastly, the barge location as proposed, would prevent traffic in and out of the harbout during low tide. I personally sounded the harbour depth with a Maritime Museum board member. Please refer to the attached image. Our boats draw 7', requiring a navigable channel of considerable more depth at low tide. Without significant dredging, movement in and out of the harbour will not be possible. It is clear that the sandbar in question has grown connsiderably since the last bathymetric survey was conducted. Thank you for your time and for your stewardship of Vancouver’s public waterfront.	Duane Elverum	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2
2026-07-20	16:01	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I support everything Eve Munro and Milt Sorokin said about why this proposal should be sunk.	Gloria Sully		
2026-07-20	16:16	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	Hong Kong’s Maritime Museum successfully lobbied its port authority to charge a small toll on each of the ships that uses its harbour to provide meaningful funding for its museum. This seems like a common sense solution that is synergetic with the city’s motto, “By land and sea we prosper” especially given we have one of the major ports in North America. Dismiss the HAVN proposal and have the Maritime Museum and the city staff work on this concept.	Gloria Sully	Kitsilano	
2026-07-20	16:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed AI data centre. I urge Council to reject these projects due to concerns over high water consumption, energy grid strain, and local community impacts.	Bobbi-Jo Moore	Mount Pleasant	
2026-07-20	16:39	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I'm writing to ask you to NOT approve the CD-1 Rezoning for 1905 Ogden Ave to accommodate HAVN's massive 150ft barge spa that has been proposed for the small Heritage Harbour Marina. I'm a resident of Kitsilano, the founder of KEEP KITS BEACH WILD and the initiator of the Petition "Protect Heritage Harbour Marina. Say No to a Massive 150ft Barge Spa!" that has 2419 signatures so far, and climbing by the hour! Surely all those voices mean something? FYI, the vast majority of signatories are from Vancouver, Greater Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. I've attached a pdf of the Petition main page and comments and an xls list of signatures that can be sorted by City. There are also 12 petition updates that provide more information and photos, some of	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5 Attachment 6 Attachment 7 Attachment 8 Attachment 9 Attachment 10 Attachment 11 Attachment 12

			which indicate that HAVN and the VMM has misrepresented the size of the barge in their renderings. Alternate and more accurate renderings are attached. This can all be found at: https://www[.]change[.]org/p/protect-heritage-harbour-marina-say-no-to-a-massive-150ft-barge-spa This is not the right place for this oversized vessel, as anyone familiar with the harbour should realize. Not only does it overwhelm this small harbour, but it privatizes public views from the harbour, the park and the beach, and, in all likelihood, will bring about the demise of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach. As one Petition commenter Leah Carlson so eloquently wrote: "The developer, HAVN, previously explored locations in North Vancouver and the Plaza of Nations, but those plans fell through due to moorage scarcity or zoning hurdles. Several larger marinas in Vancouver possess the deep-water infrastructure and waste management systems to support a 150-foot barge far more easily than the shallow, heritage-focused Heritage Harbour. Here is why we must say NO: WASTE & POLLUTION: A floating facility of this size brings serious risks. From greywater runoff and detergents to sewage management, our harbour isn't a dumping ground for private luxury. PUBLIC EXCLUSION: Our coastline is a shared trust, not a private commodity. This project threatens to block iconic views from Hadden Park and could permanently displace the small, local swimming beach we all love. Public space should be for everyone, not just those who can pay a premium. MARINE LIFE AT RISK: To fit this industrial-sized vessel, the seafloor may need dredging. This stirs up toxins, destroys sensitive eelgrass habitats, and disrupts the fragile ecosystem that local marine life depends on." OTHER KEY POINTS: If this barge spa is allowed to go ahead it will cause considerable disruption to the surrounding park and neighbourhood while being "installed" and while in operation. It will also cause both short and