

CD-1 Rezoning: 111 East 5th Avenue and 2060 Quebec Street - Support

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-16	00:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 111 East 5th Avenue and 2060 Quebec Street	Support	We must not let fear mongering get in the way of much needed data residency ownership for Canadians. Data centers, whether AI or not are needed for our interconnected future, and the one proposed and the new ones to be built are done to much higher standards, waste less energy, less water and are silent to the outside world. I support this rezoning.	Eduardo Vega		
2026-07-16	15:27	CD-1 Rezoning: 111 East 5th Avenue and 2060 Quebec Street	Support	Dear Mayor and Council, I am a Vancouver resident and an infrastructure software engineer. I support this rezoning in principle. Data centres are real industrial infrastructure. They provide the computing and storage capacity on which businesses, public institutions and ordinary residents increasingly depend. Repurposing an existing commercial building on protected industrial land is a sensible use of the site. The proposal adds no substantial new building mass, converts unnecessary underground parking into productive industrial space and retains some street-level activity through the proposed restaurant. The project is also relevant to a larger policy question. Canada has repeatedly identified the need to build greater domestic computing capacity and reduce its dependence on infrastructure controlled elsewhere. Canadian businesses, researchers and public institutions should have access to serious computing resources located in Canada, operated under Canadian law and available without exporting their data, intellectual property and economic leverage by default. TELUS has presented this facility as part of its domestic sovereign artificial-intelligence infrastructure. There are reasonable questions to ask about what “sovereign” means in practice. A Canadian address alone does not establish sovereignty. Ownership, operational control, contracts, supply chains, governing law and access for Canadian institutions all matter. Those are reasons to scrutinize the project carefully. They are not reasons to reject the physical infrastructure required to achieve the stated policy goal. Digital sovereignty cannot remain an abstraction in which Canada somehow develops domestic computing capacity without allocating land, electricity, cooling equipment, network connections or buildings to contain it. The servers must exist somewhere. That somewhere will consume power, produce heat and require industrial machinery. It would be inconsistent to call for greater Canadian control over digital infrastructure and then reject a Canadian telecommunications company’s proposal to build domestic compute capacity in an existing industrial building merely because the physical manifestation of that policy is less appealing than the phrase “digital sovereignty.” This does not give the applicant a blank cheque. Infrastructure presented as strategically important should be subject to more scrutiny, not less. The City should ensure that the project’s public benefits and environmental claims survive contact with the completed building. I strongly support integrating the facility with the False Creek Neighbourhood Energy Utility.	Ethan Plant	Downtown	

			A data centre converts nearly all of the electricity it consumes into heat. Recovering that heat for use elsewhere in the neighbourhood is exactly the sort of practical infrastructure coordination the City should encourage. My support, however, depends on the project being treated as the major electrical and mechanical facility it is. The anticipated load of up to 40 MW is not comparable to an ordinary office renovation. Council should approve the use only with clear, enforceable requirements governing its physical impacts. First, Council should retain the proposed waste-heat conditions in full. The requirement for a professional Waste Heat Recovery Study before enactment, and the provision that the rezoning must not proceed if no viable recovery path exists, are appropriate and should not be weakened later in the permitting process. The applicant should also provide a publicly accessible, non-confidential summary of the final heat-recovery plan. It should identify the expected amount and temperature of recoverable heat, the proportion expected to be delivered to the utility, anticipated availability throughout the year, implementation milestones and the method by which performance will be measured. Once the facility is operating, it should report annually on the heat actually delivered. “Heat-recovery equipment was installed” and “the data centre is meaningfully heating the neighbourhood” are not the same statement. All costs of constructing, operating, maintaining and replacing the heat-recovery infrastructure should remain with the owner, as contemplated by the staff recommendations. These costs should not be transferred to the City, the neighbourhood energy utility or its ratepayers. Second, the final cooling design and its water requirements should be disclosed before development approval. Compliance with minimum recirculation requirements is necessary, but Council should also require a firm estimate of annual potable-water consumption, confirmation that once-through cooling will not be used and an operating plan for droughts and extreme-heat events. Water consumption should be measured after occupancy so the City can confirm that the facility performs as represented. Third, the City should require acoustic modelling based on worst-case continuous operation of all cooling equipment, fans, transformers and emergency generators. Because this equipment may run around the clock, meeting a general industrial classification is not enough. The applicant should demonstrate compliance at nearby receptors during nighttime conditions, conduct post-occupancy sound testing and be subject to enforceable remediation if actual noise exceeds the modelled results. The applicant should similarly disclose the number and capacity of backup generators, their fuel-storage arrangements, expected testing schedule and applicable emissions controls. Emergency generation is a legitimate resilience measure, but its local noise, air-quality and safety effects are directly relevant to the development. Fourth, the discrepancy in the application’s floor-area calculations should be resolved before enactment. The referral report states that detailed floor plans were not provided during staff review and that the project may require an FSR of as much as 4.2 rather than the proposed 3.0. That is not a minor clerical difference. Council and the public should be able to see accurate plans and understand the development being authorized. Any necessary amendment to the proposed CD-1 bylaw should proceed transparently rather than being treated as an		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			administrative afterthought. BC Hydro, rather than the City, is responsible for deciding whether and on what terms the electrical load can be served. The City should nevertheless require documented confirmation that the necessary utility arrangements have been made before permits are issued and that transformers, switchgear and other electrical infrastructure can be accommodated on private property as proposed. Finally, I do not believe Council should decide this land-use application based on speculation about which customers might eventually use the facility. Some of the concerns raised about possible customers may reflect legitimate debates about surveillance, military procurement, artificial intelligence and the concentration of technological power. Those debates should be taken seriously through laws and institutions capable of regulating those subjects. A municipal rezoning hearing is not an effective customer-screening mechanism. The City can regulate the building’s power, water, heat, noise, emissions, public realm and physical safety. Those are measurable local effects within municipal jurisdiction. It cannot realistically administer an ongoing political acceptability test for every organization whose data or workloads might someday pass through the facility. Customers change. Workloads move. Companies merge. Contracts are signed and cancelled. Attempting to regulate an unspecified future customer list through a site-specific zoning decision would be arbitrary, difficult to enforce and unlikely to address the underlying policy concerns. This is a reasonable industrial use in a reasonable location. It is also a large piece of infrastructure whose impacts must be understood rather than hidden behind the unusually vague zoning label “Bulk Data Storage.” Canada cannot demand sovereign computing capacity in federal policy and then become surprised when that capacity arrives at a municipal rezoning hearing in the form of a large brick building full of electrical equipment. I encourage Council to approve the application in principle, retain the strong waste-heat conditions recommended by staff and require transparent, measurable and enforceable safeguards for the facility’s operation. Digital sovereignty has to live somewhere. Vancouver should allow it to be built here, and then regulate it properly. Sincerely, Ethan Plant			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CD-1 Rezoning: 111 East 5th Avenue and 2060 Quebec Street - Support

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-07-17	23:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 111 East 5th Avenue and 2060 Quebec Street	Support	As someone who lives in Vancouver and who works in Vancouver in the Construction industry I want to express my support for this rezoning application. Given the state of immigration it's necessary to construct more buildings in order to maintain affordable housing costs for all the residents in this city. Given the state of the economy the project would create much-needed jobs and boost Vancouver's wealth. The property's owners deserve to be able to develop it if they want to. It is their right as owners and should not be encumbered. Thank you!	Jamie Wu	Downtown	