

File No.: 04-1000-20-2021-617

January 19, 2022

s.22(1)

Dear s.22(1)

Re: **Request for Access to Records under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the "Act")**

I am responding to your request of December 3, 2021 under the ***Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, (the Act)***, for:

Records regarding the rezoning application for 1780 East Broadway, specifically:

- 1. Electronic submissions from citizens to the Shape Your City inbox and;**
- 2. Correspondence to City Councillors from businesses and the general public.**

Date range: November 9 to 15, 2021

All responsive records are attached. Some information in the records has been severed, (blacked out), under s.22(1) of the Act. You can read or download this section here:

http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/96165_00

Under section 52 of the Act, and within 30 business days of receipt of this letter, you may ask the Information & Privacy Commissioner to review any matter related to the City's response to your FOI request by writing to: Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner, info@oipc.bc.ca or by phoning 250-387-5629.

If you request a review, please provide the Commissioner's office with: 1) the request number (#04-1000-20-2021-617); 2) a copy of this letter; 3) a copy of your original request; and 4) detailed reasons why you are seeking the review.

Yours truly,

[Signed by Cobi Falconer]

Cobi Falconer, MAS, MLIS, CIPP/C
Director, Access to Information & Privacy
cobi.falconer@vancouver.ca

453 W. 12th Avenue Vancouver BC V5Y 1V4

If you have any questions, please email us at foi@vancouver.ca and we will respond to you as soon as possible. Or you can call the Acting FOI Case Manager at 604-873-7407.

Encl. (Response package)

:ku

Survey Responses

09 November 2021 - 15 November 2021

1780 E Broadway rezoning application comments

Shape Your City Vancouver

Project: 1780 E Broadway rezoning application



VISITORS						
249						
CONTRIBUTORS			RESPONSES			
210			212			
35	175	0	36	176	0	
Registered	Unverified	Anonymous	Registered	Unverified	Anonymous	



Respondent No: 1

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:13:18 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:13:18 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Unless you provide landspace so that people in these high rises have access to gardens and nature, I say NO!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

not answered

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 2

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:16:27 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:16:27 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

As a local resident, I think the planners are being far too greedy with the height of these towers. They will absolutely overshadow the local area. How can you put something so tall next to an entire neighborhood of buildings that are at most 3 or 4 stories and mostly 2? This development should be lowered to a quarter of the height or even less. And if it is not worth the money to redevelop at this height then they should give up.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 3

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:16:50 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 04:16:28 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

- The Grandview Woodland Plan for the site allows for towers between 12 and 24 stories above the retail plinth. Two of the three towers in the Westbank and Crombie REIT proposal exceed this limit with towers of up to 29 stories above the retail level. From street level, which is a more accurate way to describe the overall height of a building, the tallest tower will be the equivalent of 34+ stories. - One of the guiding principles in the Grandview Woodland Plan is "to support a range of affordable housing options to meet the diverse needs of the community. This includes low-to moderate-income households who need social housing, secured market rental houses, secondary rental, as well as more affordable options for ownership." According to 2016 census data on the City of Vancouver website: 63.7% of residents in Grandview- Woodlands are renters, the median household income is \$55 000, and 20% of residents are low income. The housing units in this massive housing development – both luxury rental and strata condos – are not planned for the average person currently residing in our community. In fact, only about 14% (93 of the 653 units to be built) will be accessible to households earning between \$30 000 to \$80 000. Low-income families living on social assistance will be completely excluded from this development. - In the Grandview Woodland Plan, the Commercial Broadway Station Precinct "is to be centred on and oriented around a sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza." The plaza as proposed by the developer occupies only 18% of the proposed site. Given its limited size and function, it would best be described as a wide pedestrian walkway linking the Skytrain Station and the new Safeway store. Moreover, it is unlikely to be "sunny and delightful" as it will occupy a dark space, shadowed on one side by the Broadway Skytrain Station and on the other side by a 35+ story skyscraper. The constant high-pitched squeal of brakes from trains on the overhead track will further compromise its attractiveness as a gathering place.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 4

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:17:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:17:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Building these towers to the height of 24-29 stories is too high and would ruin this neighbourhood creating income inequality and ruining the Drive. Gentrification would start, this is the only really part of Vancouver anymore in a city that is losing its identity

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 5

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:18:29 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 04:17:56 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Knocking off one storey does not make the height any more bearable. These buildings are still far too high. (Meanwhile Kits is freaking out about having 6 storey buildings! I'd like to see this kind of monstrosity proposed on the west side!) The proposal has also scrapped the daycare facility space, which is incredibly disappointing. Also, won't the outdoor plaza just become a rundown place for unhoused individuals? I know that they deserve spots to rest and enjoy the city from as well, but I have my doubts that the plaza will be used by most of the neighbourhood residents. If the buildings were around 15 storeys, I think that would be much more reasonable. Scrap the outdoor plaza and create more affordable rental units and / or bring back the childcare space.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 6

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:20:34 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:20:34 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The design really is aesthetically unappealing. The court yard and place to watch movies is an interesting idea, but with skytrains running by every several minutes, it will likely be a spectacular failure. I like the outdoor gym idea, but there is just so much wrong with this proposal. 93 units at below market rates? That's it? And the scale is all wrong as well. I'm all for densification, but not 30 stories. Our city can do better. I've lived in this neighbourhood since 2006. I know many residents that have lived here much longer. Please don't mess this up.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☒ Yes



Respondent No: 7

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:21:47 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 04:21:47 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

This development is still not taking into account the GW community plan in fact it flies in the face of the plan and creates another mini mega development. Affordability is again an issue and many current GW residents will be displaced by another bad Architecture project for Vancouver.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 8

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:22:25 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:22:25 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This does not fit in the character of the area ... why is it only developers get to bully the city when other business suffer and have no safety net. The developer lobby is too powerful

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 9

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:29:12 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:29:12 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This project in it's present form will Not serve the community in any positive fashion

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 10

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:37:01 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:37:01 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

the height of buildings is still too high, with only one story removed from previous plan. Also this was at the expenses of rental units which is unacceptable. The allotted green space for density proposed is not big enough. Unlike high density developments in other parts of the city which have built in overflow green space like the seawall for Yaletown and Stanley Park for the west end this development and the east side are landlocked. The proposed influx of people with this level of density is only going to further increase the imbalance of available green space for the east as compared to west side communities who also have ready access to the beaches and water. Overall this proposal is developer friendly for meeting the bottom line but is not community friendly. Our vibrant community is already underserved for affordable housing and green space and this proposal is not offering acceptable solutions in either of these areas. Simply being by a transportation hub does not justify this level of density without better community friendly amenities. Further revisions are very much needed. Lower tower height, more green space and go back to higher level of rental suites, at affordable rates.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 11

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:37:13 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:37:13 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It does not meet the terms of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. 1. Tower Heights - actually increased. There is no reduction in height, despite the removal of one residential storey from each tower. Even though the developers removed one storey of residences, they increased the height of the retail "plinth" (also known as podium), and increased the height of what sits on the roof - the parapet, the architectural screen, and then the elevator shaft rising steeply above. For example, in Tower A, the height from ground to the top previously was 105.6meters (346 feet). It now rises to 113.3meters - a height of 371.7 feet - the equivalent of 41.6 residential storeys*. The retail "plinth" for Tower A previously was 28.1 meters; it now is 29.6 meters. The "plinth" contains two mezzanine levels. It is the equivalent of about 8 commercial storeys, and of 10.8 standard residential storeys. On the roof of Tower A there is 11 meters (36 feet) of height above the roofline - previously there was only 2.5 meters. This all matters in terms of shadowing and mountain views. Details on height All three towers, from ground to the very top are higher in this revised plan than in the previous one. Tower A To tip top before was 105.6m, now it is 113.3m - an increase of 7.7meters (25 feet). This translates to a height of 371.7 feet - or 41.6 residential storeys. When you compare from ground to the rooftop, before and after, leaving out the height of all the stuff sitting on top of the roof, the height is now 102.3 meters - it previously was 103.1 meters. So a reduction of .8 of a meter. But the problem is there is all kinds of stuff on top of the roof, going all the way around. Tower B To tip top before, was 91.75m; now is 101.6m - an increase of 9.85 meters (32.3 ft). This equals 333.3 feet - 37 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 89.25; , now is 90.5m Tower C To tip top before was 80.95; ; now is 90.1m - an increase of 9.15 meters (30 feet). This equals 295 feet - 33.1 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 78.45; now is 78.15 While buildings are measured in height by the City from ground to the top of the roofline, what sits on top matters to us living in the neighbourhood, in terms of height. The shadowing, and blockage of mountain views is very relevant. That is why the measurement from group to the tip top is highlighted. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan calls for a range of building heights at the Safeway site, from 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform. 2. Plaza still in noisy shadow The proposed plaza remains a big problem. It still runs along the edge of the skytrain line, in its shadow, the trains loudly thundering by. It is not a "sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza" as required by the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. Nor is it centrally located in the development. The developers have enlarged it slightly. It now may be 20,000 sq feet but that includes stairs that run up underneath the commercial building, in darkness. Instead of stairs the architects describe the stairs as "Vertical Circulation to Courtyard"! It seems this is because there are stairs that run beside higher steps that can be used as bleachers for viewing a movie. A movie screen up against the noisy skytrain line! Part of what is included as in the "plaza" are stairs that actually run underneath the commercial building. Stairs to the courtyard, which is closed off to the public. Public looks at the courtyard from the top of the stairs at what the architects call a "belvedere". Stairs to nowhere. See 5.11 and 5.13 :<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/5landscape.pdf>. On page 13 (p. 133) of the Architectural Plans, one can see what the plaza really looks like, as opposed to what is in the "renderings": <https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/6arch.pdf> The public has no access to the interior courtyard, nor to the play and garden area on the rooftop of the retail building. Those areas are for residents of the towers, not the public. This is all happening because Safeway refuses to have a store that is two levels. If it would do that, there would be more room for a proper public plaza. This plaza was so key to the Grandview Woodland Community Plan because it is instead of a park - this neighbourhood has few parks. See what instead was envisioned, starting at p 111 of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/grandview-woodland-community-plan.pdf> GW Plan says to "Create a new social heart for the community with a new civic plaza as part of a renewed Safeway site". It refers to a "generous centrally located public plaza"....and says the skytrain area will be "centred on and oriented around a sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza". 3. Affordability This continues to be a problem. There are 653 suites in this massive development. 215 are condos; the rest are rental suites. It is an improvement that there are now "approximately" 93 below -market rental units, about 20% of the rental units. Yet out of the entire development, only 14% of the suites are below-market. The rest will be marketed as luxury suites. Note that none of the rental suites will get parking spots. Just the condos! See below. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area. The lower rise affordable walk-up rental buildings in the vicinity will be torn down, replaced by gentrified, expensive suites, pushing away

long term residents who will no longer be able to afford to live here. Breakdown of suites 171 studio apts 258 1 bedroom 161 2 bedroom 57 3 bedroom 4. No daycare This was removed from the revised proposal. The GW Community Plan calls for a dramatic increase in childcare spaces - 430 new childcare spaces. 5. Parking 205 residential spots. There are 215 condos. Obviously the condos will get the residential parking spots. None of the rental suites will get a spot. And 10 condos will have no parking spot at all. 33 visitor spots 208 spots for commercial 12 car share Clearly, more car share spots are needed. At the very least. 6. Local businesses - Eclectic Commercial Drive These massive towers will boost nearby property values, taxes and rents on local businesses. We cherish the eclectic nature of Commercial Drive. This will push many independent businesses - many who already are struggling - away or into closure.

Q2. Your overall position about the application	Opposed
--	---------

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future	not answered
--	--------------



Respondent No: 12

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:50:08 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:50:08 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am opposed to this plan...no childcare spots, no parking spots for the majority of residents, high skyscrapers, displacement of residents in the area and a plaza that is not suitable.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 13

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:50:45 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 20:50:45 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

"height reduced by one storey " this is almost an insult to the community . one storey is below acceptable , review the height of this enormous and devastating space ship coming in a human centric community . this is ugly and disastrous design

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 14

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 20:55:55 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 04:58:59 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

With all due respect, and in understanding that economic growth is important, I believe there are some areas where development on a large scale, that completely clashes with an areas aesthetic and culture, simply should not be made. Culture is vital to communities not only psychologically but also economically. This skyscraper would destroy the culture that many commercial drive businesses thrive on, and would in turn suck in a large target audience to itself, further damaging small businesses surrounding it. There are many better places for a skyscraper like this to be built, places with as much economic potential without the damaging effects on the surrounding community. I sincerely hope the city reconsiders this proposal. Thank you.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 15

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:00:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:00:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

In this plan the skyscrapers continue to be extraordinarily high, the design is ugly, there's still no sunny central inviting plaza for everyone, affordability is limited. This plan will have a major negative impact on people living in the area and the small businesses that give The Drive its beloved eclectic character. Affordability is insufficient Parking is insufficient. Daycare was removed Local businesses will be pushed out by increase in property values Where will people go who will be pushed out of their homes. This plan is out of scale and will harm the character of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood. The density but this goes far beyond the scope of the community plan. For reference, Grandview is 18% more dense and Cedar Cottage is 24% more dense than the rest of the City. Sources: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-grandview-woodland.pdf> and <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-kensington-cedar-cottage.pdf>

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 16

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:03:03 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:03:03 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Please keep Commercial Drive at its current human architectural scale, and keep those dehumanizing towers out of this neck of the woods. Thank you.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 17

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:11:39 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 05:24:01 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

The overall design is unattractive- in fact the shape and height of the towers spoils the concept. for me. Surely this could be improved? I also note the loss / absence of the large central public square that was to humanize the design and tie it into the neighbourhood and relaxed feeling of the Drive. This feels like an unsuccessful Manhattan wannabe, monolithic and jarring. (I note that the video only shows the bottom part of the towers until shortly before the end- struggling to make it appear more appealing.)

Q2. Your overall position about the application Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 18

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:25:37 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:25:37 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

OMG. This is a horrendous giant eyesore, and will negatively affect the whole outlying area. There will be great pressure on home owners to sell there rental units, causing a spike in the cost of rentals. The local businesses will be under great pressure from the new owners that will likely cause many to be unable to compete, as well as block the view and sun from many properties. The massive increase in car and truck traffic, will make parking a nightmare, even tho' there will be underground parking. NOBODY likes underground parking. It's a huge time consumer and it makes moving groceries a real pain. This will also create more hazards to pedestrians, with so much traffic that a ten minute quick stop for a few items, becomes a major outing.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☒ Yes



Respondent No: 19

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:32:34 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:32:34 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is too tall for the Commercial Drive area. It detracts from the "independent business" vibe of the Drive. And having these super tall towers in the middle (north-south) of the City is not a great idea. I think very tall buildings should be at the "ends" of the city like in Downtown or by the water to the South or out by UBC or further East by Boundary Rd.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 20

Login: Resident

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:32:54 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:32:54 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I have read through the new revised proposal. As a resident of the commercial drive area I am deeply opposed to this proposal. It does not fit with the Grandview woodlands plan. It is now taller in actual height than the first proposal. It is out of character with the entire neighbourhood. It does not have parking for all of the proposed apartments. We are in a parking crisis in the commercial drive area. There must be parking for every unit. This brings me back to the original grandview woodland plan. 24 storeys was the maximum height. Even that is way too tall in my opinion but that is what we agreed to. This would increase density but not devastate the neighbourhood. This proposal is against the process that our neighbourhood engaged in, in good faith. This is not a representation of what we voted into office.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☒ Yes



Respondent No: 21

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:36:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:36:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It is incredibly disappointing that the Grandview Woodland Community Plan continues to be ignored. The tower is not representative of what the community wants. The community does not want luxury high-rise condos that does not provide enough parking, that will loom over the neighbourhood, drive the cost of housing to further marginalize and will not provide adequate green, community space. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan is representative of what the people who live and love this community wants, developers should not shape our communities.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 22

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:47:12 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 21:47:12 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

As a resident of Granview Woodlands I am very frustrated that the City of Vancouver asks for feedback and says it wants to create liveable communities that work for everyone, but completely disregards community plans. I do not want my community to be a concrete ghetto like what is being built around the skytrain stations (Burquitlam, Marine Drive Station, are 2 examples). I am all for development but it should fit with the history, community and citizens that currently live, work and play in the area. I'm a renter and would love to have more affordable housing options in the neighbourhood but this does not fit. Is it really that hard to develop something that doesn't look like a soviet housing block with a few trees thrown around it?

1. Tower Heights - actually increased. There is no reduction in height, despite the removal of one residential storey from each tower. Even though the developers removed one storey of residences, they increased the height of the retail "plinth" (also known as podium), and increased the height of what sits on the roof - the parapet, the architectural screen, and then the elevator shaft rising steeply above. For example, in Tower A, the height from ground to the top previously was 105.6meters (346 feet). It now rises to 113.3meters - a height of 371.7 feet - the equivalent of 41.6 residential storeys*. The retail "plinth" for Tower A previously was 28.1 meters; it now is 29.6 meters. The "plinth" contains two mezzanine levels. It is the equivalent of about 8 commercial storeys, and of 10.8 standard residential storeys. On the roof of Tower A there is 11 meters (36 feet) of height above the roofline - previously there was only 2.5 meters. This all matters in terms of shadowing and mountain views. Details on height All three towers, from ground to the very top are higher in this revised plan than in the previous one. Tower A To tip top before was 105.6m, now it is 113.3m - an increase of 7.7meters (25 feet). This translates to a height of 371.7 feet - or 41.6 residential storeys. When you compare from ground to the rooftop, before and after, leaving out the height of all the stuff sitting on top of the roof, the height is now 102.3 meters - it previously was 103.1 meters. So a reduction of .8 of a meter. But the problem is there is all kinds of stuff on top of the roof, going all the way around. Tower B To tip top before, was 91.75m; now is 101.6m - an increase of 9.85 meters (32.3 ft). This equals 333.3 feet - 37 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 89.25; , now is 90.5m Tower C To tip top before was 80.95; ; now is 90.1m - an increase of 9.15 meters (30 feet). This equals 295 feet - 33.1 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 78.45; now is 78.15 While buildings are measured in height by the City from ground to the top of the roofline, what sits on top matters to us living in the neighbourhood, in terms of height. The shadowing, and blockage of mountain views is very relevant. That is why the measurement from group to the tip top is highlighted. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan calls for a range of building heights at the Safeway site, from 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform. 2. Plaza still in noisy shadow The proposed plaza remains a big problem. It still runs along the edge of the skytrain line, in its shadow, the trains loudly thundering by. It is not a "sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza" as required by the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. Nor is it centrally located in the development. The developers have enlarged it slightly. It now may be 20,000 sq feet but that includes stairs that run up underneath the commercial building, in darkness. Instead of stairs the architects describe the stairs as "Vertical Circulation to Courtyard"! It seems this is because there are stairs that run beside higher steps that can be used as bleachers for viewing a movie. A movie screen up against the noisy skytrain line! Part of what is included as in the "plaza" are stairs that actually run underneath the commercial building. Stairs to the courtyard, which is closed off to the public. Public looks at the courtyard from the top of the stairs at what the architects call a "belvedere".