long term damage to the harbour and surrounding marine life and environment, as well as disrupt the public enjoyment of the harbour and swimming beach, the small wooden boats in the marina, several of which will likely be demovicted, and the easy access of the False Creek Ferry, which will have to navigate around it during all types of weather, and all degrees of low tide. The harbour will most certainly require dredging to accommodate this massive barge at low tide, contrary to the claims of HAVN and VMM. Please see attached photos that were provided to me by a boat owner. The front of the barge will be where the boat with the brown cover is, and, as you can see, will be grounded at low tide. At the same time the back of the barge will be grounded on the sand bar near Vanier Park's rocky shore. These dredging requirements would likely mean the end of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach as the swim area would cross over the revised navigation route of the boats coming and going in the harbour, and would conflict with the Canadian Navigable Waters Act. Consider the Jericho Sailing Club beach where swimming is not allowed as an example of not mixing a navigation route and swimming for safety reasons. Surely a public swimming beach is much more of a public health necessity than a "wellness" centre for the affluent. They can go anywhere these days for a sauna and cold plunge. There are already numerous such facilities in Vancouver, including one on Granville Island and one soon to be available in house for the nearby residents of Senakw. Ocean swimming is becoming more popular. While there aren't many good swimming beaches, there are lots of saunas. In spite of claims of the barge being securely "moored" and offering protection for the harbour from storms, there is no proof that it would actually do that. It's also very possible that in the event of the next big king tide that barge could very likely destroy the small boats and the docks. Where are the wind and wave studies to demonstrate what HAVN and the		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				VMM are claiming? Should they also not be part of the development permit process? According to the "Yellow Memorandum" added to the CD-1 rezoning agenda on July 14, the Maritime Museum will get a moorage fee of \$250,000 a year for the 19 year term. However, if the barge is the great success that HAVN claims it will be, revenues could be in excess of \$6 million a year. And the barge would only get \$250,000 of that? Where's the revenue sharing in this equation? How can this possibly be a good deal? Not only is this deal a "sell-out" of public park space, but it's not even to the highest bidder. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, there's the legal question of the City Trust responsibility under the grant of the water lots by the Province to the City. The KPRA has submitted excellent legal arguments to Council on the Trust issue. The City, as Trustee of these water lots, has an obligation to the public, not to the Maritime Museum or a private enterprise. As the KPRA state in their July 17 submission: "the proposed rezoning and use of Hadden Park to permit the HAVN barge spa at Heritage Harbour is a commercial use not permitted by the trust established under the original crown grants, and a City decision to permit this rezoning and use will be in breach of the City's duties as trustee for the reason that the intention and primary motivation of the proposal is to financially benefit the Vancouver Maritime Museum (VMM), rather than being for the purposes and beneficiaries of the trust: the use of the land and water for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. The focus throughout has been on the interests of VMM, and on the City's own interest in finding alternate funding arrangements for cultural institutions. It is further our understanding of the law that any benefits/ income which are derived from the trust property must be held in trust by the trustee (the City) and used for the purposes of the trust. Here the business opportunity is proposed to be provided by the City to VMM for its own operational purposes for nominal consideration: the City essentially proposes to take an income opportunity that must accrue to the trust and give it to the Museum." Surely it would be a dereliction of duty as well as a breach of trust for the City as Trustee, and thereby City Council, to proceed with this rezoning prior to obtaining both internal and external legal opinions and making them available to the public? Thanks you for your attention!			
