

CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-21	11:38	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	It was meant to be affordable housing, which is desperately needed and now being turned into hotel rooms, to make money for people who are already wealthy . I strongly oppose the application	Maryam Murat-Khan	Fairview	
2026-07-21	11:45	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	Re: Public Hearing – Proposed CD-1 Amendment for 2538 Birch Street Mayor Sim and Members of Council, My name is Sean Nardi and I am a resident of Fairview. For nearly eight years, I followed the redevelopment of 2538 Birch Street through Council reports, Freedom of Information requests, Land Title records, public hearings, and, most recently, court proceedings arising from the developer's creditor protection. I respectfully urge Council to REJECT the proposed amendment to convert 202 of the building's 258 secured rental units into hotel room for medical tourists. This proposal is not merely a technical amendment. It fundamentally changes the public benefit upon which the original rezoning was approved. A Brief History The history of this project is highly unusual. In January 2018, Council approved a 16-storey rental building on this site. That project would have delivered 153 rental homes and generated little controversy. Only weeks later, the owner applied for the Moderate-Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP) proposing a dramatically larger 28-storey tower. The revised proposal immediately became one of the most controversial rezonings in recent Vancouver history. Residents raised concerns about the proposed height and density, but also about the integrity of the planning process itself. During the ensuing public hearing, residents presented evidence obtained through Freedom of Information requests showing that City staff had inexplicably reversed earlier concerns about advancing the proposal during the Broadway Planning process and had taken extraordinary steps to allow the application to proceed while broader planning work was still underway. Those records formed part of a broader debate about the interpretation of City policy and the timing of the rezoning. Residents also warned Council that: • the proposal would establish a detrimental precedent for future Broadway Plan rezonings; • the project was receiving extraordinary public concessions; • the project’s financial structure appeared unusually risky; • the claimed public benefits did not justify the magnitude of the rezoning; and • that the project generated substantial opposition from neighbourhood residents while much of the support originated from outside the affected neighbourhood, and outside of Vancouver. Council nevertheless approved the rezoning. Why Council Approved It	Sean Nardi	Fairview	

			Whether members supported or opposed the rezoning in 2020, one point was clear. Council accepted an extraordinary increase in height and density because the project promised an extraordinary public benefit: rental housing. City staff repeatedly argued that Vancouver desperately needed rental housing near rapid transit and that this justified significant increases in height, density and financial incentives. Reasonable people could disagree with that conclusion, but the central bargain was unmistakable: Vancouver would accept a larger building because Vancouver would receive hundreds of new rental homes. That bargain is the foundation upon which this amendment must be evaluated. That Bargain No Longer Exists Today, the owner asks Council to approve something fundamentally different. Rather than providing 258 rental homes, the proposal would convert 202 units into hotel rooms for medical tourists. Only 56 long-term rental homes would remain. In effect, nearly 4/5 rental homes used to justify the original rezoning would disappear. The principal public benefit that justified the original decision would be substantially reduced. Council wouldn't have approved this project in 2020 if it only provided 56 rental homes. So, why would you approve an amendment that produces that same outcome today? Events Since the Original Rezoning The years following the 2020 rezoning approval have unfortunately reinforced many of the concerns raised during the original public hearing. The project has: • received more than \$156 million in low-interest financing through BC Housing; • entered creditor protection; • experienced construction delays and work stoppages; • been offered for sale before completion; and • has now returned to Council seeking another significant amendment. I raise these facts because they demonstrate that many of the risks identified during the original rezoning have now materialized. Council is therefore not being asked to approve an amendment in isolation. It is being asked to approve another bailout for a project that has already required extraordinary public financial support. This Is a Question of Public Trust Ultimately, this hearing is about more than one building. It is about whether the public benefits used to justify rezonings remain dependable after approval. If developers can secure extraordinary density, significant public concessions and substantial public financing based on one set of promised benefits, only to later remove most of those benefits, public confidence in the rezoning process will inevitably suffer. Residents must be able to trust that the commitments made during public hearings matter, otherwise, the public consultation process risks becoming little more than a negotiation over promises that may later be broken.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				A Troubling Precedent Council's decision will extend well beyond 2538 Birch Street. Future applicants will watch closely. If this amendment is approved, future developers may reasonably conclude that public benefits presented during rezonings can later be substantially modified once approvals have been obtained. That would undermine confidence not only in this project, but in the integrity of Vancouver's broader planning process. Conclusion Council approved this project because it believed Vancouver would receive hundreds of badly needed rental homes. Today, Council is being asked to approve an amendment that would eliminate nearly 80 percent of those homes. The issue before you is whether the public benefit that justified this extraordinary rezoning still exists after the amendment. The answer is no, and for that reason, I ask Council to REJECT the proposed amendment. Thank you for your consideration. Sean Nardi Fairview, Vancouver			
2026-07-21	12:03	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	July 21, 2026 The developer, Jameson Developments Ltd. should not be allowed to convert residential units to hotel rooms. The \$156 million in financing from BC Housing was for residential units, not hotel rooms. As a private company it should adapt to market conditions. All of the units should be residential (rental or for sale) at prices that the current market supports, which would be around 20% lower than the average price attained in 2024/25 (using market data from those years). This would establish and reinforce a much-needed trend of lower housing costs and would still generate considerable revenue for the developer. This revenue would then enable the developer to negotiate with creditors who would still be paid over time. Sincerely, Gordon Yusko §22(1) Personal and §22(1) Personal	Gordon Yusko	Fairview	

CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-21	15:10	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	I oppose the project for the following reasons. 1. Removing 202 promised rental homes completely changes the basis upon which the rezoning was initially approved. 2. 56 long-term rental homes is less than one-quarter of the originally promised rental housing in the 2020 rezoning. 3. I do not understand how temporary accommodation for medical tourists helps the long term rental housing shortage. 4. The developer has received more than \$156 million in BC Housing financing and \$3.1 million in DCL concessions that was intended to support RENTAL HOUSING. Vancouver taxpayers should not be responsible for a poorly managed project that doesn't provide the promised rental housing. 5. I am tired of highly leveraged developers who privatize their gains but then try to socialize the costs to taxpayers. 6. The rationale for changing the zoning bylaws to allow this project that included exceptional height, density and financial incentives was because of the rental housing benefit. This rational no longer exists. The height and density incentives were given in exchange for building rentals. What happens to these incentives? 7. The neighbours in my strata oppose the amendment and we are very concerned about the planning process. 8. If council approves the amendment, they are rewarding a development project that has repeatedly deviated from the commitments made. 9. If this amendment is approved, it sets a horrible precedent that will lead to major public benefits used to justify rezoning to then be removed later once approvals have been secured. 10. I ask Council to protect Vancouver's scarce supply of rental housing by rejecting this amendment and requiring the project to deliver the promised long-term rental homes.	Melanie Semlacher	Fairview	

CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-21	17:24	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	Too big and too tall for the neighborhood and with too many changes to its proposed nature and size, said changes often being to the public net detriment -- (1) A one-story restaurant on Broadway to (2) 16 stories of apartments on Birch to (3) 28 stories of apartments with some at below-market rents (rationalizing subsidized public financing) to (4) 28 stories mostly for out of town medical visitors at VGH to (5) 28 stories mostly for hotel rooms but still with that minority of below-market rentals. Forgive me if I have some of this wrong but the site has now been readdressed, repurposed, heightened, re-repurposed, re-heightened, and re-re-repurposed! It was hard to argue with 16 stories of rentals but 28 stories was and is too high for a site that fronts onto Broadway but, more significantly, backs onto Fairview. We need homes for Vancouverites even more than for medical or tourist visitors. The below-market rentals may still be in the proposal before Council but there is not much else for we who live, work and play here. Please change this back to an all rental building to benefit the greatest number. Thank you.	Tom Hague	Fairview	
2026-07-21	23:11	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	Totally oppose the application to rezone 2538 Birch Street from rental homes to majority of hotel rooms. The entire Broadway project with tall buildings was pushed through with the premise that rental homes were required. As a member of the Fairview community this has ruined the neighbourhood with these tall buildings blocking views and casting shadows on other buildings and causing a huge increase of traffic. You are turning a once beautiful neighbourhood into a ugly concrete jungle. In my opinion rezoning should be denied if rental homes are no longer required then it is unnecessary to give out more building permits to developers to build more high risers.	CAROLYN Milne	Fairview	

CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-22	07:51	CD-1 (708) Text Amendment: 2538-2550 Birch Street and 1290-1298 West Broadway	Oppose	This project was approved and given extra density under because the city argued that rentals were needed along a transit line. Now the developers want to change it to a hotel?!? The idea that a project can be given extra height and financial concessions for one purpose and then pivot and retain those benefits is ridiculous. If the project is drastically different, which this one is, then it should have to go back to the beginning. If they don't want to do that then they can proceed with what was originally approved. Strongly Opposed	Andrea Baxendale	Shaughnessy	