Stairs to nowhere. See 5.11 and 5.13 :<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/5landscape.pdf>. On page 13 (p. 133) of the Architectural Plans, one can see what the plaza really looks like, as opposed to what is in the "renderings": <https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/6arch.pdf> The public has no access to the interior courtyard, nor to the play and garden area on the rooftop of the retail building. Those areas are for residents of the towers, not the public. This is all happening because Safeway refuses to have a store that is two levels. If it would do that, there would be more room for a proper public plaza. This plaza was so key to the Grandview Woodland Community Plan because it is instead of a park - this neighbourhood has few parks. See what instead was envisioned, starting at p 111 of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/grandview-woodland-community-plan.pdf> GW Plan says to "Create a new social heart for the community with a new civic plaza as part of a renewed Safeway site". It refers to a "generous centrally located public plaza"....and says the skytrain area will be "centred on and oriented around a sunny,

welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza". 3. Affordability This continues to be a problem. There are 653 suites in this massive development. 215 are condos; the rest are rental suites. It is an improvement that there are now "approximately" 93 below -market rental units, about 20% of the rental units. Yet out of the entire development, only 14% of the suites are below-market. The rest will be marketed as luxury suites. Note that none of the rental suites will get parking spots. Just the condos! See below. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area. The lower rise affordable walk-up rental buildings in the vicinity will be torn down, replaced by gentrified, expensive suites, pushing away long term residents who will no longer be able to afford to live here. Breakdown of suites 171 studio apts 258 1 bedroom 161 2 bedroom 57 3 bedroom 4. No daycare This was removed from the revised proposal. The GW Community Plan calls for a dramatic increase in childcare spaces - 430 new childcare spaces. 5. Parking 205 residential spots. There are 215 condos. Obviously the condos will get the residential parking spots. None of the rental suites will get a spot. And 10 condos will have no parking spot at all. 33 visitor spots 208 spots for commercial 12 car share Clearly, more car share spots are needed. At the very least. 6. Local businesses - Eclectic Commercial Drive These massive towers will boost nearby property values, taxes and rents on local businesses. We cherish the eclectic nature of Commercial Drive. This will push many independent businesses - many who already are struggling - away or into closure. Other comments We support increased density near a transit hub. But we don't want a Brentwood style development imposed on our neighbourhood. This plan is out of scale and will harm the character of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood. Again, we welcome density but this goes far beyond the scope of the community plan. For reference, Grandview is 18% more dense and Cedar Cottage is 24% more dense than the rest of the City. Sources: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-grandview-woodland.pdf> and <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-kensington-cedar-cottage.pdf> * Standard residential storey of 2.72m

Q2. **Your overall position about the application** Opposed

Q3. **I would like to be contacted about this application in the future** Yes



Respondent No: 23

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 21:47:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 18:25:34 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

How any architect can put his name to the so-called design of these buildings I do not know. They are totally out of character with the Drive. Why do you want to destroy such a distinct area of which Vancouver should be proud? The public places are in shadow and will be noisy because of the trains thundering by. You would never get away with this in the west of the City.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 24

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 22:04:23 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 22:04:23 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Can we please build something that inspires the people. Not mindless architecture. Can we build something that honors the older architecture style, perhaps like the taller building in gastown that fits right in. Can we build lower to the ground so it doesn't block the already limited sunshine we have on the west coast. And continue to block views of our precious mountains. Soon all will have are views of ugly skyscrapers. This would be depressing.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 25

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 22:18:06 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 22:18:06 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This rezoning proposal will significantly negatively impact the existing community. The impact of this project will immediately and progressively displace a well-established community that already experiences challenges and barriers to affordability. It shows zero intent to integrate with the existing neighbourhood, nor awareness or acknowledgement of the community it is attempting to enter. The project is not in keeping with the goal of supporting marginalized communities and respecting the diverse culture and communities that inhabit this area. The area is already struggling and being displaced by the impact of development, gentrification, and unaffordability. The city has a duty to preserve and uphold communities of significance that add unique value to our culture and diversity, and this project presents a threat of erasure and displacement - both in the immediate and longitudinally. Housing development for the community should be celebrated, but a more appropriate approach for this community would be on a smaller building scale with a much higher ratio of affordable/rent geared to income units. That is the type of housing that will truly benefit this community, not this garish sore thumb of excess.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 26

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 22:22:05 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 22:22:05 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I'm sorry, but this plan is outrageous - a gross insult to the existing community and longstanding character of Commercial Drive. The towers are now even more absurdly tall than in the previous version of the plan. The plaza is not "sunny" or well located. There are too many "luxury" condos, low-rise existing buildings in the area will be destroyed, renters will need to find parking in a neighbourhood already burdened with limited parking options, etc, etc. Like many others, I understand the need for densification and the logic of doing so close to transportation hubs. But please folks, can this not be done with an eye to the future of the neighbourhood altogether. With the height and placement of the towers and the dominance of high-end condos, I don't see how this serves either the local community or the city. I don't know of course, but this smacks of the city being in the pocket of private, well-moneyed developers from elsewhere, or at least inappropriately influenced by them. We're not naive. We know that many developers are in it for the money and don't give a damn about local integrity or any kind of sane longterm vision that serves the most people.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 27

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 22:28:40 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 22:28:40 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Still too high Need more rental units

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 28

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 22:29:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 22:29:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Lower & Better looking building, more public space, parks

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 29

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 22:33:34 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 22:33:34 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

the planned development is out of scale to the whole neighbourhood and opens up the probability of more towers along Broadway and Commercial. It reduces the corner area to a thoroughway for traffic and people, not a neighbourhood community. There is no allowance for daycare and rental parking. The majority of the units are for singles and couples, not families.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 30

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 23:11:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 23:11:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

These towers are way too high. We are not Hong Kong. Time for a height by law.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 31

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 23:34:02 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 23:34:02 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Still to much density.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 32

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 09, 2021 23:46:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 09, 2021 23:46:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Very disappointed with this development. Way to high for the community. Increased noise. Style of the building doesn't fit the community. Pricing and # of rentals to suit the community of people here does not make sense. Feels like you are pushing the people of this community out. Too few rentals.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 33

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 00:05:35 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 00:05:35 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I do not want this eyesore in our neighborhood! Traffic during construction and moving forward will be a nightmare. This only serves greedy developers and Politicians that get a kick back from the project. This is not a welcomed edition to our neighbourhood or our vision of the direction it should be moving in!. Keep your Towers with the disgusting monstrosi at Brentwood!

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 34

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 01:30:54 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 01:30:54 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

No. This is an abomination. Not only is it ugly and unwelcoming, but it doesn't do anything to serve the needs of this community. I'm honestly disgusted looking at these plans. More gentrification, more "luxury". The heartbeat of this community exists in the artists and immigrants and blue collar workers that call it home, this development doesn't encourage that community. This area needs more affordable rentals and co-op housing models not this bullshit. These rich asshole "developers" are going to destroy everything that makes commercial drive special just like you've done with most of the rest of Vancouver. I do not support this plan as presented.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 35

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 06:12:18 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 06:12:18 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Significantly higher than the 12 storeys recommended by the community consultation focus group.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 36

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 06:22:32 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 14:26:32 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Please don't wreck my neighbourhood with a huge ugly unaffordable building project!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 37

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 06:57:59 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 06:57:59 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Too high. Unlikely to improve affordability.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 38

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 07:13:59 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 07:13:59 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

One less storey for each tower? An April fools joke in November. We're in uptown not downtown. 10 storeys max for all towers.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 39

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 07:33:22 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 07:33:22 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The proposal is just fine. Approve the damm thing for crying outloud

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 40

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 07:34:12 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 07:34:12 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

THESE LANDS ARE STOLEN. Unless you plan on housing all indigenous people in every single one of those units, kindly fuck off with this disgusting plan. I am appalled at the fact that you think this defines a community. High rises are cages for humans, and it will destroy East Van culture. If you don't know what defines East Van it's: working class, affordability, local, diversity. You will displace the entirety of this area with those boxes. We are just asking for 1/3 of the units and to house those with low income and homeless people. This is still not changing that. How dare you. s.22(1) And I can tell you first hand that changing the demographic of an area changes kids. They are only concerned about wealth and power, even at 6 years old. You just create meaninglessness and consumer robots from these high rises. Mount Pleasant has already changed dramatically. The kids who need a community space can't find it anymore when they see a "penthouse" at the top of a building. The buildings also immediately impact wild life and our ecosystem. Did we not learn anything from COP26? This terrible idea supports the Industries that are destroying our planet. if you think those buildings will stand more than 20 years, you're kidding yourself. It's a waste of money, energy, resources.. Have a heart. And stop building.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 41

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 08:20:04 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 08:20:04 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Commercial dr is a precious cultural jewel in a vulnerable position. Please don't let development destroy what little we have left of old Vancouver..

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 42

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:11:29 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:11:29 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Please do not destroy our neighbourhood

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 43

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:12:06 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:12:06 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I strongly feel that 25 to 30 storeys is not fitting for this community. it will completely destroy what is uniquely Commercial Drive. It looks like Brentwoods poor neighbor.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 44

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:20:53 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:20:53 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Way too large of a tower

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 45

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:25:09 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:25:09 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

There is no reduction in height. In fact, it looks as though the overall design has actually gotten taller. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan calls for a range of building heights at the Safeway site, from 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan says to "Create a new social heart for the community with a new civic plaza as part of a renewed Safeway site". It refers to a "generous centrally located public plaza"....and says the skytrain area will be "centred on and oriented around a sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza". The proposed design does none of this and isn't accessible to the public. Affordability continues to be a problem. Out of the entire development, only 14% of the suites are below-market. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area. The lower rise affordable walk-up rental buildings in the vicinity will be torn down, replaced by gentrified, expensive suites, pushing away long term residents who will no longer be able to afford to live here. The GW Community Plan calls for a dramatic increase in childcare spaces - 430 new childcare spaces. Daycare was removed from the revised proposal. We support increased density near a transit hub. But we don't want a Brentwood style development imposed on our neighbourhood. This plan is out of scale and will harm the character of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 46

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:30:15 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:30:15 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This design is ridiculously out of human scale. I'm all about density but this is ridiculous. Let's keep the community intact with 3 story walk ups not mega towers. Save the mega towers for Burnaby Brentwood (close) and Metrotown downtown etc. The drive is about community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 47

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:41:22 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:41:22 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This overwhelmingly ugly monstrosity will negatively impact my neighbourhood. The towers are higher and the daycare has been removed. There is nowhere near enough below-market housing. This monstrosity will drive up rents in the neighbourhood and drive out the more unique businesses in the neighbourhood.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 48

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:47:55 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:47:55 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This project is a contributor to the climate crisis as well as an inadequate social friendly build. This should wait until the Vancouver Plan is finalised. This should not be a spot re-zone.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 49

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 09:57:29 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 09:57:29 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The 1780 E Broadway rezoning application misses opportunities to add to the vibrancy and housing appeal of the community. I believe the City has ignored feedback from the community and has supported a development that gives little to this area of the city: height to top increases despite strong opposition to the original proposal height; only 14% of units are below-market thereby excluding locals and likely forcing up local values, taxes and rents; the public plaza area has been shunted up against the noisy train; the public do not have access to the 'sunny, park-like area. I am a many-decade customer of this particular Safeway, and I am so disappointed they keep to the sprawling one-floor design, hogging space that could be opened for public access. I'm so disappointed in the same-old 'luxury condo' design. The city talks about transformative designs that integrate well with existing communities but does not act on that goal.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 50

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 10:06:28 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 18:14:59 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

There are more than enough studies that highlight the fact that these towers do not build community. This part of our city does not suit this mega tower model. Aside from being an eyesore it will immediately rob us of the charm and the vibe that is very important to all of us who live here. Please don't build these over kill buildings here. This is just wrong.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 51

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 10:07:07 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 10:07:07 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Does not fit in with the grandview-woodlands community plan. This will completely change Commercial Drive and have a negative impact on the existing culture and community. It does not offer solutions to affordable housing, and it will lead to incredible density issues and increased traffic in what is already a very busy intersection.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 52

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 10:12:09 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 10:12:09 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Cancel all proposals for a mega tower. A terrible plan to up end the east side, it's resedents and traffic. Will add more congestion to an already congested area !

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 53

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 10:27:02 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 10:27:02 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I truly believe building this highrise in this neighborhood is a bad idea. s.22(1) an overpriced newly built apartment, which is only 6 stories high, and the neighborhood is not happy s.22(1) There have been rude signs posted on the lamps s.22(1) It's smack in the middle of a neighborhood in commercial. If it wasn't one of the only pet friendly buildings in the city I wouldn't have supported its construction either. Now this high rise proposal is way taller and uglier and badly designed for the neighborhood than the one I live in. Not only will this building force surrounding tenants to move farther east by driving up the prices through gentrification, but it will also drive away the character that commercial drive is so famous for. I'm sure you already know the downsides to putting such an eyesore in the middle of this neighborhood, so just know that no one will be happy except the rich developers who don't have to look at it blocking the mountains everyday.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 54

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 10:43:44 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 10:43:44 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This proposal does not fit into the neighbourhood context in the least. It is enormous and extremely tall, and there is not another building anywhere near here that is even half as high. It will dramatically alter the character of the neighbourhood. What is there now is awful, to be sure, but what could be there could be some much better and so much more appropriate than what is proposed. As the community consultations years ago showed, and what the Citizens Assembly also showed, and which the City has simply ignored, is that there is overwhelming neighbourhood opposition to a project of this scale in this location. There is overwhelming support for increased density, but increased density through appropriate housing types. It is clear that this project is developer-driven, and not neighbourhood driven and has been conceived without the least real consideration of the wishes of the people who live here. The amenities this neighbourhood offers are increasingly under pressure from increased population, and this project will only add to the problem. What few amenities it will subsidize--and it remains to be seen what those will really be--will do little to nothing to offset the increased pressure this development will bring. Finally, the design of this project is awful. The plaza is terrible both in its dimensions and location. There is no plan for the "stewardship" of the space, as far as I can tell, despite the City's planners during the consultation period talking about "stewardship" as if it were a central element of its concerns.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 55

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 10:53:21 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 18:56:45 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Hello, I am a resident of the Grandview Woodland area and do not support this proposal. Simply put, the sheer size and height of this development does not align with the surroundings and the community. The Grandview Woodland area is a long established community that takes it's pride in its history, character and "village" feel. I am very surprised that the City of Vancouver would ever consider this proposal. It does not take an experienced eye to see that this building does not fit in this community. Does the City not see that this building is completely out of character and could have a devastating impact on the community?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 56

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:02:34 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:02:34 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

My thought is that this is mere "lip service" and that any comments we may provide will be ignored. I am terrified to see the negative effect that come from suddenly having more than 1,400 people stuffed into the area (700 units with 2 or more per unit). Homelessness, petty crime, robberies, vandalism are already common here, so increasing density will just make it worse. But I imagine the architects that have designed the building will do well financially and return home to their North Van mansions every evening. Sigh.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 57

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:03:43 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:03:43 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It sounds like this project is still well outside of the community development plan for the neighbourhood and is still completely out of scale for other developments in this area. It is basically a way to maximize profits at the expense of the people who actually live and work here. Is one of the tallest projects in the entire city really appropriate for this area?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 58