2026-07-20	17:02	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I'm writing to ask you to NOT approve the CD-1 Rezoning for 1905 Ogden Ave to accommodate HAVN's massive 150ft barge spa that has been proposed for the small Heritage Harbour Marina. I'm a resident of Kitsilano, the founder of KEEP KITS BEACH WILD and the initiator of the Petition "Protect Heritage Harbour Marina. Say No to a Massive 150ft Barge Spa!" that has 2419 signatures so far, and climbing by the hour! Surely all those voices mean something? FYI, the vast majority of signatories are from Vancouver, Greater Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. I've attached a pdf of the Petition main page and comments and an xls list of signatures that can be sorted by City. There are also 12 petition updates that provide more information and photos, some of which indicate that HAVN and the VMM has misrepresented the size of the barge in their renderings. Alternate and more accurate renderings are attached. This can all be found at: https://www.change.org/p/protect-heritage-harbour-marina-say-no-to-a-massive-150ft-barge-spa This is not the right place for this oversized vessel, as anyone familiar with the harbour should realize. Not only does it overwhelm this small harbour, but it privatizes public views from the harbour, the park and the beach, and, in all likelihood, will bring about the demise of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach.	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5 Attachment 6 Attachment 7 Attachment 8 Attachment 9 Attachment 10 Attachment 11

			As one Petition commenter Leah Carlson so eloquently wrote: "The developer, HAVN, previously explored locations in North Vancouver and the Plaza of Nations, but those plans fell through due to moorage scarcity or zoning hurdles. Several larger marinas in Vancouver possess the deep-water infrastructure and waste management systems to support a 150-foot barge far more easily than the shallow, heritage-focused Heritage Harbour. Here is why we must say NO: WASTE & POLLUTION: A floating facility of this size brings serious risks. From greywater runoff and detergents to sewage management, our harbour isn't a dumping ground for private luxury. PUBLIC EXCLUSION: Our coastline is a shared trust, not a private commodity. This project threatens to block iconic views from Hadden Park and could permanently displace the small, local swimming beach we all love. Public space should be for everyone, not just those who can pay a premium. MARINE LIFE AT RISK: To fit this industrial-sized vessel, the seafloor may need dredging. This stirs up toxins, destroys sensitive eelgrass habitats, and disrupts the fragile ecosystem that local marine life depends on." OTHER KEY POINTS: If this barge spa is allowed to go ahead it will cause considerable disruption to the surrounding park and neighbourhood while being "installed" and while in operation. It will also cause both short and long term damage to the harbour and surrounding marine life and environment, as well as disrupt the public enjoyment of the harbour and swimming beach, the small wooden boats in the marina, several of which will likely be demovicted, and the easy access of the False Creek Ferry, which will have to navigate around it during all types of weather, and all degrees of low tide. The harbour will most certainly require dredging to accommodate this massive barge at low tide, contrary to the claims of HAVN and VMM. Please see attached photos that were provided to me by a boat owner. The front of the barge will be where the boat with the brown cover is, and, as you can see, will be grounded at low tide. At the same time the back of the barge will be grounded on the sand bar near Vanier Park's rocky shore. These dredging requirements would likely mean the end of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach as the swim area would cross over the revised navigation route of the boats coming and going in the harbour, and would conflict with the Canadian Navigable Waters Act. Consider the Jericho Sailing Club beach where swimming is not allowed as an example of not mixing a navigation route and swimming for safety reasons. Surely a public swimming beach is much more of a public health necessity than a "wellness" centre for the affluent. They can go anywhere these days for a sauna and cold plunge. There are already numerous such facilities in Vancouver, including one on Granville Island and one soon to be available in house for the nearby residents of Senakw. Ocean swimming is becoming more popular. While there aren't many good swimming beaches, there are lots of saunas. In spite of claims of the barge being securely "moored" and offering protection for the harbour from storms, there is no proof that it would actually do that. It's also very possible that in the event of the next big king tide that barge could very likely destroy the small boats and the docks. Where are the wind and wave studies to demonstrate what HAVN and the VMM are claiming? Should they also not be part of the development permit process? According to the "Yellow Memorandum" added to the CD-1 rezoning agenda on July 14, the Maritime Museum will get a moorage fee of \$250,000 a year for the 19 year term. However, if the barge is the great success that HAVN claims it will be, revenues could be in excess of \$6 million a year. And the barge would only get \$250,000 of that? Where's the revenue sharing in this equation? How can this possibly be a good deal? Not only is this deal a "sell-out" of public park space, but it's not even to the highest bidder. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, there's the legal question of the City Trust responsibility under the grant of the water lots by the Province to the City. The KPRA has		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				submitted excellent legal arguments to Council on the Trust issue. The City, as Trustee of these water lots, has an obligation to the public, not to the Maritime Museum or a private enterprise. As the KPRA state in their July 17 submission: "the proposed rezoning and use of Hadden Park to permit the HAVN barge spa at Heritage Harbour is a commercial use not permitted by the trust established under the original crown grants, and a City decision to permit this rezoning and use will be in breach of the City's duties as trustee for the reason that the intention and primary motivation of the proposal is to financially benefit the Vancouver Maritime Museum (VMM), rather than being for the purposes and beneficiaries of the trust: the use of the land and water for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. The focus throughout has been on the interests of VMM, and on the City's own interest in finding alternate funding arrangements for cultural institutions. It is further our understanding of the law that any benefits/ income which are derived from the trust property must be held in trust by the trustee (the City) and used for the purposes of the trust. Here the business opportunity is proposed to be provided by the City to VMM for its own operational purposes for nominal consideration: the City essentially proposes to take an income opportunity that must accrue to the trust and give it to the Museum." Surely it would be a dereliction of duty as well as a breach of trust for the City as Trustee, and thereby City Council, to proceed with this rezoning prior to obtaining both internal and external legal opinions and making them available to the public?			
2026-07-20	17:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I'm writing to ask you to NOT approve the CD-1 Rezoning for 1905 Ogden Ave to accommodate HAVN's massive 150ft barge spa that has been proposed for the small Heritage Harbour Marina. I'm a resident of Kitsilano, the founder of KEEP KITS BEACH WILD and the initiator of the Petition "Protect Heritage Harbour Marina. Say No to a Massive 150ft Barge Spa!" that has 2419 signatures so far, and climbing by the hour! Surely all those voices mean something? FYI, the vast majority of signatories are from Vancouver, Greater Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. I've attached a pdf of the Petition main page and comments and an xls list of signatures that can be sorted by City. There are also 12 petition updates that provide more information and photos, some of which indicate that HAVN and the VMM has misrepresented the size of the barge in their renderings. Alternate and more accurate renderings are attached. This can all be found at: https://www.change.org/p/protect-heritage-harbour-marina-say-no-to-a-massive-150ft-barge-spa This is not the right place for this oversized vessel, as anyone familiar with the harbour should realize. Not only does it overwhelm this small harbour, but it privatizes public views from the harbour, the park and the beach, and, in all likelihood, will bring about the demise of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach. As one Petition commenter Leah Carlson so eloquently wrote: "The developer, HAVN, previously explored locations in North Vancouver and the Plaza of Nations, but those plans fell through due to moorage scarcity or zoning hurdles. Several larger marinas in Vancouver possess the deep-water infrastructure and waste management systems to support a 150-foot barge far more easily than the shallow, heritage-focused Heritage Harbour. Here is why we must say NO: WASTE & POLLUTION: A floating facility of this size brings serious risks. From greywater runoff and detergents to sewage management, our harbour isn't a dumping ground for private luxury. PUBLIC EXCLUSION: Our coastline is a shared trust, not a private commodity. This project threatens to block iconic views from Hadden Park and could permanently displace the small, local swimming beach we all love. Public space should be for everyone, not just those who can pay a premium. MARINE LIFE AT RISK: To fit this industrial-sized vessel, the seafloor may need dredging. This stirs up	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5 Attachment 6 Attachment 7 Attachment 8 Attachment 9 Attachment 10 Attachment 11

			toxins, destroys sensitive eelgrass habitats, and disrupts the fragile ecosystem that local marine life depends on." OTHER KEY POINTS: If this barge spa is allowed to go ahead it will cause considerable disruption to the surrounding park and neighbourhood while being "installed" and while in operation. It will also cause both short and long term damage to the harbour and surrounding marine life and environment, as well as disrupt the public enjoyment of the harbour and swimming beach, the small wooden boats in the marina, several of which will likely be demovicted, and the easy access of the False Creek Ferry, which will have to navigate around it during all types of weather, and all degrees of low tide. The harbour will most certainly require dredging to accommodate this massive barge at low tide, contrary to the claims of HAVN and VMM. Please see attached photos that were provided to me by a boat owner. The front of the barge will be where the boat with the brown cover is, and, as you can see, will be grounded at low tide. At the same time the back of the barge will be grounded on the sand bar near Vanier Park's rocky shore. These dredging requirements would likely mean the end of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach as the swim area would cross over the revised navigation route of the boats coming and going in the harbour, and would conflict with the Canadian Navigable Waters Act. Consider the Jericho Sailing Club beach where swimming is not allowed as an example of not mixing a navigation route and swimming for safety reasons. Surely a public swimming beach is much more of a public health necessity than a "wellness" centre for the affluent. They can go anywhere these days for a sauna and cold plunge. There are already numerous such facilities in Vancouver, including one on Granville Island and one soon to be available in house for the nearby residents of Senakw. Ocean swimming is becoming more popular. While there aren't many good swimming beaches, there are lots of saunas. In spite of claims of the barge being securely "moored" and offering protection for the harbour from storms, there is no proof that it would actually do that. It's also very possible that in the event of the next big king tide that barge could very likely destroy the small boats and the docks. Where are the wind and wave studies to demonstrate what HAVN and the VMM are claiming? Should they also not be part of the development permit process? According to the "Yellow Memorandum" added to the CD-1 rezoning agenda on July 14, the Maritime Museum will get a moorage fee of \$250,000 a year for the 19 year term. However, if the barge is the great success that HAVN claims it will be, revenues could be in excess of \$6 million a year. And the barge would only get \$250,000 of that? Where's the revenue sharing in this equation? How can this possibly be a good deal? Not only is this deal a "sell-out" of public park space, but it's not even to the highest bidder. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, there's the legal question of the City Trust responsibility under the grant of the water lots by the Province to the City. The KPRA has submitted excellent legal arguments to Council on the Trust issue. The City, as Trustee of these water lots, has an obligation to the public, not to the Maritime Museum or a private enterprise. As the KPRA state in their July 17 submission: "the proposed rezoning and use of Hadden Park to permit the HAVN barge spa at Heritage Harbour is a commercial use not permitted by the trust established under the original crown grants, and a City decision to permit this rezoning and use will be in breach of the City's duties as trustee for the reason that the intention and primary motivation of the proposal is to financially benefit the Vancouver Maritime Museum (VMM), rather than being for the purposes and beneficiaries of the trust: the use of the land and water for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. The focus throughout has been on the interests of VMM, and on the City's own interest in finding alternate funding arrangements for cultural institutions. It is further our understanding of the law that any benefits/ income which are derived from the trust		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				property must be held in trust by the trustee (the City) and used for the purposes of the trust. Here the business opportunity is proposed to be provided by the City to VMM for its own operational purposes for nominal consideration: the City essentially proposes to take an income opportunity that must accrue to the trust and give it to the Museum." Surely it would be a dereliction of duty as well as a breach of trust for the City as Trustee, and thereby City Council, to proceed with this rezoning prior to obtaining both internal and external legal opinions and making them available to the public?			