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:08:49 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:08:49 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This "revised" proposal is no better than the previous one and it not acceptable. It will cause more harm than good unless it is changed to address the following issues: 1. Tower Heights - actually increased. There is no reduction in height, despite the removal of one residential storey from each tower. Even though the developers removed one storey of residences, they increased the height of the retail "plinth" (also known as podium), and increased the height of what sits on the roof - the parapet, the architectural screen, and then the elevator shaft rising steeply above. For example, in Tower A, the height from ground to the top previously was 105.6meters (346 feet). It now rises to 113.3meters - a height of 371.7 feet - the equivalent of 41.6 residential storeys*. The retail "plinth" for Tower A previously was 28.1 meters; it now is 29.6 meters. The "plinth" contains two mezzanine levels. It is the equivalent of about 8 commercial storeys, and of 10.8 standard residential storeys. On the roof of Tower A there is 11 meters (36 feet) of height above the roofline - previously there was only 2.5 meters. This all matters in terms of shadowing and mountain views. Details on height All three towers, from ground to the very top are higher in this revised plan than in the previous one. Tower A To tip top before was 105.6m, now it is 113.3m - an increase of 7.7meters (25 feet). This translates to a height of 371.7 feet - or 41.6 residential storeys. When you compare from ground to the rooftop, before and after, leaving out the height of all the stuff sitting on top of the roof, the height is now 102.3 meters - it previously was 103.1 meters. So a reduction of .8 of a meter. But the problem is there is all kinds of stuff on top of the roof, going all the way around. Tower B To tip top before, was 91.75m; now is 101.6m - an increase of 9.85 meters (32.3 ft). This equals 333.3 feet - 37 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 89.25; , now is 90.5m Tower C To tip top before was 80.95; ; now is 90.1m - an increase of 9.15 meters (30 feet). This equals 295 feet - 33.1 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 78.45; now is 78.15 While buildings are measured in height by the City from ground to the top of the roofline, what sits on top matters to us living in the neighbourhood, in terms of height. The shadowing, and blockage of mountain views is very relevant. That is why the measurement from group to the tip top is highlighted. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan calls for a range of building heights at the Safeway site, from 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform. 2. Plaza still in noisy shadow The proposed plaza remains a big problem. It still runs along the edge of the skytrain line, in its shadow, the trains loudly thundering by. It is not a "sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza" as required by the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. Nor is it centrally located in the development. The developers have enlarged it slightly. It now may be 20,000 sq feet but that includes stairs that run up underneath the commercial building, in darkness. Instead of stairs the architects describe the stairs as "Vertical Circulation to Courtyard"! It seems this is because there are stairs that run beside higher steps that can be used as bleachers for viewing a movie. A movie screen up against the noisy skytrain line! Part of what is included as in the "plaza" are stairs that actually run underneath the commercial building. Stairs to the courtyard, which is closed off to the public. Public looks at the courtyard from the top of the stairs at what the architects call a "belvedere". Stairs to nowhere. See 5.11 and 5.13 :<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/5landscape.pdf>. On page 13 (p. 133) of the Architectural Plans, one can see what the plaza really looks like, as opposed to what is in the "renderings": <https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/6arch.pdf> The public has no access to the interior courtyard, nor to the play and garden area on the rooftop of the retail building. Those areas are for residents of the towers, not the public. This is all happening because Safeway refuses to have a store that is two levels. If it would do that, there would be more room for a proper public plaza. This plaza was so key to the Grandview Woodland Community Plan because it is instead of a park - this neighbourhood has few parks. See what instead was envisioned, starting at p 111 of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/grandview-woodland-community-plan.pdf> GW Plan says to "Create a new social heart for the community with a new civic plaza as part of a renewed Safeway site". It refers to a "generous centrally located public plaza".....and says the skytrain area will be "centred on and oriented around a sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza". 3. Affordability This continues to be a problem. There are 653 suites in this massive development. 215 are condos; the rest are rental suites. It is an improvement that there are now "approximately" 93 below -market rental units, about 20% of the rental units. Yet out of the entire development, only 14% of the suites are below-market. The rest will be marketed as luxury suites. Note that none of the rental suites will get parking spots. Just the condos! See below. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area. The lower rise

affordable walk-up rental buildings in the vicinity will be torn down, replaced by gentrified, expensive suites, pushing away long term residents who will no longer be able to afford to live here. Breakdown of suites 171 studio apts 258 1 bedroom 161 2 bedroom 57 3 bedroom 4. No daycare This was removed from the revised proposal. The GW Community Plan calls for a dramatic increase in childcare spaces - 430 new childcare spaces. 5. Parking 205 residential spots. There are 215 condos. Obviously the condos will get the residential parking spots. None of the rental suites will get a spot. And 10 condos will have no parking spot at all. 33 visitor spots 208 spots for commercial 12 car share Clearly, more car share spots are needed. At the very least. 6. Local businesses - Eclectic Commercial Drive These massive towers will boost nearby property values, taxes and rents on local businesses. We cherish the eclectic nature of Commercial Drive. This will push many independent businesses - many who already are struggling - away or into closure. Other comments We support increased density near a transit hub. But we don't want a Brentwood style development imposed on our neighbourhood. This plan is out of scale and will harm the character of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood. Again, we welcome density but this goes far beyond the scope of the community plan. For reference, Grandview is 18% more dense and Cedar Cottage is 24% more dense than the rest of the City. Sources: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-grandview-woodland.pdf> and <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-kensington-cedar-cottage.pdf> * Standard residential storey of 2.72m

Q2. **Your overall position about the application** Opposed

Q3. **I would like to be contacted about this application in the future** Yes



Respondent No: 59

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:10:02 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:10:02 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Shameful. We continue to see major problems with it. It does not meet the terms of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. The skyscrapers continue to be extraordinarily high, the design is ugly, there's still no sunny central inviting plaza for everyone, affordability is limited. This plan will have a major negative impact on people living in the area and the small businesses that give The Drive its beloved eclectic character. REVISED PROPOSAL: Quick Facts and Analysis 1. Tower Heights - actually increased. There is no reduction in height, despite the removal of one residential storey from each tower.

Even though the developers removed one storey of residences, they increased the height of the retail "plinth" (also known as podium), and increased the height of what sits on the roof - the parapet, the architectural screen, and then the elevator shaft rising steeply above. For example, in Tower A, the height from ground to the top previously was 105.6meters (346 feet). It now rises to 113.3meters - a height of 371.7 feet - the equivalent of 41.6 residential storeys*. The retail "plinth" for Tower A previously was 28.1 meters; it now is 29.6 meters. The "plinth" contains two mezzanine levels. It is the equivalent of about 8 commercial storeys, and of 10.8 standard residential storeys. On the roof of Tower A there is 11 meters (36 feet) of height above the roofline - previously there was only 2.5 meters. This all matters in terms of shadowing and mountain views. Details on height All three towers, from ground to the very top are higher in this revised plan than in the previous one. Tower A To tip top before was 105.6m, now it is 113.3m - an increase of 7.7meters (25 feet). This translates to a height of 371.7 feet - or 41.6 residential storeys. When you compare from ground to the rooftop, before and after, leaving out the height of all the stuff sitting on top of the roof, the height is now 102.3 meters - it previously was 103.1 meters. So a reduction of .8 of a meter. But the problem is there is all kinds of stuff on top of the roof, going all the way around. Tower B To tip top before, was 91.75m; now is 101.6m - an increase of 9.85 meters (32.3 ft). This equals 333.3 feet - 37 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 89.25; , now is 90.5m Tower C To tip top before was 80.95; ; now is 90.1m - an increase of 9.15 meters (30 feet). This equals 295 feet - 33.1 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 78.45; now is 78.15 While buildings are measured in height by the City from ground to the top of the roofline, what sits on top matters to us living in the neighbourhood, in terms of height. The shadowing, and blockage of mountain views is very relevant. That is why the measurement from group to the tip top is highlighted. The Grandview Woodland Community Plan calls for a range of building heights at the Safeway site, from 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform. 2. Plaza still in noisy shadow The proposed plaza remains a big problem. It still runs along the edge of the skytrain line, in its shadow, the trains loudly thundering by. It is not a "sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza" as required by the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. Nor is it centrally located in the development. The developers have enlarged it slightly. It now may be 20,000 sq feet but that includes stairs that run up underneath the commercial building, in darkness. Instead of stairs the architects describe the stairs as "Vertical Circulation to Courtyard"! It seems this is because there are stairs that run beside higher steps that can be used as bleachers for viewing a movie. A movie screen up against the noisy skytrain line! Part of what is included as in the "plaza" are stairs that actually run underneath the commercial building. Stairs to the courtyard, which is closed off to the public. Public looks at the courtyard from the top of the stairs at what the architects call a "belvedere". Stairs to nowhere. See 5.11 and 5.13

:<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/5landscape.pdf>. On page 13 (p. 133) of the Architectural Plans, one can see what the plaza really looks like, as opposed to what is in the "renderings": <https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1780ebroadway/resubmission/6arch.pdf> The public has no access to the interior courtyard, nor to the play and garden area on the rooftop of the retail building. Those areas are for residents of the towers, not the public. This is all happening because Safeway refuses to have a store that is two levels. If it would do that, there would be more room for a proper public plaza. This plaza was so key to the Grandview Woodland Community Plan because it is instead of a park - this neighbourhood has few parks. See what instead was envisioned, starting at p 111 of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/grandview-woodland-community-plan.pdf> GW Plan says to "Create a new social heart for the community with a new civic plaza as part of a renewed Safeway site". It refers to a "generous centrally located public plaza"....and says the skytrain area will be "centred on and oriented around a sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza". 3. Affordability This continues to be a problem. There are 653 suites in this massive development. 215 are condos; the rest are rental suites. It is an improvement that there are now

"approximately" 93 below-market rental units, about 20% of the rental units. Yet out of the entire development, only 14% of the suites are below-market. The rest will be marketed as luxury suites. Note that none of the rental suites will get parking spots. Just the condos! See below. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area. The lower rise affordable walk-up rental buildings in the vicinity will be torn down, replaced by gentrified, expensive suites, pushing away long term residents who will no longer be able to afford to live here. Breakdown of suites 171 studio apts 258 1 bedroom 161 2 bedroom 57 3 bedroom 4. No daycare This was removed from the revised proposal. The GW Community Plan calls for a dramatic increase in childcare spaces - 430 new childcare spaces. 5. Parking 205 residential spots. There are 215 condos. Obviously the condos will get the residential parking spots. None of the rental suites will get a spot. And 10 condos will have no parking spot at all. 33 visitor spots 208 spots for commercial 12 car share Clearly, more car share spots are needed. At the very least. 6. Local businesses - Eclectic Commercial Drive These massive towers will boost nearby property values, taxes and rents on local businesses. We cherish the eclectic nature of Commercial Drive. This will push many independent businesses - many who already are struggling - away or into closure. Other comments We support increased density near a transit hub. But we don't want a Brentwood style development imposed on our neighbourhood. This plan is out of scale and will harm the character of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood. Again, we welcome density but this goes far beyond the scope of the community plan. For reference, Grandview is 18% more dense and Cedar Cottage is 24% more dense than the rest of the City. Sources: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-grandview-woodland.pdf> and <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-indicators-profile-kensington-cedar-cottage.pdf> * Standard residential storey of 2.72m

Q2. Your overall position about the application	Opposed
---	---------

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future	not answered
---	--------------



Respondent No: 60

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:12:00 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:12:00 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The skyscrapers continue to be extraordinarily high, the design is ugly, there's still no sunny central inviting plaza for everyone, affordability is limited. This plan will have a major negative impact on people living in the area and the small businesses that give The Drive its beloved eclectic character.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 61

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:20:03 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:20:03 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Firstly the plinth height must be included in the overall height. The original GW plan was for 15 -20 stories. A plinth was never discussed. The designs of the proposed buildings are ugly. There is nothing that lends to the beautification of this classic humble neighborhood. Do better Perkins Will. Would any of you want to call that your forever home or are you aiming specifically at the foreign market who need to hide their money away? From the calculations, there will be about 1.000 more residents added to this neighbourhood. This neighborhood is full. Trout lake CC is full. Britannia CC is full. And it is to be redeveloped soon. Where are the services for these 1.000 more people. The doctors/ dentists/.physiotherapy/ services are full. It is fine for developers to build, sell, take the money and run and then what? It is time we demand that developers leave legacies for the communities they are building in, beyond the non existent plaza, for everyone to partake in. And do not overbuild an ugly out of place structure that appears to not even give all the residents outdoor access. I have lived in this neighborhood since s.22(1). The current GW plan I have been commenting on since 2013. This is a smart neighborhood, not opposed to density. But for reasonable portioned out density. Not for one quick fix ugly, unthought out plan at Broadway and Commercial. And then there is the traffic.... CoV has decided to close Grandview from Victoria to Commercial. Now ALL traffic needing to go north on Commercial can only do so at Broadway and Commercial, after getting around the bus lane. Firstly what were they thinking and now all the traffic from the 450 parking spaces for the residents and retail plinth customers of the the new mugly, yes mugly complex. This whole plan was in place and the the developers got greedy. As a taxpayer and resident of this grandview neighborhood, CoV needs to tell the developers that they need to do better, listen to the neighborhood, stop saying that they are building a vertical village that will be the heartbeat of Commercial Drive. The heartbeat of Commercial Drive beats in the chests of everyone who lives, walks, shops and visits this neighborhood everyday. Come on CoV. speak up for me and my fellow neighbors. That's why we elected you. Planned density yes. Mega towers NO.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 62

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:34:09 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:34:09 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The goal of increased density around a major transit hub is acknowledged; however, this revised project does not address objections. The height of the three towers is completely unacceptable and must be lowered to a scale that is compatible with the community. A height of 20 stories or preferably less would be preferable. Increased public space with sunlight that is accessible to the public is necessary. There are few parks in the neighbourhood and there is an enormous increase in population density already. Local parks are being degraded by over use. Plus we need amenities such as daycares. I am a longtime resident of Grandview Woodlands and value it's smaller scale, diversity and working class history. People are passionate about this area. Please don't ruin it. Go back to the drawing board. This current revision is not acceptable.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 63

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:40:24 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:40:24 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Far too many storeys, ugly architecture and that walkway beside the grocery store will attract panhandlers and petty criminals. Looks like a prime spot for muggings. The size of those buildings will cast a depressing shadow over this community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 64

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:43:28 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:43:28 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

As a local resident I have serious concerns about this development. A 29 story building is equivalent to a downtown skyscraper and would completely dwarf all of the other buildings in the area which are mostly around 2-3 stories on average. By allowing this kind of development to take place, it sets a precedence for more oversized buildings in the area. I think at most buildings in this area should be around 7 -10 stories high. While I can appreciate the need for more housing in Vancouver, this doesn't sound like it will be providing sufficient affordable housing options.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 65

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:44:16 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:44:16 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This still does not at all meet the terms of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. What was the point of the alleged "community consultation" in forming the plan if the most significant neighbourhood change does not conform to it? This has all just been a long-term PR stunt so that the city and developers can do what they want while claiming the community was listened to.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 66

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 11:48:33 am

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 11:48:33 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Will parking permits be given for the area to people residing in the towers or working in these businesses?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 67

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 12:00:33 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 12:00:33 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Though I was more supportive of previous proposals for this land (higher density, childcare space, etc.) I believe *something* needs to get approved and this is better than nothing. The so-called "no megatower" crowd will never be pleased no matter how much revision occurs, and the housing this space can bring is necessary. Please consider approval of this proposal. The neighbourhood needs this property to be redeveloped, and the Broadway corridor made more livable- this proposal goes a long way toward that.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 68

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 12:09:09 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 20:12:38 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

I disagree with a proposal for yet more high rise developments.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 69

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 12:38:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 12:38:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

With this development being adjacent to a major transit station, the number of parking spaces provided should be much lower than what's proposed. It is the perfect example of a transit-oriented development where parking is still being oversupplied. The reduction in parking spaces would help reduce the cost of construction, which hopefully would translate to more affordable housing prices.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 70

Login: ...

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 13:11:45 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 13:11:45 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The proposal is too large for the neighbourhood. There should be a higher percentage of below market units - and "below market" should be actually affordable to most residents. Also, a development of this size should have more public amenities.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 71

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 13:30:54 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 13:30:54 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Hello, I'm writing to let you know that we are opposed to this development as proposed here. We are in favour of density, but it has to match the neighbourhood in scale and in design. We are supportive of buildings similar to the scale of those at Kingsway and Knight/25th. The buildings proposed here are much too tall. Also there is no central plaza or outdoor neighbourhood meeting place. This is an example of the kind of urban planning we don't want. We would like to challenge our city to do better for its longtime citizens and for the new people coming in. We look forward to seeing a redesigned proposal that is in line with what East Van residents support: shorter buildings with friendly outdoor spaces in between. Thank you.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 72

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 13:34:34 pm

Last Seen: Dec 01, 2021 00:06:41 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, height (no reduction). inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking and most importantly - no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value. An additional concern is for the local businesses and the likely possibility that their rents will go up as property values increase in the neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood is unique and valued all over the lower mainland. If businesses go under as a result of this project, what replaces them? Uptown glitz? Please know that density itself is not the issue as we favour smart gradual densification. This project is not that!!! Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for a better use of this corner.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 73

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 13:39:58 pm

Last Seen: Nov 19, 2021 07:03:23 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Changes are an inevitable part of time...each new citizen of Vancouver adds to this fact. I welcome those changes and feel this development is 20 years behind. I think every skytrain stop should have "mega-towers" to make it ultimately more convenient for commuters and people in the community. The fact this development wants to have a public space and so much commercial promotes community and gives businesses more opportunity for growth too. This development would be very supportive to the city's agenda. 1. Affordable housing. Simple supply and demand. If supply is restricted and/or limited (like it is today) and there is consistent population growth, of course there will be affordable housing issues. Forget about the factor of "what's affordable?" With enough housing for a variety of income levels , it will help. 2. Opioid Crisis and Homelessness. This is a complex issue that can clearly consume a lot of money and resources. However, with this issue and any other issue that requires money to help fix....the city needs to tax people. If you build more businesses and housing...doesn't that by default...give the city more people to tax? Also...more multi-use complexes like this one in question allows more business to come in. Business generally have much greater ability to pay higher taxes (vs a family home)...so it really just benefits the city to allow these developments in. And 3rd? Changes to address concern. I don't have a concern for this development other than how it will get delayed...again. The view cones this city has..is, put bluntly: stupid. Mountain and ocean views should be treated as a luxury item. It's not a fundamental need. Even if it was? Go outside and enjoy it..thats what attracts lots of people to the city. Get rid of view cones and approve more towers faster so you can tax more people and businesses. It's a win-win in my opinion....