2026-07-20	17:24	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I'm writing to ask you to NOT approve the CD-1 Rezoning for 1905 Ogden Ave to accommodate HAVN's massive 150ft barge spa that has been proposed for the small Heritage Harbour Marina. I'm a resident of Kitsilano, the founder of KEEP KITS BEACH WILD and the initiator of the Petition "Protect Heritage Harbour Marina. Say No to a Massive 150ft Barge Spa!" that has 2419 signatures so far, and climbing by the hour! Surely all those voices mean something? FYI, the vast majority of signatories are from Vancouver, Greater Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. I've attached a pdf of the Petition main page and comments and an xls list of signatures that can be sorted by City. There are also 12 petition updates that provide more information and photos, some of which indicate that HAVN and the VMM has misrepresented the size of the barge in their renderings. Alternate and more accurate renderings are attached. This can all be found at: https://www.change.org/p/protect-heritage-harbour-marina-say-no-to-a-massive-150ft-barge-spa This is not the right place for this oversized vessel, as anyone familiar with the harbour should realize. Not only does it overwhelm this small harbour, but it privatizes public views from the harbour, the park and the beach, and, in all likelihood, will bring about the demise of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach. As one Petition commenter Leah Carlson so eloquently wrote: "The developer, HAVN, previously explored locations in North Vancouver and the Plaza of Nations, but those plans fell through due to moorage scarcity or zoning hurdles. Several larger marinas in Vancouver possess the deep-water infrastructure and waste management systems to support a 150-foot barge far more easily than the shallow, heritage-focused Heritage Harbour. Here is why we must say NO: WASTE & POLLUTION: A floating facility of this size brings serious risks. From greywater runoff and detergents to sewage management, our harbour isn't a dumping ground for private luxury. PUBLIC EXCLUSION: Our coastline is a shared trust, not a private commodity. This project threatens to block iconic views from Hadden Park and could permanently displace the small, local swimming beach we all love. Public space should be for everyone, not just those who can pay a premium. MARINE LIFE AT RISK: To fit this industrial-sized vessel, the seafloor may need dredging. This stirs up toxins, destroys sensitive eelgrass habitats, and disrupts the fragile ecosystem that local marine life depends on." OTHER KEY POINTS: If this barge spa is allowed to go ahead it will cause considerable disruption to the surrounding park and neighbourhood while being "installed" and while in operation. It will also cause both short and long term damage to the harbour and surrounding marine life and environment, as well as disrupt the public enjoyment of the harbour and swimming beach, the small wooden boats in the marina, several of which will likely be demovicted, and the easy access of the False Creek Ferry, which will have to navigate around it during all types of weather, and all degrees of low tide. The harbour will most certainly require dredging to accommodate this massive barge at low	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5 Attachment 6 Attachment 7 Attachment 8

			tide, contrary to the claims of HAVN and VMM. Please see attached photos that were provided to me by a boat owner. The front of the barge will be where the boat with the brown cover is, and, as you can see, will be grounded at low tide. At the same time the back of the barge will be grounded on the sand bar near Vanier Park's rocky shore. These dredging requirements would likely mean the end of Teetotaler Beach as a swimming beach as the swim area would cross over the revised navigation route of the boats coming and going in the harbour, and would conflict with the Canadian Navigable Waters Act. Consider the Jericho Sailing Club beach where swimming is not allowed as an example of not mixing a navigation route and swimming for safety reasons. Surely a public swimming beach is much more of a public health necessity than a "wellness" centre for the affluent. They can go anywhere these days for a sauna and cold plunge. There are already numerous such facilities in Vancouver, including one on Granville Island and one soon to be available in house for the nearby residents of Senakw. Ocean swimming is becoming more popular. While there aren't many good swimming beaches, there are lots of saunas. In spite of claims of the barge being securely "moored" and offering protection for the harbour from storms, there is no proof that it would actually do that. It's also very possible that in the event of the next big king tide that barge could very likely destroy the small boats and the docks. Where are the wind and wave studies to demonstrate what HAVN and the VMM are claiming? Should they also not be part of the development permit process? According to the "Yellow Memorandum" added to the CD-1 rezoning agenda on July 14, the Maritime Museum will get a moorage fee of \$250,000 a year for the 19 year term. However, if the barge is the great success that HAVN claims it will be, revenues could be in excess of \$6 million a year. And the barge would only get \$250,000 of that? Where's the revenue sharing in this equation? How can this possibly be a good deal? Not only is this deal a "sell-out" of public park space, but it's not even to the highest bidder. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, there's the legal question of the City Trust responsibility under the grant of the water lots by the Province to the City. The KPRA has submitted excellent legal arguments to Council on the Trust issue. The City, as Trustee of these water lots, has an obligation to the public, not to the Maritime Museum or a private enterprise. As the KPRA state in their July 17 submission: "the proposed rezoning and use of Hadden Park to permit the HAVN barge spa at Heritage Harbour is a commercial use not permitted by the trust established under the original crown grants, and a City decision to permit this rezoning and use will be in breach of the City's duties as trustee for the reason that the intention and primary motivation of the proposal is to financially benefit the Vancouver Maritime Museum (VMM), rather than being for the purposes and beneficiaries of the trust: the use of the land and water for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. The focus throughout has been on the interests of VMM, and on the City's own interest in finding alternate funding arrangements for cultural institutions. It is further our understanding of the law that any benefits/ income which are derived from the trust property must be held in trust by the trustee (the City) and used for the purposes of the trust. Here the business opportunity is proposed to be provided by the City to VMM for its own operational purposes for nominal consideration: the City essentially proposes to take an income opportunity that must accrue to the trust and give it to the Museum." Surely it would be a dereliction of duty as well as a breach of trust for the City as Trustee, and thereby City Council, to proceed with this rezoning prior to obtaining both internal and external legal opinions and making them available to the public?		