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 74

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 14:03:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 14:03:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

First of all, I'm a fan of density. I love cities that have it, and think it's key to vibrant, creative communities. I wish there was more of it, everywhere. The towers proposed are not an example of the kind of density that I think works well, and in fact, have seen how this transit/housing densification approach has failed in Vancouver: Who wants to hang out at Marine Gateway? The Amazing Brentwood Mall? I appreciate that there's some logic to this in outlying neighbourhoods that don't have an existing community vibe and structure in place, but Commercial Drive is not that. Bring on the density, but do it in buildings that are human-scaled, in 4 storey buildings. 6 storey buildings, maybe a few 8 storey buildings. Look at the West End, the Cambie Corridor. Montreal. Paris. Amsterdam. Even much of New York. Etc. Commercial Drive is a delicate community. It could *definitely* use some intensifying, but having a gargantuan building at one end of it is not that. In addition, the towers effectively exacerbate the separation of the North end of Commercial from the South (which is where I live). Hope you reconsider this

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 75

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 14:07:42 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 22:07:42 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

This does not conform with the Grandview Woodland Community Plan in spirit or in fact. The Plan calls for heights between 12-24 storeys. These towers soar to as high as 40 residential storeys, when you include the elevator shaft and architectural screen; Tower A even just to its roofline rises to 102.3 meters - 37 storeys high. NOT THE PLAN! The plaza is not sunny generous or welcoming. It is in the noisy shadow of the skytrain. The steps that are now included in the plaza go up and underneath the commercial building and then end at the courtyard to which the public has no access. Grandview has few parks; the plaza was to be a substitute. That isn't happening here. No daycare - Grandview Plan calls for creation of more than 400 spaces

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 76

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 14:32:49 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 14:32:49 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The architecture is terrible. This needs to be redesigned from scratch because it is unacceptable. There are not enough trees around this development and please preserve the mountain view.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes

**Respondent No:** 77**Login:** s.22(1)**Email:** s.22(1)**Responded At:** Nov 10, 2021 15:04:49 pm**Last Seen:** Nov 10, 2021 15:04:49 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Your comments**

I am a resident and home owner just off of Commercial Drive. I hope to live in this area and be a positive contributor to our local Commercial Drive for decades to come, most likely for the majority of the rest of my life. I am entirely and completely opposed to the 1780 E Broadway rezoning application. I am opposed for several reasons which I summarize below. First, the Tower Heights have increased in the rezoning application. There is no reduction in height, despite the removal of one residential storey from each tower. Even though the developers removed one storey of residences, they increased the height of the retail "plinth" (also known as podium), and increased the height of what sits on the roof - the parapet, the architectural screen, and then the elevator shaft rising steeply above. For example, in Tower A, the height from ground to the top previously was 105.6meters (346 feet). It now rises to 113.3meters - a height of 371.7 feet - the equivalent of 41.6 residential storeys*. The retail "plinth" for Tower A previously was 28.1 meters; it now is 29.6 meters. The "plinth" contains two mezzanine levels. It is the equivalent of about 8 commercial storeys, and of 10.8 standard residential storeys. On the roof of Tower A there is 11 meters (36 feet) of height above the roofline - previously there was only 2.5 meters. This all matters in terms of shadowing and mountain views. All three towers, from ground to the very top are higher in this revised plan than in the previous one. Tower A To tip top before was 105.6m, now it is 113.3m - an increase of 7.7meters (25 feet). This translates to a height of 371.7 feet - or 41.6 residential storeys. When you compare from ground to the rooftop, before and after, leaving out the height of all the stuff sitting on top of the roof, the height is now 102.3 meters - it previously was 103.1 meters. So a reduction of .8 of a meter. But the problem is there is all kinds of stuff on top of the roof, going all the way around. Tower B To tip top before, was 91.75m; now is 101.6m - an increase of 9.85 meters (32.3 ft). This equals 333.3 feet - 37 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 89.25; , now is 90.5m Tower C To tip top before was 80.95; ; now is 90.1m - an increase of 9.15 meters (30 feet). This equals 295 feet - 33.1 residential storeys. To top of roof before was 78.45; now is 78.15 Second, the plaza still in noisy shadow The proposed plaza remains a big problem. It still runs along the edge of the skytrain line, in its shadow, the trains loudly thundering by. It is not a "sunny, welcoming, delightful and people-friendly civic plaza" as required by the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. Nor is it centrally located in the development. The developers have enlarged it slightly. It now may be 20,000 sq feet but that includes stairs that run up underneath the commercial building, in darkness. Instead of stairs the architects describe the stairs as "Vertical Circulation to Courtyard"! The public has no access to the interior courtyard, nor to the play and garden area on the rooftop of the retail building. Those areas are for residents of the towers, not the public. Third, affordability This continues to be a problem. There are 653 suites in this massive development. 215 are condos; the rest are rental suites. It is an improvement that there are now "approximately" 93 below -market rental units, about 20% of the rental units. Yet out of the entire development, only 14% of the suites are below-market. The rest will be marketed as luxury suites. Note that none of the rental suites will get parking spots. Just the condos! See below. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area. The lower rise affordable walk-up rental buildings in the vicinity will be torn down, replaced by gentrified, expensive suites, pushing away long term residents who will no longer be able to afford to live here. Breakdown of suites 171 studio apts 258 1 bedroom 161 2 bedroom 57 3 bedroom Fourth, there is no longer daycare provided. This was removed from the revised proposal. The GW Community Plan calls for a dramatic increase in childcare spaces - 430 new childcare spaces. Fifth, there is a major issue related to parking. 205 residential spots. There are 215 condos. Obviously the condos will get the residential parking spots. None of the rental suites will get a spot. And 10 condos will have no parking spot at all. 33 visitor spots 208 spots for commercial 12 car share Clearly, more car share spots are needed. At the very least. Sixth, importantly local businesses and the eclectic Commercial Drive culture will be negatively affected. These massive towers will boost nearby property values, taxes and rents on local businesses. We cherish the eclectic nature of Commercial Drive. This will push many independent businesses - many who already are struggling - away or into closure

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed**Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future** Yes



Respondent No: 78

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 16:04:36 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 16:04:36 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I do not see how the proposal meet the terms of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. Childcare facility is replaced by fitness..... The skyscrapers are too high and the reduction of the building height by one-storey does not make any difference. Has the overall height of the buildings been reduced? Do we want commercial Drive to look like downtown neighborhood?! The Public space along the noisy Skytrain and in the shade of the elevated guideway and buildings does not make it attractive.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 79

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 16:26:10 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 16:26:10 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

When this was first proposed and the city came to our neighbourhood - pretty sure people said 24-30 storeys is way too high. I gather you were not listening. Think 15-20 storeys would be more in line with what is going on in our neighbourhood. Think there needs to be a revisit. And the design is terrible.....way too flashy for The Drive

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 80

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 16:38:21 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 16:38:21 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This development is too high and will set a precedent. This is the wide end of the wedge, it is best to start with the narrow end. This is not even close to the often mentioned community consultations and Grandview-Woodland Plan. Please do not allow this plan as drafted to proceed. We asked for less height and they came back with buildings that are actually higher. "The sunny central plaza" is replaced by space that is right next to the noisy Skytrain and will be shadowed most of the time. There is no mountain view corridor in the plinth. What happened to the Daycare? What benefit is the community going to receive from the loss of our mountain view and sunlight, quiet enjoyment of our homes for the next few years and increased density and traffic in our neighbourhood thereafter? This proposal is not acceptable as it does not meet the minimum standards we have set to maintain the character of our neighbourhood. As citizens we come in good faith to these meetings and we expect the City of Vancouver to respond to our carefully considered community plans. The civic election is less than one year in the future. It might be best to delay this decision and request further amendments to the proposal. These developers know exactly what they are doing, they want to squeeze as much as they can without giving the public anything. These experienced professionals make their plans and submit them to our representatives at City Council and Staff. We citizens are not paid to deal with these complex issues, so we look to the professionals employed by our City of Vancouver. Please assist us to extract some value to compensate us for the loss of beauty and quiet we will experience in our community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 81

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 16:39:38 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 16:39:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am opposed to this rezoning, as these huge towers would change the character of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood and its eclectic small shops. As a longtime resident of the Commercial Drive neighbourhood, I value the small businesses, restaurants and cafes and the unique character of the neighbourhood that would be gone with this sort of huge development. I would also say that the elementary and secondary schools do not have capacity for the enormous influx of children that this would bring to the area, so our infrastructure is not developed for school and recreation that would be needed.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 82

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 17:29:52 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 17:29:52 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I live close to this proposed development and I really hope that it is approved. It will offer many amenities to the neighbourhood. Plus it has places for people to live!!!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 83

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 17:31:37 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 17:31:37 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

What public amenities is being donated to the surrounding neighborhoods as part of this large development? Will there be any contribution to common shared spaces such as parks, since there will be an increase in population density? What happened to the childcare facility? Also, has there been any consideration to impact on surrounding schools? And consideration to the impact on traffic in this area? It currently is a very busy intersection.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 84

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 17:33:10 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 17:33:10 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This development plan continues to ignore the Grandview Woodlands plan, a plan that we worked so hard on to allow for increased density while retaining the neighbourhood feeling. I am shocked that the city would even consider this plan after the city had encouraged us to develop a plan, a plan that they accepted. Was all that work a waste of time?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 85

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 17:35:19 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 01:48:37 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

General: - support densification at transit hubs but this goes too far - The design not attractive, towers are too high, out of place and out of character, and out of scale with neighborhood. - massive towers create shadows, block views, - Plan does not align with community plan. - driven by developers and greed How the proposal affects the immediate surroundings - negative impact on neighborhood and surrounding area, - less livable - lower sense of community The proposal's fit with the City's goals and priorities - we don't need massive towers to achieve density goals - contradicts results of intensive planning exercise Any changes you feel are needed to address your concerns - make the towers much smaller and better designed. - focus on what the community needs, not developers

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 86

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 18:06:21 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 18:06:21 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

absolutely no sense of place or resonance with the area,as if an alien spaceship landed and destroyed the area surrounding it,a monster,,it will be a concrete wall ,29 stories tall,that will be the new mtn view, only the developers will benefit ,not the residents of the area,or the city of vancouver,affordable housing,and community plan,not a thought or consideration,, f rom a lifelong resident of east van

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 87

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 19:16:07 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 19:16:07 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I would like to see more below-market rental units in this development - ideally around 150-200 rather than 93, including 2 and 3 bedroom family units.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 88

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 20:18:06 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 04:19:59 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Please Press the pause button. Commercial Drive is a neighbourhood that is not perfect, but it gives so much to so many and feels like a community. To go from our current housing situation to the Safeway Monster seems like a knee jerk/lazy solution. There has to be an in between solution here. Vancouver can do better. Montreal has created many different neighbourhoods where the buildings are no more than 3 storeys tall. Each one has its own infrastructure. It's own vibe. Keep the towers downtown and come up with something more creative to these communities that we live in and love.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 89

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 21:34:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 21:34:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I have lived in Granby Woodland for over s.22(1) I do not support this development in Grandview Woodland for many reasons : This development does not at all fit with this neighborhood. It is too big, and tall; it will overpower and overshadow other buildings. It will kill small local businesses The build this community and made it what it is. It will not be affordable housing or affordable to anyone on me minimum wage. It will change the entire landscape of this neighborhood for the worse. It does not include any social spaces for the residence of the area. Respectfully, I do not support this development in this neighborhood. Please consider building elsewhere where it is more fitting.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 90

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 22:03:26 pm

Last Seen: Nov 24, 2021 18:15:24 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

This proposal is so out-of-line with the community and with the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan I that I am appalled that the planning department should have to waste its time reviewing it. No substantive changes have been made that make this proposal any more acceptable than the previous iteration. The heights of the towers are far higher than the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan allowed and far, far higher than what the Grandview-Woodland community wanted. The so-called public plaza is a joke. It is more like a walkway. While there are many other things wrong with this proposal (no daycare; such a small number of so-called affordable housing units; utterly ugly overpowering design), the building height and the lack of a large inviting public plaza are my main complaints. A design such as this also does not create a sense of community - it creates three towers with little interaction among them. And finally such a huge, high, overwhelming development is not in keeping with the Grandview-Woodland and Kensington-Cedar Cottage communities. It would have a very destructive impact on these two communities that it straddles. While I support increased density around transportation hubs, there is good density and there is bad density. This is an egregious example of the latter.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 91

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 23:15:13 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 23:15:13 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This development does not increase the community energy of Commercial Drive

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 92

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 10, 2021 23:54:30 pm

Last Seen: Nov 10, 2021 23:54:30 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Sad to hear the daycare was removed,. where can all the kids go now? No parking space for rental unit, where are they going to park. The building is way too high, even higher than those one on Main and Broadway area These changes are totally unacceptable. Even e lol electronic cars need space to park and charge. Population is increased, but no additional space for kids, daycare is a must. Affordable unit is only less than 15%. Mayor, affordable housing is what you promised

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 93

Login: 5.22(1)

Email: 5.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 06:34:53 am

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 06:34:53 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The towers are far too high and ruin the commercial drive neighbourhood. Not to mention, it will increase the amount of traffic to the area which is already busy enough.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 94

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 10:22:16 am

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 10:22:16 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It will take a lot of sunlight away with such high towers. There also doesn't appear to be an area for significant green space. The density of the area is already increased with single family homes being turned into triplexes. I've lived and owner here for s.22(1) and still have an issue with parking in front of my place.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 95

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 10:41:55 am

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 18:41:55 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Concentrating so many new residents into one city block will destroy the fabric of the community. Also, the height of the towers is completely out of scale with the rest of the community. That area is already overcrowded. This will turn it into an even more unpleasant area to be outdoors. It will make the people already living around the area feel like their privacy is being invaded by people looking down on them. The towers will diminish daylight substantially for all those unlucky enough to live in the range of the shadows cast. These are de-humanizing projects based on profits for the builders, and little else. This will be remembered at election time.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 96

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 11:07:36 am

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 11:07:36 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The urban plaza needs to be central in the development. The courtyard which is resident access only looks lovely, if some of those design concepts were extended to the public space, it would be more desirable for the community. Calling the belvedere "a collective experience and visual access to green" seems like a stretch; I wouldn't expect very many people to walk up multiple sets of stairs to peek over the fence into a beautiful courtyard which they have no access to. The people of the community want the developers to actually make a space that works with the surrounding area, rather than putting forth generalized statements about "loving the Drive", and throwing in a stage/theater. Make a beautiful park that is open for all and you will succeed in creating a space that functions as you say you intend it to. As it stands, the renderings and the proposal paint a picture of some paradise which must be shielded off from the outer community. So that residents can enjoy all of the "cultural perks" of the community, without having to interact with it while they walk their dog or do their yoga on the lookout. While this remains as a design concept in the proposal, it will never gain the approval of the community because it is offensive, and because the community does not gain access to the developer's green paradise above (as mentioned before, the belvedere/paradise viewing area does not count). Its way too tall. Obviously make it less tall from ground to top of building by at least 25%. Make more of the suites and condos affordable. Downscale everything. And just maybe then there is a chance of fitting in to the community as you claim to want to do.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☒ Yes



Respondent No: 97

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 12:27:49 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 12:27:49 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The design is boring verging on ugly, the towers are way too tall and defy the Grandview-Woodlands Citizens Assembly recommendations, there is not enough green space in an area sorely lacking in parks, there is not enough parking for the tenants so they will look to the neighbourhood and take local's parking and any expanding development around the site is glossed over in the presentation and needs to be factored in.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 98

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 12:35:55 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 12:35:55 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

High rise towers have no place in the Commercial Drive neighbourhood. Even though some of these units will be listed "below market price," these units will still be unaffordable for many people given how inflated Vancouver's housing market is. These high rises will also speed up the gentrification of the Drive, and will wreck the community's old school character. As a resident of the drive, I insist that there is no place for high rises in our community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 99

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 12:50:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 12:50:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The lack of housing overall affects everyone, but not everyone equally. We need an abundance of affordable housing! It is the government's job to do this.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 100

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:05:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:05:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Looking great,we need some change around this part and this looks great designs

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 101

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:21:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:21:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

New development and affordable housing is important, but high-rise towers do not fit with the aesthetic or vibe of the entire neighbourhood. More low rise condos could achieve this and fit more with the previous developments. Also, having a residential building with less than 50% stratified units puts strata unit owners at a serious disadvantage.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 102

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:31:36 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:31:36 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am in support of the below-market units, childcare facility, and more parking and bike spaces. I think more below-market units should be included in this proposal.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 103

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:32:21 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:32:21 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Glad to see there are more rental units than strata units and I hope an acceptable amount of those rental units will be below market units for low income households.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 104

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:39:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:39:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

As a close and long time neighbour of this proposed site I think the tall towers and the lack of well thought out and people friendly gathering space makes these revised plans unacceptable. I support density and more housing but not at the expense of beauty, livability and the essence and scale of the existing neighbourhood.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 105

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:40:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:40:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

We need more rental units in this area. A lot of businesses along commercial are staffed by people who cannot necessarily afford to live in the limited housing already available in East Van. If we cannot provide homes for people to live locally, the we cannot find staff to support local businesses or residents to shop at those local businesses. Density around sky trains also make sense to allow for easy commuting.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 106

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:40:46 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:40:46 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am very supportive. It's a mix of housing that is needed, In a very appropriate location.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 107

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:45:50 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:45:50 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

A larger percentage of below market/affordable housing should be offered. Availability is one issue renters have but affordability is as well. All studios and one bedrooms should be below market value.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 108

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 13:57:17 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 13:57:17 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

As a parent s.22(1) I can't stress how difficult it already is to find affordable, & licensed childcare spaces in this neighbourhood. By allowing this application to not include childcare facilities we are only compounding an already out of control situation. The families that you expect to rent the affordable rentals in this building will be forced to look for nannyshare opportunities that are most likely more than what is left of their salary after basic living expenses. I am in favour of higher density projects; but NOT if we are not including the appropriate community infrastructures to support them.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 109

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:07:02 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 14:07:02 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am in support of this application so long as it is aligned with the current status of requirements outlined in the Broadway Plan

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 110

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:08:56 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 14:08:56 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It seems that to continue to push high rises throughout the city with the knowledge that many residents are against them, is a city council that continues to please developers. The developing Cambie corridor does not look out of place in its neighbourhood, these proposed towers are an assault to the Commercial Dr. neighbourhood, I am not against development, but ask that it be kept in line with the family oriented nature of east Vancouver.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 111

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:33:23 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 14:33:23 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Too tall, higher percentage of rental units should be below market rates

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 112

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:34:29 pm

Last Seen: Nov 23, 2021 18:14:41 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

I'm in favour of all projects increasing density

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 113

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:39:19 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 14:39:19 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is a fantastic use of space. However, please ensure the public plaza is publicly owned and maintained. Private-public spaces are a detriment to our communities as they can easily restrict access for any reason, political or otherwise.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 114

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:40:20 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 14:40:20 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Absolutely support but wonder why the child care option was removed. I live at s.22(1) but my children attend and have attended s.22(1) Would prefer 20 stories so buildings are not quite so looming, but we need affordable rental housing along transit lines. My only hope is that transit infrastructure and neighbouring schools keep pace.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 115

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 14:44:44 pm

Last Seen: Nov 24, 2021 19:15:44 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

The Citizens Assembly provided a mandate for a maximum of 12 storeys on this site. City Hall then ignored the Citizens Assembly and doubled the maximum to 24 storeys. Then the developer comes along and ignores both and applies for even more - once again proving that developers are truly the tail that wags the dog in this city. Public consultation appears to be little more than posturing.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 116

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 15:11:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 15:11:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I think this is a good idea. hoping there will also be many garden roof tops, we need more green. The more secure rental in our city the better. our real-estate is out of control. I say that as a property owner. Property and Housing are rights and necessities, not a financial commodity to flip and produce profit from. Too long has our housing market been treated like a damn stock exchange.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 117

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 15:15:00 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 15:15:00 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Given the developed nature of this area and the fact that it is a major transit hub, I think this development makes a lot of sense. We need more dense housing next to transport if we are to solve our housing and climate crises. Finding a way to increase the share of below-market housing in this proposal would be ideal, but it is important regardless that this rezoning happen to create more desperately needed housing.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 118

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 15:25:26 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 15:25:26 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Sounds good to me. The more affordable housing the better and I could use more info on how "below market" the 93 suites are, but a solid proposal.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 119

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 15:30:38 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 15:30:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I think it is good to increase housing density in locations like this which are transit, bike, and walking-friendly and reduce car dependence. It's also important to improve affordable housing in Vancouver (for rental or ownership). I hope you will keep in mind sustainable and energy efficient construction methods. Make sure any wood used is sourced sustainably, include solar panels, EV chargers, etc.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 120

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 16:14:18 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 16:14:18 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This city is becoming over densified and not a nice city any longer.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 121

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 16:41:27 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 16:41:27 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

More affordable housing units are needed before this should pass.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 122

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 11, 2021 19:12:06 pm

Last Seen: Nov 11, 2021 19:12:06 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Affordable rental units are so desperately needed all over Vancouver, especially in this neighbourhood. Ideally, 50% of the proposed 438 units would be made available at below market rate, allowing families and lower income residents an opportunity to take advantage of the excellent location & availability of transit. The goal of this project should be to provide as many below market rate rental units as possible. I live within blocks of this proposed plan & fully support its construction.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered

**Respondent No:** 123**Login:** s.22(1)**Email:** s.22(1)**Responded At:** Nov 11, 2021 21:59:56 pm**Last Seen:** Nov 11, 2021 21:59:56 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Your comments**

This revision for the proposal does not respond to the broader concerns of the community. It should not be recommended by staff. It's much too high, much too dense for this location. It definitely does not follow the direction in the final report of the Citizens' Assembly for the site. Planning staff threw out those recommendations in the 11th hour, a month before the passage of the plan and imposed their own ideas (couldn't all of this have been avoided had planning staff not betrayed the Grandview-Woodland Community? And respected the 12 to 8 storeys as per the text of the Citizens' Assembly Final Report? Was it Andrew Pask, Brian Jackson, Jane Pickering, Gil Kelley or someone else responsible for this? We have a right to know.) While imposing their will on the community in the final Vision Vancouver-passed GWCP, would it be a reasonable expectation that staff actually could say that this proposal DOES NOT respect the City's plan for Grandview-Woodland? Are the interests of an out of town REIT to maximize profit the only driving factor here? And to reward Westbank again? The shadow impacts would be huge. The renderings do not provide an accurate sense of scale, and for example, leave entire buildings out, like the medical building on the south side of East 10th Avenue across from the Safeway site. There's the structural issue of making a mini-bridge to connect over the Grandview Cut from the existing Broadway Bridge. This wasn't ever contemplated in the GWCP drawings. The 'plaza' is something that I could live without, it's a terrible location and a poorly conceived idea for that noisy and polluted site. There was no response to the issues I've raised earlier. Not many communities have No Megatowers signs throughout. Please listen to the community for a change. You've gotten your way with the rest of the GWCP and went far in excess of what was ever contemplated or discussed in public. Are we being treated like fools? These proposals are not a joke and there are very long-term implications of large scale upzoning. There's a 200 plus book written about the failures of the Grandview-Woodland planning process. There's no need to make this site yet another addition to the long string of betrayals by the City.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed**Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future** ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 124

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 12, 2021 01:07:04 am

Last Seen: Nov 12, 2021 01:07:04 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is an utterly appalling design, will effectively destroy the neighbourhood, completely ignores the GWAC community plan. I posted a picture of this monstrosity on my FB page and the comments are 98% negative. This will be fought tooth and nail by this community. Shame on the city for attempting to foist this on us

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 125

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 12, 2021 05:04:31 am

Last Seen: Nov 12, 2021 05:04:31 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This proposed development s far too large for this neighborhood and will destroy the harmonious community we have lived and loved. Please do not move ahead with these towers. Please maintain our low rise area.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 126

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 12, 2021 10:13:19 am

Last Seen: Nov 12, 2021 10:13:19 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am not opposed to the height of the building, but the central public plaza should be available for all to use, not just the residents. I would support this plan if it still had the daycare part of the plan in place and more affordable housing ie. the plan would need to replace any affordable rental suites that it tears down in making the new development at least.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 127

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 12, 2021 12:25:27 pm

Last Seen: Nov 12, 2021 12:25:27 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

All three towers are too high and should be reduced by a further 10 stories apiece and have the actual physical height of the building reduced drastically. These three towers at their current height will be so out of place and seem very alien in an area of the city with lower-height buildings. Increasing density is important, but there are better ways to build up that density than massive towers in the sky. The commercial drive area is such an eclectic area of the city and to have a Brentwood Style tower complex in this neighbourhood would drastically reshape the neighbourhood for the worse. A focus on below market-rate units should be a TOP priority and the supply across each tower should be increased, as affordability within the neighbourhood should be maintained to allow people to stay in the communities where they want to live.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 128

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 13, 2021 09:26:41 am

Last Seen: Nov 13, 2021 09:26:41 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The 1780 East Broadway towers proposal: I live in the 1700 block of East 5th Ave, a stone's throw from the proposed development, and I can see that what we are heading toward in this proposal is a version of the BRENTWOOD NIGHTMARE, and that is a look that even with all the proposed landscaping, etc. is fundamentally unfriendly. These towers are TOO TALL for this well-established, family-oriented neighbourhood. The PLAZA: i don't know what input the VPD may have had, but I am concerned that this area will become a magnet for street life and intimidating drug culture that gravitate to such spaces. "Informal clothing sales", as promised, while it is a tradition on the Drive, also contains the possibility of dealing in stolen goods. Planners can't predict human behavior, just try to plan for optimum, legitimate, safe public use of the space. DAYCARE: Where is the DAYCARE in this revised plan? We can encourage families with sort-of affordable housing, but without DAYCARE, this proposal is a non-starter. AFFORDABILITY: There needs to be MORE affordable, low-rent accommodation.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 129

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 13, 2021 10:53:49 am

Last Seen: Nov 13, 2021 10:53:49 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am in support overall as the city needs more housing but I would like to see more suites below market, and truly affordable.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 130

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 13, 2021 12:07:30 pm

Last Seen: Nov 13, 2021 20:10:14 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

I have to wonder if the people behind the development plan and rezoning application have actually spent any time in the Grandview - Woodland neighbourhood. If you did, you would understand that the proposed redevelopment model is at complete odds with this community. I understand that the need for the city to expand development, but it should be aligned with the neighbourhood values and needs and not imposed or driven by the developers financial ambitions. The proposed towers/development is completely out of scale with the area. I am also someone who relies on translink and uses the Commercial -Broadway station to commute to work downtown/ The skytrain is already severely congested at rush hour (pre-covid). I am not sure how the skytrain station could accommodate an increase in usage resulting from the towers increased density (even if only a portion of the residents use skytrain.) I would also ask who will be able to afford to live in the towers. There is a housing crisis in Vancouver and yet, city council's approach seems to construct high density, 'mixed' housing that is beyond the reach of most residents. It is sad that council is so out of touch with the people it is suppose to represent. I feel strongly that this is yet another example of City Council not listening to its residents and imposing a plan that is incongruous with the community consultation that was undertaken. Did the council not read the report? Then how would you justify approving the re-zoning application. In speaking to friends and neighbours who live in this neighbourhood, I have not encountered one individual who supports this development application. I would ask that you re-visit the application and SCALE DOWN the development so that it has less impact on the community and is more congruous and respects the culture and history of Grandview-Woodland community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

☒ Yes



Respondent No: 131

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 13, 2021 15:12:12 pm

Last Seen: Nov 13, 2021 15:12:12 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is so out of place for the Commercial Drive area, it does not fit the area at all. Could you not come up with something more suitable, four story buildings, green space available to the community, affordable housing and mom and pop stores?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 132

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 13, 2021 16:04:43 pm

Last Seen: Nov 13, 2021 16:04:43 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

More affordable housing please. This is going to drive folks that already live here further out. Commercial and Broadway is already a very busy precinct, this is going to increase demand on transport and facilities even more. I don't support three towers going up

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 133

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 13, 2021 17:15:05 pm

Last Seen: Nov 13, 2021 17:15:05 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I don't believe that this would be a project with positive outcomes for our community. It would only weaken the identity of the neighbourhood and force low-income community members even further from where they've called home for decades.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 134

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 10:54:02 am

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 10:54:02 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am opposed to the current proposed Tower development for the following reasons: 1) Both Grandview and Cedar Cottage already are significantly more dense than ANY OTHER official neighbourhood in the city. 2) The proposed rental costs for the units in the towers do not answer the URGENT NEED - often discussed but seldom acted upon - for Affordable Housing in Vancouver. 3) The proposed design for the development shows it as a very unwelcoming public space - NOISY, DARK, AND ELIMINATING SKY VIEWS. Overall, this is the WRONG DEVELOPMENT for this part of the city.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☒ Yes



Respondent No: 135

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 12:49:24 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 20:49:24 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Please approve this project. I am a homeowner near the skytrain and am seeing more and more families moving out because they can't afford the area. We need to accept that the character of this neighborhood will change, and that is ok

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 136

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:22:05 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:22:05 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The towers are now even more absurdly tall than in the previous version of the plan. The plaza is not "sunny" or well located. There are too many "luxury" condos, low-rise existing buildings in the area will be destroyed, renters will need to find parking in a neighbourhood already burdened with limited parking options, etc, etc. The towers will diminish daylight substantially for all those unlucky enough to live in the range of the shadows cast. " The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, height (no reduction). inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for a better use of this corner. "

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 137

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:23:21 pm

Last Seen: Dec 08, 2021 05:34:08 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

The community's fabric will be destroyed by cramming so many new residents into one city block. In addition, the buildings' height is utterly out of proportion to the rest of the neighbourhood. That place is already suffocating. This will make it much more unpleasant to spend time outside. People who already live in the region will feel as if their privacy is being violated by those staring down on them. For those unfortunate enough to reside in the shadows cast by the towers, daylight will be significantly reduced. These are dehumanising constructions designed solely on profit for the builders. At election time, this will be remembered.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 138

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:28:19 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:28:19 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, no height reduction, inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, limited parking and no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 139

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:30:40 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:30:40 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This plan would be terrible for the area. We don't want tall towers and all the problems associated with them. It would drastically change the character of Commercial Drive and surrounding area.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 140

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:33:11 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:33:11 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

As a resident home owner who has lived here for twenty years I do not support the development. There is already an increased density in the neighbourhood causing issues. It's louder, the parks are jammed, it's impossible to park my car anymore - I worry every time I leave my house as to where I will park on my return, there's increased litter, and I no longer know my neighbours as the neighbourhood has become increasingly transient. Increasing density without associated services is only going to create more problems. Develop Shsunessey instead.?

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 141

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:36:23 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 22:40:37 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

This plan is a gross insult to the existing community and longstanding character of Commercial Drive. The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, height , inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking and most importantly - no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value. The towers are now even more absurdly tall than in the previous version of the plan. The height of the towers is completely out of scale with the rest of the community. The towers will diminish daylight substantially for those unlucky enough to live in the range of the shadows cast. To make it even worse, the building form and design is bulky and ugly. This project does not respect the neighbourhood and I will not be voting for city council members or a mayor who passes this proposal. Density itself is not the issue as this could be achieved with gentler and lower buildings. Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for a better use of this corner.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 142

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:38:36 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:38:36 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I feel that Commercial drive will become another Robson street if this proposal goes through. Look what happened there. A lot of businesses shuttered because of the high cost of retail space. Projects like this should happen further out towards the city limits. Low density strata housing or needed seniors housing would work there- where people are encouraged to walk or bicycle to the shops along the drive. Do we really need more high rise buildings catering to the wealthy? Isn't there enough in yaletown and the west end? Vancouver is becoming a city with no middle class. Thanks for your consideration.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 143

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:48:08 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:48:08 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

To whom it may concern The proposed towers are an insanely out of touch development that caters to the wealthy. The proposed number of floors is not in keeping with the community. I am strongly against such a development being built to this scale.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 144

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:49:02 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:49:02 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This plan is offensive to anyone living in the Commercial Drive area. The concept is so far removed from everything that makes this part of town unique and desirable. Yes, we need more housing in the city but putting a monstrosity like this in a neighbourhood like the Drive is just absurd. It's beyond insanity! What's next? Condos in Stanley Park? Stop it now!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 145

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:49:38 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:49:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Please stop this overdevelopment of a high traffic area to just add more congestion. These massive structures do not fit into this area and seems like the developer could care less about the community culture or its safety!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 146

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:50:09 pm

Last Seen: Dec 14, 2021 08:47:05 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

A resounding NO to this project. I am perplexed that such a beast of a plan could even be entertained. Where is the respect for the citizens of our community? I am disappointed in our city planners and council. It makes me wonder if you have respect for all the effort and work that this community has done (for decades!) to keep our essence alive and welcoming. It's a wonderful place to live. We are a very connected community and embrace change that makes sense always looking at the long term for all. Our Grandview Woodland plan never included such a disaster. It is out of scale (our plan had a 12 story community plan) and completely out of place. No adequate plaza, no day care, limited parking, not enough affordable housing, no doubt an increase in rents will result for the area (which would be a disaster on so many levels) and so many more negative affects on our neighbourhood. And I know you know all of this. There are places where these projects can go and Grandview Woodlands is NOT one of them. This development is a profit based plan with no care for who we are as a community. We all acknowledge that this transportation hub needs a plan. One that makes sense, one that makes the area thrive not dwindle with negative short and long term impacts. Please be on our side with this development. Please listen to us. It's your job to listen to your citizens and help us make our communities livable and sustainable. This project is not that. Thank you.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 147

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 14:58:33 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 14:58:33 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

No, No, No, just no! Have some respect for the community, make it fit.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 148

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:06:25 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 23:25:25 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Stop this process! This neighbourhood does not need or want a mega tower. This is a neighbourhood with families that support local shops and businesses. It's one of the oldest neighbourhoods and should remain that way. We do not want another Metrotown!!! The mega tower is not in keeping with the original architecture that makes Grandview Woodland awesome! This is old little Italy with lots of mixed cultures, and not a place for a huge mega tower that looks like Metrotown. DO NOT DESTROY OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD!! People choose to live here because of its unique characteristics. We don't want to live anywhere else, least of all beside a mega tower!! This monstrosity will significantly change the neighbourhood with increased traffic, increased living density and congestion, and severely out already strained transportation and bike routes. This neighbourhood does not need more people living in it. The city of Vancouver's job is to protect our neighbourhoods and serve its citizens.. This project does neither. It only puts more money in the hands of developers. If you want to build a mega tower then do it downtown or near the new Hospital or Main St & Terminal Ave where people WANT urban density and where it makes sense. Do not destroy our neighbourhood for a few bucks in developers pockets. You are the guardians of this city so please do your job and protect it!! s.22(1) Kitchener St

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 149

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:06:58 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:06:58 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Honestly, the fact there are such tall towers coming to this area is upsetting and sad. I've lived in this area for over 25 years and bringing in these towers will make the area and community lose it's charm, but also pushing affordability out of the window. We are not renovating and building up areas like brentwood/lougheed or so many other places that towers upon towers. Also, these revisions made are not sufficient. Reducing its story by less than one does not make it any better as it will still be over 20 stories taller than anything else. Let's be honest, these revisions do not serve the interest to the locals or communities it's made to "benefit", if anything, its more pocket money to the developers and detrimental to everyone else who lives around here.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 150

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:11:32 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:11:32 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

NOTHING over 4 stories!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 151

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 16:36:20 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 23:25:25 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Terrible idea. Another example of the City of Vancouver lining the pockets of Developers. No one in this neighbourhood wants the mega tower to go through. Do your research and build high density / affordable living where it is needed and required - DTES Main & Terminal UBC Downtown Core

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 152

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:17:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:17:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I completely concur with all of the comments iterated below. We are actually losing our home for the second time due to these types of densification plans. "I'm sorry, but this plan is outrageous - a gross insult to the existing community and longstanding character of Commercial Drive. The towers are now even more absurdly tall than in the previous version of the plan. The plaza is not "sunny" or well located. There are too many "luxury" condos, low-rise existing buildings in the area will be destroyed, renters will need to find parking in a neighbourhood already burdened with limited parking options, etc, etc. Like many others, I understand the need for densification and the logic of doing so close to transportation hubs. But please folks, can this not be done with an eye to the future of the neighbourhood altogether. With the height and placement of the towers and the dominance of high-end condos, I don't see how this serves either the local community or the city. I don't know of course, but this smacks of the city being in the pocket of private, well-moneyed developers from elsewhere, or at least inappropriately influenced by them. We're not naive. We know that many developers are in it for the money and don't give a damn about local integrity or any kind of sane longterm vision that serves the most people." "Concentrating so many new residents into one city block will destroy the fabric of the community. Also, the height of the towers is completely out of scale with the rest of the community. That area is already overcrowded. This will turn it into an even more unpleasant area to be outdoors. It will make the people already living around the area feel like their privacy is being invaded by people looking down on them. The towers will diminish daylight substantially for all those unlucky enough to live in the range of the shadows cast. These are de-humanizing projects based on profits for the builders, and little else. This will be remembered at election time." " The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, height (no reduction). inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking and most importantly - no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value. An additional concern is for the local businesses and the likely possibility that their rents will go up as property values increase in the neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood is unique and valued all over the lower mainland. If businesses go under as a result of this project, what replaces them? Uptown glitz? Please know that density itself is not the issue as we favour smart gradual densification. This project is not that!!! Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for a better use of this corner. "

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 153

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:20:19 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:20:19 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It does not suit the neighborhood! Too big!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 154

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:26:10 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:26:10 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This "development" will help to destroy a good community. Is there any truly affordable housing in this plan? Would most people want to live in such an awful structure, even if truly affordable? This is not good community planning, but it's pretty good community destruction.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 155

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:26:59 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:26:59 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is an awful plan. There's been no consideration to the long established community. It's outrageous and insulting to distort and destroy our neighbourhood with absurdly high mega towers and the wealthy. I understand densification but this is disturbing. Have you thought about how this affects the families and people who've fought to make this a home?