--	--	--	--	--	--

CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-20	17:36	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	Outsize element will: i) Degrade views of city skyline & mountains from park, Marina & beaches. ii) displace &/or eliminate heritage vessels from moorages iii) impact navigable channel to marina- tidal low water already grounds some vessels, the blue cabin and certain areas of the docks iv) introduce unmanageable pressures on available paid and residential street parking v) constant or extended hours operations will degrade park atmosphere with operational noise, on board entertainment noise, client traffic, and light pollution in the evngs vi) provision for sewage and grey water treatment have not been addressed. vii) negative environmental impact upon riparian foreshore re erosion, silting, and sandbar formation.	Geoff Alexander	Kitsilano	
2026-07-21	01:15	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	1905 Ogden Avenue Rezoning to Allow a Sauna and Cold Plunge I strongly oppose adding this large monstrosity to the waterfront. It will only benefit rich people and will not be affordable for the majority of residents. This will further erode the peace and quiet of the waterfront. This area is away from the busy, noisy main beach and is one of the few areas left where people can peacefully enjoy the waterfront. Sitting on the peninsula there beside the marina is a quite heaven. I dont want it thoughtlessly destroyed and see or hear rich people yapping and splashing at this gross intrusive monstrous sauna boat. There are also a million better ideas for the Vancouver Maritime Museum to generate income that would actually benefit the majority of the community. For example, they have a huge deck that is almost completely unused. They could sell coffee and snacks there, which could make them much more money while being far more accessible than this gross intrusion for rich people. Do not allow this large monstrosity to ruin the peace, quiet, and view at this location. This sauna will cost at least \$80 to \$180 to use and will therefore be just another attraction for rich people that does not benefit the vast majority of the community. We are sick and tired of every last quiet spot being overrun by ideas like this. Leave the peace and quiet alone. We do not want more amenities that are only accessible to rich people and are not even affordable for the middle class. Thank you. John H.	John Hatzitolios	Kitsilano	

CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-21	08:39	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	I am writing to express my opposition and serious concern regarding the proposed rezoning of 1905 Ogden Avenue from R1-1 to CD-1 to permit a “beauty and wellness centre” in the form of a large floating barge at the Vancouver Maritime Museum’s Heritage Harbour. From the City’s own materials, the barge is described as a three-storey commercial structure, approximately 1,274.5 m² (about 13,700 sq. ft.) over three levels and roughly 10–12 m (34–40 ft) above the water line. In the context of Kits Point and Vanier Park, this is an extremely large, visually dominant commercial building inserted into what is currently a low-scale, historically oriented museum and park setting. My concerns are: 1. Scale and visual impact: The height and massing of the barge will significantly alter views from the shoreline, seawall, and park, and detract from the natural beauty and open character of this highly valued public waterfront. The proposal is fundamentally out of scale with the existing Maritime Museum and surrounding park uses. 2. Commercialization of a heritage and park site: The Vancouver Maritime Museum and Heritage Harbour are important cultural and historical assets. Introducing a substantial private beauty/wellness operation as a primary new use shifts the focus from public education and heritage to commercial recreation, which I do not believe is appropriate for this site or consistent with the spirit of R1-1 and park uses. 3. Precedent for future development: Approving a CD-1 that explicitly enables this kind of intensive commercial use on the water sets a troubling precedent for further