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 156

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:32:41 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:32:41 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This plan is completely unacceptable and inappropriate for this iconic heritage neighbourhood. Some years ago, Commercial Drive was listed in the well-known and widely read (now defunct) American magazine Utne Reader as one of the 10 most interesting neighbourhoods in North America. Three extremely tall towers overshadowing a neighbourhood like this would be the fatal nail in the coffin of the character of the area. And as numerous others have pointed out, there are at least a half dozen things wrong with the plan that don't serve the neighbourhood or even those needing reasonably priced lodging. Dear Mayor Stewart, council, and planning department. Please straighten up and fly right on this issue for the benefit of all (except profit-focused developers.)

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 157

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:35:23 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 23:40:05 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

I am writing to voice our concerns about the current plan. Though I understand and support the need for the city to increase density, particularly around transit hubs, I think the plan to build towers will have a negative impact on the neighborhood and the city. Densification should be spread out and to scale with the neighborhood. I think buildings with about 12 stories is more to scale with new buildings all along Broadway. Design should include public space and green space. The city needs many more rental units and rents should be truly affordable not tied to the market which is inflated and not affordable to working families.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 158

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:39:03 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:39:03 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

It's time for a height bylaw. Its not about densification. It's about greedy developers who dont give a rats--- about the city. Vancouver is dense enough.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 159

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:50:11 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:50:11 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I understand and support the need for the city to increase density, particularly around transit hubs, However, I think the plan to build towers will have a negative impact our neighborhood. Densification should respect the scale of the neighborhood. I think buildings with about 12 stories is more to scale of our neighborhood. Design should include public space, green space and take bicycle traffic into considère. The city needs many more rental units and rents should be truly affordable not tied to the market which is inflated and not affordable to working families.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 160

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 15:51:07 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 15:51:07 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I agree with these comments "I'm sorry, but this plan is outrageous - a gross insult to the existing community and longstanding character of Commercial Drive. The towers are now even more absurdly tall than in the previous version of the plan. The plaza is not "sunny" or well located. There are too many "luxury" condos, low-rise existing buildings in the area will be destroyed, renters will need to find parking in a neighbourhood already burdened with limited parking options, etc, etc. Like many others, I understand the need for densification and the logic of doing so close to transportation hubs. But please folks, can this not be done with an eye to the future of the neighbourhood altogether. With the height and placement of the towers and the dominance of high-end condos, I don't see how this serves either the local community or the city. I don't know of course, but this smacks of the city being in the pocket of private, well-moneyed developers from elsewhere, or at least inappropriately influenced by them. We're not naive. We know that many developers are in it for the money and don't give a damn about local integrity or any kind of sane longterm vision that serves the most people." "Concentrating so many new residents into one city block will destroy the fabric of the community. Also, the height of the towers is completely out of scale with the rest of the community. That area is already overcrowded. This will turn it into an even more unpleasant area to be outdoors. It will make the people already living around the area feel like their privacy is being invaded by people looking down on them. The towers will diminish daylight substantially for all those unlucky enough to live in the range of the shadows cast. These are de-humanizing projects based on profits for the builders.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered

**Respondent No:** 161**Login:** s.22(1)**Email:** s.22(1)**Responded At:** Nov 14, 2021 16:34:20 pm**Last Seen:** Nov 15, 2021 00:33:44 am**IP Address:** s.22(1)**Q1. Your comments**

The proposal for the Safeway site will destroy the historic Grandview-Woodlands and Cedar Cottage neighbourhoods, and I oppose it. It does not fit our neighbourhood. It's neighbourhoods like ours, with our historic buildings, small proprietorships and personalized shopping, human-scale housing, vibrant street life, and character that breathe life into a city, and they should be protected. That ton of cement you want to drop on us at the Safeway site would be a killer. Perhaps you are familiar with the animated short "Bambi Meets Godzilla"? That about says it. Which brings me to the matter of the planning process, or more specifically, community participation in the planning process. The proposal for the Safeway site runs contrary to community plans, both the Grandview-Woodlands Community Plan, and the Station Area Plan before it. When Skytrain was first proposed, it was Cedar Cottage that the City invited to participate in planning the station area. Skytrain runs through Cedar Cottage and the station area is (at least, was) in Cedar Cottage. But, down the road, when it came to planning the Safeway site, Cedar Cottage was not even invited to the table. Planning had turned the station area over to Grandview-Woodlands, Cedar Cottage no longer a player. I am a resident of Cedar Cottage, I live a six-minute walk from the station area, and this annoys me. It is self-evident that any development on the Safeway site is of as much interest to Cedar Cottage as it is to Grandview-Woodlands. It escapes me then, why Cedar Cottage was excluded from the planning. Perhaps it was the gerrymandering. When the City decided to amalgamate Cedar Cottage with Kensington, perhaps it was then the decision was made, on our behalf, that the station area no longer concerned us. It seems the Planners considered the lines they were drawing on paper to define the newly invented Kensington-Cedar Cottage neighbourhood, represented a wall between Cedar Cottage and Grandview Woodlands. There is no wall, or natural division between our neighbourhoods. Cedar Cottage and Grandview-Woodlands have a natural affinity. We are two of the oldest neighbourhoods in the City, existing side-by-side, and we share common interests and concerns, including The Drive, Broadway, the station area and the Safeway site. It was a mistake not to include representatives from both Cedar Cottage and Grandview-Woodlands in planning the Safeway site. The community consultation process for the Safeway site has been divisive, dismissive, and manipulative. Residents and businesses directly impacted have been excluded or ignored, and the developer has been given sway, no doubt along with other big money interests. As my opinion is being invited only after the fact, I am taking the prerogative to say start over. That design you have there cannot be saved. It's an insult to the community and it should be an embarrassment to City Hall. Where is the design that shows imagination, that is relevant to our times—socially, architecturally, and ecologically. How about a design that employs the latest in green technology, building materials, construction, energy, and living. There must be plenty of good ideas out there, and massive, ugly, looming towers are not one of them. No towers on the Safeway site. Please.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed**Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future** Yes



Respondent No: 162

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 16:50:18 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 16:50:18 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

gentrifying and expensive, ugly, house ppl who need it.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 163

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 16:53:29 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 16:53:29 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

How come this proposal is so high (41 residential storeys including the retail plinth) when the Citizens Assembly endorsed a maximum of only 12 storeys and Grandview-Woodlands Community Plan passed by City Council endorsed buildings ranging between 12 and 24 storeys? The current proposal fails on several counts: (1) it's way too high; (2) there is no sunny central plaza as stipulated in the Grandview-Woodlands Community Plan; (3) it will have a deleterious effect on the local eclectic Commercial Drive community, particularly with regard to raising rents and property values so that low-rise buildings will be re-developed - both of which will force small businesses to close or move to a cheaper area; (4) what happened to the promised daycare centre that was in the original version of this proposal?; (5) this will add pressure on street parking spots in the neighbourhood since the proposal has only 205 parking spots for residents of the new towers, while there will be 653 new residential units in the towers (including both condos and rental units); and (6) out of 653 residential units, only around 90 - 95 of them will be below-market - wasn't this project supposed to help with low-income housing?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 164

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 16:57:38 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 16:57:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am in agreement with my neighbour: " The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, height (no reduction). inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking and most importantly - no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value. An additional concern is for the local businesses and the likely possibility that their rents will go up as property values increase in the neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood is unique and valued all over the lower mainland. If businesses go under as a result of this project, what replaces them? Uptown glitz? Please know that density itself is not the issue as we favour smart gradual densification. This project is not that!!! Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for a better use of this corner. "

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 165

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 17:04:48 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 17:04:48 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I highly discourage this revision- this neighbourhood should be left mega tower free. The construction will create a further grid lock of traffic 14 hours + daily. The height will be an eye sore from 365 view points.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 166

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 17:12:42 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 17:12:42 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Absolutely NOT, this is an appalling design, totally out of keeping with the neighbourhood and the Community Plan. - Reduce the building heights by 50 percent - only one building for Condominiums, two for rentals. - Public plaza required, sunny, away from the train.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 167

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 17:14:49 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 17:14:49 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

There seem to be only minimal changes from the last proposal. I support my many neighbours who have opposed this project. It would substantially alter the character of the immediate neighbourhood.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 168

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 17:41:44 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 01:44:11 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

This proposal is entirely out of scale for the existing neighbourhood. We want gradual and thoughtful densification. The amount of storeys on these towers (with a one-storey reduction) is offensive and reflects NO evidence of incorporating public input into the vision. We need more publicly accessible green space, more thought around traffic flow (to this day I have not seen any traffic measurement done on the Lakewood entrance bridge that they want to close to vehicles). Byng Thom had envisioned an "anti-" tower that both provided density and public green space. His vision did not involve anywhere near 43 storeys. It is both short-sighted and disrespectful to disregard his forward vision and replace it with a greedy, regressive one. Show Vancouverites that their opinions matter by taking views expressed in these public forums seriously and reflect them back in the designs put out. So far, the city has been doing exactly the opposite of this.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 169

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 18:08:45 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 18:08:45 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The proposed reduction in height is still inappropriate for the neighborhood. It also appears that what is now a bike route along 10th Ave will become a relatively heavy traffic route.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 170

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 18:36:55 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 18:36:55 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I believe in the good that can come from increasing urban density, but please, not at the expense of one of Vancouver's few remaining cultural landmarks. The soul of this city can't afford to lose Commercial Drive. Don't do this.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 171

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 19:37:00 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 19:37:00 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The proposal continues to be an eyesore with a profoundly negative impact on the local community. Keep it small 6-8 stories max with room for original, local retail rather than franchises, chains, more pharmacies, and cannabis stores. Let's build an environmentally responsible and caring community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 172

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 19:43:10 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 19:43:10 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

These buildings are completely out of character with the neighbourhood. I understand the need for densification, but not at the cost of the affordability, well-being and atmosphere of Commercial Drive. I would be in favour of 5-6 story buildings but not mega-towers.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 173

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 19:44:07 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 19:44:07 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is way too expensive - the majority of those living in this area right now are at or below the poverty line. There is not enough housing for those on a fixed or below poverty income. This is just a cash grab for developers... it is very obvious what this is...was there not to be childcare associated with this development at one point? What happened to that...this does not fit within the current area and reeks of gentrification.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 174

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 19:48:55 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 19:48:55 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am deeply endeared to this neighbourhood and am scared of its gentrification. I will support the project if four major changes are made: - I did not find anything in the resilience plan about overheating in suites. Overheating analysis underestimates risk unless it is run using future weather files. To mitigate overheating risk and reduce TEDI, the window to wall ratio should be lowered by 10%. This is the direction future-ready buildings need to take, and this redevelopment has the opportunity to be a leader. It is the engineer of record's responsibility to ensure people will not die of heat in their suites - Affordable rental units must exceed the minimum requirement and should be 30% of all available units. This will ensure Grandview-Woodland remains diverse and economically inclusive. What is the definition of "affordable"/"below market value"? - The modelled TEUI is only 2% below the performance limit. A wider margin of error should be provided; it is well known that actual TEUI typically greatly exceeds modelled values - I did not find any reference to reconciliation in the project documents. The true owners of this land (Musqueam, Squamish, and/or Tsleil-Waututh Nations) must be consulted on the development in accordance with UNDRIP. Good work is slow work. Meet your responsibility, walk the talk!

Q2. Your overall position about the application Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 175

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 19:59:07 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 19:59:07 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I love the commercial character of Grandview Woodland, as outlined in Principle 4 of the community plan. I would support this project if it included 2 more small CRUs, as shown on the south side of the development on 10th. These could become home to small, local retailers instead of multinationals like Safeway that do not bolster a resilient local economy.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 176

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 20:07:26 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 20:07:26 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I saw the revised application with dismay. It does not conform to the Grandview Woodland plan, and although it may appear at first brush to be *slightly* better than the previous plan, the towers are actually higher, the true plaza where the park should be is only for residents (the strip along the Skytrain will have no natural light and will just be like an alley, and there are no more child-care spaces! None of this is in keeping with the Grandview-Woodlands community plan. This plan should be REJECTED. In fact, any plan that does not fit the spirit and the letter of the already agreed-upon Grandview-Woodlands plan should be outright rejected, and should not even make it to a public consultation. It feels as if the developers are just trying to wear the community down and sneak a proposal through that is pretty much the same as previous proposals when we aren't looking. These towers are totally not in keeping with the Commercial Drive neighbourhood. This is not Metrotown or Brentwood. I am not against density but the Commercial Drive neighbourhood is recognized internationally for its distinct character, so any development needs to respect that character and not detract from the community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 177

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 20:20:01 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 20:20:01 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The design and size is inappropriate for the architecture which surrounds it. Nor does it fit in with the community which is the Drive.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 178

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 20:31:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 20:31:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This is too large for this neighborhood and the towers would be an eyesore. 12 stories are high enough, no more than 12 stories please.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 179

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:13:55 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 21:13:55 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

We are very disappointed that the revised proposal does not address any of the basic and fundamental concerns addressed by many people at the outset of this development proposal. 1. There is no reduction in actual height of these towers despite the stated removal of one residential storey. Tower A actually increases by 25 feet, Tower B increases by 32.3 feet and Tower C increases by 30 FEET. What is going on here??? This is deceptive and dishonest. In any event all the towers are far too high with the GW Community Plan calling for heights of 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform in any way to the plan. This should not be allowed. 2. The proposed "plaza" remains a huge problem. In reality it is not a plaza at all, but a walkway between the development and the skytrain station. Its a sham. It does not meet the "people friendly and centrally located civic plaza" called for in the community plan. Not by a long shot. 3. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area with lower rise affordable walk-up rentals and other affordable housing being torn down and replaced by very expensive condos and unaffordable market rental units. A paltry 14 per cent of all units in this development will be below market. Not enough by far in our housing crisis-ridden city. 4. The cherished vibe of Commercial Drive is seriously at risk from this ugly, overly dense and massive Brentwood style development. Can anyone with any sense possibly believe this is good for one of the very special and unique neighbourhoods in Vancouver. No. Please City Council, ditch this proposal entirely and send the planners and the architects back to the drawing board to come forward with a sensible, modest scale proposal, for this key portion of Grandview. s.22(1)

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☒ Yes



Respondent No: 180

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:14:06 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 21:14:06 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This does not support small businesses and the kind of boutique stores that make the Commercial Drive area unique and exciting. This does not do enough to address affordable housing, but will inevitably drive the cost of housing even higher, making it impossible for many long term residents to continue living in this area. High rise buildings will change the fundamental shape of the area. Mixed use is ok, but why not 5-7 story buildings, like in the Cambie corridor?

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 181

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:21:40 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 21:21:40 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

We are very disappointed that the revised proposal does not address any of the basic and fundamental concerns addressed by many people at the outset of this development proposal. 1. There is no reduction in actual height of these towers despite the stated removal of one residential storey. Tower A actually increases by 25 feet, Tower B increases by 32.3 feet and Tower C increases by 30 FEET. What is going on here??? This is deceptive and dishonest. In any event all the towers are far too high with the GW Community Plan calling for heights of 12 to 24 storeys. This proposal does not conform in any way to the plan. 2. The proposed "plaza" remains a huge problem. In reality it is not a plaza at all, but a walkway between the development and the skytrain station. Its a sham. It does not meet the "people friendly and centrally located civic plaza" called for in the community plan. Not by a long shot. 3. This large development will result in a massive land lift in this area with lower rise affordable walk-up rentals and other affordable housing being torn down and replaced by very expensive condos and unaffordable market rental units. A paltry 14 per cent of all units in this development will be below market. Not enough by far in our housing crisis-ridden city. 4. The cherished vibe of Commercial Drive is seriously at risk from this ugly, overly dense and massive Brentwood style development. Can anyone with any sense possibly believe this is good for one of the very special and unique neighbourhoods in Vancouver. Please City Council, ditch this proposal entirely and send the planners and the architects back to the drawing board to come forward with a sensible, modest scale proposal, for this key portion of Grandview. s.22(1)

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 182

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:28:45 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 21:28:45 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Please, no! The plan shown looks much like Brentwood. Ultra modern, cold and uninviting; uptown International elite (think Dubai). Commercial and Broadway is gateway to the charming, warm, vibrant Commercial Drive, known for eclectic, funkiness blended with Italian heritage, creating a unique, diverse community.. To the south lies the lovely, green, Trout lake and Clark Park neighbourhoods, which will surely be bought up and turned to cold, cement money-making towers as soon as zoning allows. The only ones to truly benefit from allowing high such rise towers at Commercial & Broadway are the developers themselves. These developments promote a dearth of over-priced, undersized living spaces, with a cold, sterile, elite vibe, while razing chunks of affordable housing that cant and wont be replaced.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 183

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:31:14 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 21:31:14 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I fully realize the need for densification and affordable housing. But I am sorry I cannot support this project. The Drive has a unique vibe. These huge towers do not fit in with this community. I feel that the East side of Vancouver is always being shortchanged. The City of Vancouver needs to listen to the people of East Van NOW. Many East Van residence do not support these outrageous towers because they will fundamentally alter the character of Commercial Drive. So many residents in these towers will be concentrated in one block, which is not consistent with the rest of the community. It's time that the City of Vancouver explores OTHER OPTIONS than mega towers in order to supply affordable housing in our communities in Vancouver.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 184

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:44:22 pm

Last Seen: Nov 14, 2021 21:44:22 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The proposal doesn't fit the community or serve the community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 185

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 21:46:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 06:28:43 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include, height (no reduction). inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking and most importantly - no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value. An additional concern is for the local businesses and the likely possibility that their rents will go up as property values increase. Grandview-Woodlands is a colourful and unique neighbourhood, one that is known for its diversity and uniqueness. If businesses go under as a result of this project, what replaces them? Monoculture? Please know that density itself is not the issue as we favour smart gradual densification. There are many good models for this in other cities around the world. This project is not that! Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for a better use of this corner.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 186

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 14, 2021 22:35:15 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 06:35:15 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

I'm tired of the city asking for input from the citizens then entertain revisions from the developers that seem to be the opposite of what the opinions suggest. Slash the height by 25% and ensure construction is monitored closely so there isn't a repeat of the complex on Broadway between Nanaimo and Kamloops (parts of it look like a slum in a foreign country) and the Vancouver House complex.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 187

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 01:28:03 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 01:28:03 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The height of buildings proposed here is simply incompatible with a pleasant, walkable and sustainable city. As a building rises beyond 10 storeys, the materials and energy used to support the structure grow ever greater relative to the growth of the number of occupants, while simultaneously over shadowing the daily business of living in the neighbourhood. The push for these towers is almost entirely the high profit margin for developers, and has no value for the neighbours who already reside here. We do not want towers, we want sustainable middle density development which improves the character of an already delightful neighbourhood.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 188

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 02:42:17 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 02:42:17 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This style and height of building has no Place in the Commercial Drive community. The development will ruin the nature and character of the neighbourhood. Keep the development low and set back from the street to create more accessible and welcoming spaces and avoid the horrible tunnel effect characterized by less sunlight and closed in streets. It will also pave the way for a string of similar ugly, characterless towers full of tiny, overpriced, apartments of poor quality.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 189

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 06:15:20 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 06:15:20 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Please stop this project...it will kill this neighbourhood...the area around trout Lake is being overbuilt ...3600 block Victoria. , 1800 block stainsbury..2 giant buildings , 3600 hull, another building planned on East side of 3600 Victoria...it's too much...our neighborhood is like New York city..what on earth are you thinking? Trout Lake park is bearing the brunt of over development...now you want megatowers at Broadway and commercial??? What ???????

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 190

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 08:54:57 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 08:54:57 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

These proposed buildings will drastically change the nature of Commercial Drive.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 191

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 09:24:00 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 09:24:00 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I do not support this proposal for a number of reasons. 1. The proposed community plaza is not in line with the Grandview Woodland plan to create a community amenity for gathering here. It is in shadow and right next to the skytrain tracks which means it will be noisy and unpleasant. A screen for movies/projections makes no sense as you wouldn't be able to hear anything. A beautiful expensive wall is a waste of money - how will graffiti be removed from it and children prevented from climbing it. Further, this area contains a number of unsavory characters - this plaza will provide the perfect new posh home for them. How will homeless and drug use be addressed in this space. E.g. will there be 24 hour security? Gates? And if they are pushed from here (aka their current home) where will they go? Much more consideration needs to be devoted to create a grander and more usable community space that is safe and usable for neighbourhood residents and visitors to the area. 2. How come additional dedications are not being taken to increase and improve sidewalk/pedestrian realm on 10th Ave and Broadway? I couldn't find any sidewalk dimensions on the drawings to provide more specific comments - other than the fact that there is an opportunity to create great streets instead of cheap mediocre thoroughfares. 3. Why are there so few larger units? Families need homes. Only 11% of 653 are 3 bedrooms. This doesn't meet the required 35% in COV. Why not? 4. The proposal is highly deficient in parking/loading and bike parking. The developer needs to dig down further in their parkade. Less money in their pockets but an overall better proposal. The proposal is not meeting City minimum requirements for parking, loading, bike parking etc. Further, given the location and extraordinary density, these minimums are not considered sufficient. 5. Market rental in the area is oversaturated. I live a few blocks away and near me there are 3 new market rental projects (always with vacancies) and about another 4 in progress. Do we need a few hundred more market rental units that will sit vacant? Why not consider senior's housing or another beneficial use? 6. I'm concerned about vehicle circulation in the area. I drive westbound on Broadway daily and it's always jammed up - adding another access point/intersection mid-block is going to be a nightmare. Further - there is also a random bike connection on Broadway - I didn't see that consideration in the drawings. There is already a ton of traffic into and out of Safeway - when you layer on all the other uses - it's going to be a zoo however I'm sure ICBC will benefit from all the claims. 7. Schools for all these new residents? Secord is already at capacity. 8. This area lacks daycare. Located this here to actually provide a necessary amenity for the community. In summary, the developer stands to make significant profits on this project while providing very little contributions or amenities back to the community. I am not supportive of 3 giant towers here (this isn't Yaletown!!), I am not supportive of the barebones basic proposal that does not meet minimum requirements nor does it offer the community anything. Redevelopment of this under-utilized site is welcome in a manner that respects the existing context and gives something back to the community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 192

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 09:26:23 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 09:26:23 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This proposal is way too high for the area it is in. There was a plan that was agreed upon in the Grandview Community Plan that was far more in keeping with the flavour of this neighbourhood. It does not have nearly enough low rental units in it. This community has a large rental population and the units in the towers should be able to rent for what is currently the market value (which is already too high for medium to low single income earners). The increase in population will be dumping even more people onto streets, sidewalks and public transit that is already over extended at this location. The streets are jammed with cars, pedestrians and cyclists with the current population. What is the city plan to deal with the significant influx of people trying to get around?

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 193

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 10:06:46 am

Last Seen: Dec 05, 2021 17:26:14 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Granted that the Broadway/Commercial intersection is ugly and needs a redo. However, this does not mean truncating 2 neighborhoods (Grandview-Woodlands and Cedar Cottage-Kensington) with Brentwood/Oakridge style towers and a cold, austere rendition of public space with few community facilities (eg daycare) and the avoidance of input from residents who care about reasonably priced & affordable units, an overcrowded parking situation with messy traffic at a huge intersection, and unaffordable local business space. Who will this proposal benefit OTHER THAN THE DEVELOPERS!

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 194

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 10:14:38 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 10:14:38 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I have been following this proposed project as a longstanding community member, 35 plus years. This project doesn't even pretend to take into account the fabric of the neighbourhood and community. While I am a proponent of density to provide housing for a range of incomes, this goes against ever principle of good communication in development. It ignores the makeup of the community, most low to moderate folks, and families. It doesn't provide enough subsidized housing, and affordable retail for small businesses. It would also loom over the area, blocking light, and leaving our neighbourhood in shadow. The plaza is hardly accessible, and clearly not designed to encourage people to gather in any meaningful way. Overall I am disappointed that the city continues to engage in this as the development has not even come close to addressing the community as laid out in our community plan that we all worked so hard on so that we could have a voice in shaping our communal needs.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 195

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 10:49:03 am

Last Seen: Dec 08, 2021 06:03:03 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

My concern as a resident of Grandview Woodland is the staggering building height being proposed. I'm all for increased density but feel strongly that it should reflect an integrated approach, with residential transition to main corridor in a gradual rise in height. Having three towers that are the tallest buildings by a significant amount for many, many miles around is damaging both visually but also in terms of the neighbourhood community. I live in a single-family residence four blocks from this site - even from four blocks away this development will block out the entire skyline to the south. The proposed height goes far beyond what was discussed in the Grandview Woodland community meetings, and I do not believe it is in the best interest of the Grandview Woodland community.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 196

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 11:50:46 am

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 11:50:46 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The height and monstrosity of this building is not suitable for this area. Commercial Drive and its surrounding neighbourhoods are a hub of cultural presence in this town. There is character, heritage and design to be found in this neighbourhood. The towers are ugly and would not suit this neighbourhood. Don't take away that little bit of character that is left in this town. Its a shame.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 197

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 12:30:35 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 20:30:35 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

Changes suggested are minimal considering the concerns of the community related to massive height of this building. Ongoing concerns: 1) This design does not include accommodating a significant increased traffic and parking challenges at this corner. It is already jammed up regularly at both the 10th/commercial crosswalks and the Broadway commercial. 2) impact to small business owners is negative - supporting growth of mass industry 3) Does not fit with the Commercial drive Aesthetics - community, social, supporting families and young people. Currently a quaint and interesting area. This building will cast a HUGE shadow to neighbouring buildings and homes. 4) This building sets an undesirable precedent for ongoing massive tower developments. 5) Commercial drive could be built up by attending to improvements along the entire street - slight increases to allowable building heights above small businesses. Spreading out the increased density and allowing for smaller building groups to contribute to the diversity . Maximising heights to 5 stories. Currently most buildings are 2 or 3 stories.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 198

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 13:35:24 pm

Last Seen: Dec 07, 2021 02:30:06 am

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

What a monstrosity this project plan is! It will negatively affect not just the immediate surrounding area, but the whole East side of Vancouver. Whom is this design planned to serve? We already know that Real Estate Investment Trusts scoop up condos and other properties for the sole purpose of making more money, which increases inequity. We are suffering the effects of inequity greatly, and not just in Vancouver, but around the world. Economically, it is a terrible idea, and will simply unhouse many more people. I question the geological safety of the site with this kind of development on it. The Earth is not one solid block of stone; it is a dynamic natural environment which can change with the conditions around it. As we are experiencing, climate change is making our natural environment unpredictable. And with "Skytrains" whizzing by and under this corner, the stability will last only so long. Why can't we enlarge some of the lower cost developments we already have and create actual housing for people who need it? This project will not help our social problems at all. In fact, it will create more. I hope that you send this development back to the drawing board with strict instructions to design something that houses more low and middle income earners, as well as those with disabilities and mental issues. Also, more public space is needed to allow people to socialize and feel that they belong to a community. The developers and investors of this project are, apparently, not part of the local community, nor do they identify as part of the community. This is a serious problem. Those who have extreme wealth should be able to share and develop solutions for our social problems, not create more. I look forward to seeing Vancouver City Council vote against this project and require stricter guidelines that are actually beneficial to the neighbourhood.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

☒ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

☒ Yes



Respondent No: 199

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 14:22:47 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 14:22:47 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Vancouver is flooded with massive building projects some of which fit into the area they are in. 1780 East Broadway is completely out of place and will damage the Commercial Drive community area feel and I object.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes



Respondent No: 200

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 14:58:19 pm

Last Seen: Nov 16, 2021 20:28:39 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments

I feel that this proposal is still not in the best interests of the Commercial Drive community. These buildings are signs of the wave of gentrification that is rolling East over Vancouver and into the surrounding communities. Buildings like these do nothing to address the housing crisis that is currently decimating the community - the "affordable" or "below market" suites are simply virtue signalling. They are still well above the income levels of current members of the community, and make no meaningful contribution to protecting the vibrant alternative and resistant groups that inhabit this area. Condos decimate culture and community, commercializing neighbourhood relationships through strata arrangements and applying restrictions that function to homogenize individual lifestyles and expressions. The groups that these buildings would bring in - because these suites clearly are not within the budgets or lifestyle preferences of current community members - have no understanding of or investment in the historic culture of the Drive. The heights of the buildings are also unacceptable, and especially the performative reduction of height by one storey. Height in the service of offering higher density housing to address the lack of homes accessible to folks in the area is acceptable - but these structures clearly have profit in mind, not community support.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 201

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 14:58:29 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 14:58:29 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

The revisions are not faithful to the Grandview Woodland's Community Plan and don't address the reasons for changes or the proposed revisions. Issues of concern include the unacceptable height, a plaza with no sun or suitable public access, no daycare, and limited parking. Another critical issue is the small amount of affordable housing. This is so typical of the city, it's a city for developers who make their money on the sale of condos to foreign interests and speculators. Young, working Vancouverites can't afford this city, never mind low income residents. This development will also negatively impact local businesses with increased rents and competition from big chain retailers. The neighbourhood is against these towers that in time will become high rise slums, the developers won't be around when these buildings need to be re-piped in the not too distant future. People understand that densification is necessary, but why can't this be accomplished with a range smaller buildings. If the city doesn't get serious about affordable housing there are just going to be ongoing colonies of tent cities destroying our parks and homeless street people lying in the doorway of these unaffordable towers. And working people will leave this city that is becoming stupidly and devastatingly unaffordable.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 202

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 14:59:45 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 14:59:45 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Dear City of Vancouver, I hope this comment finds you well. I'm sorry, but this plan is outrageous - a gross insult to the existing community and longstanding character of Commercial Drive. The towers are now even more absurdly tall than in the previous version of the plan. The plaza is not "sunny" or well located. There are too many "luxury" condos, low-rise existing buildings in the area will be destroyed, renters will need to find parking in a neighbourhood already burdened with limited parking options, etc, etc. Like many others, I understand the need for densification and the logic of doing so close to transportation hubs. But please folks, can this not be done with an eye to the future of the neighbourhood altogether. With the height and placement of the towers and the dominance of high-end condos, I don't see how this serves either the local community or the city. I don't know of course, but this smacks of the city being in the pocket of private, well-moneyed developers from elsewhere, or at least inappropriately influenced by them. We're not naive. We know that many developers are in it for the money and don't give a damn about local integrity or any kind of sane long-term vision that serves the most people." "Concentrating so many new residents into one city block will destroy the fabric of the community. Also, the height of the towers is completely out of scale with the rest of the community. That area is already overcrowded. This will turn it into an even more unpleasant area to be outdoors. It will make the people already living around the area feel like their privacy is being invaded by people looking down on them. The towers will diminish daylight substantially for all those unlucky enough to live in the range of the shadows cast. These are de-humanizing projects based on profits for the builders, and little else. This will be remembered at election time." " The revisions still do not address issues that vary from Grandview Woodland's Community Plan. These include height (no reduction). inadequate plaza with no sun or good public access, no daycare, limited parking and most importantly - no likelihood that the development would increase affordable housing since only 20% of the units would rent below market value. An additional concern is for the local businesses and the likely possibility that their rents will go up as property values increase in the neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood is unique and valued all over the lower mainland. If businesses go under as a result of this project, what replaces them? Uptown glitz? Please know that density itself is not the issue as we favour smart gradual densification. This project is not that!!! Please please do not pass this re-zoning and go back to the drawing board/research stage for better use of this corner. "

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 203

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 15:24:28 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 15:24:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am at a complete loss why the City is even entertaining this development proposal - the extreme density and height are ridiculous - it is located at an already at-capacity Skytrain station, and adjacent to an already dysfunctional major intersection. Reduce the height significantly, and spread it out over several blocks. This development does not fit into the overall plan for the area, of which I am a resident.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 204

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 15:44:06 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 15:44:06 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am fully supportive of higher density living particularly close to transit hubs, I hope that the prices will be affordable enough for locals. I also hope that more public, urban green spaces are created whenever apartment buildings go up.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 205

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 16:10:31 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 16:10:31 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

No towers. This area is about community living. Towers will change the skyline here. Not for the better.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 206

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 17:00:26 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 17:00:26 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I looked at the new proposal being made and I really concerned regarding the density to be absorbed at a critical locations where there are long line ups for public transportation. It is a high crime area. I don't believe the tranquil plaza that is pictured will look like the picture for more than one week, but will more dangerous and not a place for kids and seniors. We need to work with the provincial and federal government on below market housing and building a better community. Large towers in this location will be a disaster, and will not achieve the outcomes we need.

Q2. Your overall position about the application ☐ Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future ☐ Yes



Respondent No: 207

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 17:48:43 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 17:48:43 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Affordable housing should be a priority!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 208

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 20:00:37 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 20:00:37 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

24 floors is the maximum the city should allow at this location. The people of the community helped create the plan, please stick to it!!!!!!