commercialization and built form creep along this sensitive shoreline and park area. 4. Impacts on neighbourhood and park experience: Increased traffic, noise, and activity associated with a large commercial wellness facility will affect nearby residents, park users, and the quiet, contemplative character that currently defines the museum and its surroundings. I respectfully urge Council to reject this rezoning and associated CD-1 by-law, and instead work with the Maritime Museum on options that support its long-term viability while preserving the low-scale, heritage-focused, and park-oriented character of Kits Point and Vanier Park. The shoreline at 1905 Ogden Avenue should remain a place where history, nature, and public access are prioritized over intensive commercial development. Thank you for considering my comments.	Shaun Greffard	Kitsilano	
2026-07-21	11:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	If a giant barge on the beach, stirring up and potentially polluting the marine environment while blocking the views of beachgoers and other visitors to the Vanier Park precinct, were being proposed with no financial benefit to the Maritime Museum, would it be considered?	Sal Robinson	Kitsilano	

CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-21	12:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 1905 Ogden Avenue	Oppose	FYI HERITAGE HARBOUR BARGE SPA PETITION has reached 2436 signatures as of 12:35pm. https://www[.]jchange[.]org/ProtectHeritageHarbourMarina_SayNoToMassiveBargeSpa I'm adding information and documents to my previous submission relating to the Canadian Navigable Waters Act and the need to dredge Heritage Harbour to allow for safe navigation in and out of the harbour by the small craft and the False Creek Ferry, which often runs aground during low tides, as do several of the larger boats moored at the harbour. 1. Dredging brochure attached that outlines the specific standards and criteria under which Transport Canada considers dredging projects as “minor works” and do not require an application under the Navigable Waters Protection Act (NWPA). These criteria are based on the terms and conditions outlined in section 9 1. the works consist of regular maintenance arounddocks, retaining walls, marina basins or otherstructures; 2. the works and associated marine equipment are more than 30 metres (m) from a navigation channel; 3. all dredged materials are disposed of: 4. (i) (ii) above the high-water mark, or in waters where the disposal is authorized by or under an Act of Parliament and where there are more than 20 fathoms (36.576 m) of water at all times; no suction dredging that includes any floating or submerged pipes is used; 5. the works have no cables that cross on, over or through any portion of the navigable waters; and 6. the works do not include blasting. It appears that dredging Heritage harbour to accommodate a 150ft barge does not fulfill ALL the criteria for a minor work and therefore would require a Major Works Application and approval by Transport Canada. 2. PDF of SWIM AREAS under the CANADIAN NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT — DESIGNATED CLASS OF MINOR WORKS UNDER THE MINOR WORKS ORDER. Swim areas are considered minor works and must meet the following criteria to be designated as minor works: a) The swim area is situated 30 m or more from a navigation channel or, if there is no navigation channel, is not situated in, on, over, through or across a navigation route; b) The swim area does not extend more than 30 m into or on the navigable water; c) The swim area does not occupy more than one-third of the width of the navigable water; d) The ropes used to demarcate the swim are marked by line floats; e) The perimeter of the swim area is marked by swimming buoys; and f) The swim area is situated 5 m or more from the adjacent property boundaries and property line extensions. It's difficult to see how the current Teetotaler Beach could continue as a swimming beach and satisfy the above criteria once dredging is completed. There would not be enough safe distance between the new navigation route and the current swimming area.	Elvira Lount	Kitsilano	Attachment 1 Attachment 2