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 209

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 21:44:35 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 21:44:35 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

This proposal is way too high. I understand we need to increase density but this is extreme and in one location. You're asking too much for the neighbourhood to change it's character entirely.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Mixed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

not answered



Respondent No: 210

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 22:41:12 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 22:41:12 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I am strongly opposed to the development at the Safeway site Commercial Broadway. The area is a small vibrant community that thrives on the local merchants and small business owners. The First Nations presence and participation in the many events that celebrate the land and the community demonstrates the strong cultural connect to the current small neighbourhood dynamic. The proposed development structure does not reflect the culture or local First Nations community, nor provides benefit to the First Nations within this community. The Commercial Broadway area is currently overpopulated. The surrounding land, parks, and public infrastructure cannot sustain the current population much less additional growth. The City of Vancouver should look to improve the current community before considering expanding development. Private developers are participating in the municipal planning permitting process for profit not for building and sustaining a community. Upon completion of the proposed development the dollars and community support will leave. This profits from developments such as this one, exit Vancouver. Foreign investors is one part of this problem. There is no local economic gain. This speaks both to the Commercial Broadway community and the City of Vancouver. Look to improve and support the current community. This proposal solely focus is enhancing developers profits. I am strongly opposed to this development. This will destroy the Commercial Broadway community. Looking at cities within Europe, it can be noted that the city centers often have building height limits. Some as little as 4 to six stories. Housing densification within these cities often occurs outside of the cultural city hubs. The City of Vancouver should look to these successful planning models as goalposts. The City of Vancouver and adjacent cities have partnered to expand the public transit access into the City of Vancouver. This supports the expansion of housing opportunities within the less populated neighboring cities outside of Vancouver. The financial commitment and multi government approach to public transit into Vancouver is to be celebrated. It also demonstrates the lack of need to plant three monstrous highrises in the middle of a quaint historical Vancouver community. Each element of negativity of the proposal can be looked at in isolation: lack of parking, lack of schools, lack of community centers, lack of public park space, lack of roadways to support the current traffic, traffic congestion, lack of health care facilities, lack of daycares, lack of adequate sidewalks, lack of community planning for the proposed new population surplus. These elements are a select few of the many negative aspects of this proposal. I ask you not to look at each element individually but as a whole. The increased population from the proposed three towers can not be supported within the current municipal support structure. Please disallow this proposal. I am strongly opposed to this proposal.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 211

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 23:36:50 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 23:36:50 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

Looks great, although my understanding of the plaza and the rooftop park area is that it is only accessible by residents takes away a lot of the allure of the plaza part of this project. If you look at the success of south false creek / olympic village and the unbelievable usage it gets allowing the public to meander from public space to public space, restricting access to the upper courtyard area really is a negative to the community feel of this project and plan. Hopefully there can be a way to include or rezone the west side of the skytrain station as well and extend the plaza.

Q2. Your overall position about the application

Support

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future

Yes



Respondent No: 212

Login: s.22(1)

Email: s.22(1)

Responded At: Nov 15, 2021 23:44:26 pm

Last Seen: Nov 15, 2021 23:44:26 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments

I really think that the developers and the city need to reconsider this proposal entirely. None of the concerns that people have expressed about this project have been addressed in this "revised plan". The people who live just to the south of this project, the community the project is located in, Cedar Cottage, have not been consulted! The towers will obscure the view of the mountains from their neighbourhood and from Trout Lake. The "revised plan" is even taller than the original one. The plaza is just a paved area between the skytrain and Safeway -- it's not at all an open plaza where people can enjoy the outdoors to congregate, meet, sit in the sun for a read or a lunch. And who wants to live like a factory chicken? Only 14% of the units in the development will be below market, affordable. This is not what we need. The area of Commercial Drive and Grandview and Cedar Cottage has always been quirky and welcoming with many affordable suites and shared houses. These housing towers will turn the Drive into a Brentwood-like development. We, the people who live in this neighbourhood, want something green, land-oriented, affordable, beautiful. These towers are so ugly! Please start over on this site and get the planners and architects to create something beautiful that will fit into the neighbourhood of Grandview/Cedar Cottage and will actually be a credit to Vancouver and its lovely natural surroundings.

Q2. Your overall position about the application Opposed

Q3. I would like to be contacted about this application in the future Yes

From: s.22(1)
To: "Erdman, Scott" <Scott.Erdman@vancouver.ca>
"Phan, Thien" <Thien.Phan@vancouver.ca>
Date: 11/14/2021 12:59:30 PM
Subject: [EXT] BUCCI- RA Application for 2062-2092 E Broadway

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

• Good day to you all,

This is Part 1 of my commentary re this application. I assume my comments will be summarized by Scott as 'other' on his RA report results. Part 2 will directly address the building proposed.

To those I am cc'ing re this application it is to make you more familiar with the BROADWAY TRIANGLE (BT) and that it is a non traditional street grid neighbourhood that certain build form typologies are not suitable in abundance. This is why we have to constantly harp each time a developer submits an application. Please study this aerial shot and follow roadways. Unfortunately the photo leaves off our Nanaimo tip.

The excavation of the Grandview Cut starting in 1913 made this area what it is..a right scalene triangle. Sadly Laura Secord had build eight classrooms before the start of the excavation. Who..would build a school purposely in that Lakewood corner location to then find themselves cut off from access streets, typical of our north neighbours.

CONTEXT PLAN:



The north side Broadway does NOT equal the south side in ingress/ egress possibilities. Like apples do not equal oranges. Again the map.

In the Broadway Triangle the avenues and their back-lanes do NOT go fully through to streets such as Victoria Drive. Because of Laura Secord and its large playground, between Broadway and Garden Drive, there is no access to back-lanes from Lakewood to Garden Drive.

Semlin, Templeton and Garden Drives DO NOT have access to 12th Ave.

The only internal south access between Nanaimo and Victoria is an overpass/ bridge at Lakewood Drive.

In October the Engineering Services thought to close the bridge for vehicles for its CVG UPGRADES so that 'cyclists using the CVG and other bike routes could have a more pleasurable riding experience.'

Another indication that this BT area is not understood at city-hall, and, that priorities are for cyclists and not residents existing nor for those to arrive in condos.

You were a new municipal governance, except for two councillors re-elected, when you were initiated in January 2019 for the Public Hearing of BUCCI for his RA application at 2550 Garden Drive. You did not have an idea of all the processes involving residents that led up to that hearing.

You also voted at the Virtual Public Hearing held January 2021 re the OMICRON project at 2246-2268 E Broadway. None of us got to speak to the developer or planners in person for the RA virtual open house.

Here we are again, since the adoption of the GWCP in 2016, with the THIRD private developer with a Virtual RA application for six storey condos. Ironically it is the same as the first- BUCCI. He likely is pleased he does not have to meet us in person.

It is quite feasible you will be voting on this one as well before the new election in October 2022.

** I might add you will be doing the same for BUCCI's other conquest to developer rule this area @ 2037-2061 E Broadway.

THE CONFLICT WITH THE GWCP's aspirations, expectations, policies re the Broadway Triangle.

1) The local residents have protested since 2013 about the cookie cutter formula 6's on the south side of Broadway. We still protest the two extra floors but have to 'suck it up' as there is no amendment or revision in the GWCP policies and guidelines..be some of them now archaic, and based on rigid ideology, and not in touch with reality as far as our Climate Emergency action needs of today.

2) We ACCEPT the increase in density of human beings that this build form brings. But Affordable should be the criteria in Vancouver- one of the most unaffordable and expensive Cities in the world. Our favourite forms and more suitable for density are duplexes, triplexes, row houses, townhouses.

3) What is NOT ACCEPTABLE are the cars, SUV's, that come with the package of 4-6 storeys. It seems that invasive excavation for two floors of underground parkades for the 6's, are a necessity^a requirement, a law, by city hall. Again environmentally not in touch with reality.

**Currently between BUCCI, OMICRON and Gary Lee's four storey at 2660 Garden Drive, we can expect an additional 182 cars circumnavigating the difficult street grids of the BT. Add BUCCI's new proposal for 71 stalls. This is insane and totally unfair in this challenged area.

There are more lots yet to be developed along Broadway to fulfill VISION's aspirations of densification. So far there are Three parcels of only 3 lots!not as appealing for a developer to build 6 storeys. These are jammed up from the back of the school playground mini lane to Garden Drive. hBUCCI's new acquisition of 5 lots at Lakewood, has left 7 lots up to Semlin to be developed. Hmm? The math says another will end up being only 3 lots. Add in the GWCP's aspiration to have mixed use at grade on the east side of Semlin, is another complication, and I will add a bad idea from the very beginning.

4) I quote from a CHW article of 11/01/21 by Christina De Marco. It was about the Streamlining of rents, but condos fit the bill except for the CAC exemptions.

**One stall unit can cost around \$60,000- \$100,000 to build as I have read in other reports.

¹ Underground parking structures undermine affordability and climate goals. Underground parking garages will accompany most of these projects and can eat up 20% of total building costs⁴wiping out the affordability advantage of the City's CAC exemptions and undermining affordable rents. The greenhouse cases created by using vast quantities of cement in construction seriously weakens the best of green building intentions/ regulations.^m

5) The CLIMATE EMERGENCY PARKING PROGRAM (CEPP) would have issued 'curb taxes' for residents but would NOT have affected condo dwellers and their cars!yet they could infiltrate our roadways and add to pollution.

There was a 50/50 split amongst councillors and the mayor made the tie breaker to oppose. **It still remains that with the frenzy of developing hi rise to low rise buildings, that emissions from the increased cars is NECESSARY to be dealt with.

hEven if every single family house in the BT was turned into a duplex, or even row houses or townhouses, there would still not be the same number of cars that will come forth ONLY out of these current four projects-253 cars.

6) In all the presentations by the RA/ DA Planners (and I have read them all as far as the BT goes)!the Commercial- Broadway Station Precinct area, or 'Broadway East Multi Family'^m gets promoted heavily by them under the GWCP. The Applicants constantly quote about fulfilling the policies and guidelines. A case in point is this new application of BUCCI and his overemphasize in the Rezoning and Design Rationales.

It is getting rather mundane to hear these blurbs repeated over and over, almost robotically especially from City planners who have been trained to think in terms of tunnel vision only. As far as input from residences go, they ignore or reinterpret their concerns as they have been taught..towards approving a project as they like it.

Who is trying to convince whom that the GWCP rules are so justified? The UDP, Mayor and Councillors, Director of Planning are already familiarized with the rules, so maybe presenters can cut their presentations short.

7) Excerpts from Joseph Tohill or Ryan Dinh at the UDP meeting about 2037-2061 E Broadway- BUCCI's north side project.

‘ In the Plan, the surrounding area will become a vibrant, accessible, and walkable, transit- oriented neighbourhood with a mix of land uses and scales that give residents, workers, and visitors the HIGHEST DEGREE OF TRANSPORTATION ACCESSIBILITY OF ANYWHERE IN VANCOUVER’.

‘ It is also within three blocks of one of the region's most significant transit hubs at the Commercial-Broadway Skytrain station, which provides access to the Expo and Millennium Skytrain lines and the Evergreen Extension, as well as major bus routes including the 99B-Line to UBC.’

**I would have even added the abundance of cycling routes that are being upgraded.

We are BLESSED, are we not?

7) h) This should mean that sites close to ‘the blessings of good public transit and cycling routes’ should have parking space reductions to encourage more use of sustainable forms of transportation, that should be constantly improved.

So WHY do we residents who live in the BT have to suffer the consequences of invasive parkade construction over and over, and the glut of excess car emissions that will do zilch to help the environment that is escalating in deterioration?

Perhaps it should be a criteria issued from City hall and not a choice of the developer, that if they desire to build their condo units close to transit hubs but also on one of the busiest, noisiest and air polluted arterials in Vancouver, they are to have a maximum of one floor of parking with minimal car stalls that do not equal the condo units proposed. 476sf Studios each need a stall- more than family units? Bring on lots of bike spaces. Make the areas close to superb transit a model for more car free neighbourhoods.

EXAMPLE: 1837-1863 E 11TH AVE / 2631-2685 VICTORIA DRIVE.

This has been going on since 2017. Coming up for a revised RA at the public hearing on November 16th. I have gone through the Referral Report and the UDP minutes for this application. Being a rental is no excuse for Planning to come back and say Condos have different rules.

This project, for 136 units, went from 2.5 floors of underground parking to 1 floor with 43 car spaces and 270 bicycle spaces. Again there is a basis for this as close to significant Transportation hubs. The GWCP wanted 10 storeys here, so a 6 storey is somewhat breaking the rules but it looks like it still complies with policies and guidelines.

But of course this would mean that the outdated GWCP which had NO climate issues addressed especially to reduce emissions by vehicles, would have to have some ‘ policies and guidelines’ Amended. I am not asking for an Amendment for every area in the whole Plan’ only the area I know, the Broadway Triangle.

This is where you who govern at City hall come in. I ask you to even just consider this request in debate perhaps. Making such changes can also indicate a seriousness on your parts of really wanting to deal with the Climate Emergency.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

s.22(1)

Vancouver

SORRY, I don't know how to remove the aerial image at the bottom, as not very savvy technically. However, it is worth another look.

5:14 PM Sat Oct 23

rezoning.vancouver.ca

64%

CONTEXT PLAN:



From: s.22(1)
To: "Pete Fry" <pete@petefry.ca>
"Carr, Adriane" <Adriane.Carr@vancouver.ca>
"De Genova, Melissa" <Melissa.DeGenova@vancouver.ca>
"Bligh, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Bligh@vancouver.ca>
"Boyle, Christine" <Christine.Boyle@vancouver.ca>
"Dominated, Lisa" <Lisa.Dominated@vancouver.ca>
"Hardwick, Colleen" <Colleen.Hardwick@vancouver.ca>
"Kirby-Yung, Sarah" <Sarah.Kirby-Yung@vancouver.ca>
"Swanson, Jean" <Jean.Swanson@vancouver.ca>
"Wiebe, Michael" <Michael.Wiebe@vancouver.ca>
"Stewart, Kennedy" <Kennedy.Stewart@vancouver.ca>
Date: 11/15/2021 3:43:27 PM
Subject: [EXT] Re: 1780 East Broadway Zoning Application

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

To: The Mayor and Council, Vancouver
Re: Submission made to Shape Your City on the proposal for the Safeway site at 1780 East Broadway

I am sending you a copy of my submission as I want you to see it as it is written, and not via a planner's summary.

The proposal for the Safeway site will destroy the historic Grandview-Woodlands and Cedar Cottage neighbourhoods, and I oppose it. It does not fit our neighbourhoods. It's neighbourhoods like ours, with our historic buildings, small proprietorships and personalized shopping, human-scale housing, vibrant street life, and *character* that breathe life into a city, and they should be *protected*. That ton of cement you want to drop on us at the Safeway site would be a killer. Perhaps you are familiar with the animated short "Bambi Meets Godzilla"? That about says it.

Which brings me to the matter of the planning process, or more specifically, community participation in the planning process.

The proposal for the Safeway site runs counter to community plans, both the Grandview-Woodlands Community Plan, and the Station Area Plan before it. When Skytrain was first proposed, it was Cedar Cottage that the City invited to participate in planning the station area. Skytrain runs *through* Cedar Cottage and the station area is (or, was) in Cedar Cottage. But, down the road, when it came to planning the Safeway

site, Cedar Cottage was not even invited to the table. Planning had turned the station area over to Grandview-Woodlands, Cedar Cottage no longer a player. I am a resident of Cedar Cottage, I live s.22(1) from the station area, and this *annoys* me.

It is self-evident that any development on the Safeway site is of as much interest to Cedar Cottage as it is to Grandview-Woodlands. It escapes me then, why Cedar Cottage was excluded from the planning.

Perhaps it was the gerrymandering. When the City decided to amalgamate Cedar Cottage with Kensington, perhaps it was then the decision was made, *on our behalf*, that the station area no longer concerned us. It seems the Planners considered the lines they were drawing on paper to define the newly invented Kensington-Cedar Cottage neighbourhood, represented a *wall* between Cedar Cottage and Grandview Woodlands. There is no wall, or natural division between our neighbourhoods. Cedar Cottage and Grandview-Woodlands have a natural affinity. We are two of the oldest neighbourhoods in the City, existing side-by-side, and we share common interests and concerns, including The Drive, Broadway, the station area and the Safeway site. It was a mistake not to include representatives from *both* Cedar Cottage and Grandview-Woodlands in planning the Safeway site.

The community consultation process for the Safeway site has been divisive, dismissive, and manipulative. Residents and businesses directly impacted have been excluded or ignored, and the developer has been given sway, no doubt along with other big money interests.

As my opinion is being invited only after the fact, I am taking the prerogative to say *start over*. That design you have there *cannot be saved*. It's an insult to the community and it should be an embarrassment to City Hall. Where is the design that shows *imagination*, that is *relevant to our times*—socially, architecturally, ecologically. How about a design that employs the latest in green technology, building materials, construction, energy, and living. There must be plenty of good ideas out there, and massive, looming, ugly towers are not one of them. No towers on the Safeway site. Please.

From: s.22(1)

To: "Pete Fry" <pete@petefry.ca>
"Carr, Adriane" <Adriane.Carr@vancouver.ca>
"De Genova, Melissa" <Melissa.DeGenova@vancouver.ca>
"Bligh, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Bligh@vancouver.ca>
"Boyle, Christine" <Christine.Boyle@vancouver.ca>
"Dominated, Lisa" <Lisa.Dominated@vancouver.ca>
"Hardwick, Colleen" <Colleen.Hardwick@vancouver.ca>
"Kirby-Yung, Sarah" <Sarah.Kirby-Yung@vancouver.ca>
"Swanson, Jean" <Jean.Swanson@vancouver.ca>
"Wiebe, Michael" <Michael.Wiebe@vancouver.ca>
"Stewart, Kennedy" <Kennedy.Stewart@vancouver.ca>

Date: 11/15/2021 11:55:53 PM

Subject: [EXT] Please reject the revised plan for the Safeway site at Broadway and Commercial

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I really think that the developers and the city need to reconsider this proposal in its entirety, to start over from scratch. None of the concerns that people have expressed about this project have been addressed in this "revised plan". None of them.

Most importantly, the people who live just to the south of this project and who will be most affected by it, the community the project is actually located in, Cedar Cottage, have not been consulted! The towers will obscure the view of the mountains from their neighbourhood and from Trout Lake. And will serve as a barrier between Cedar Cottage and main part of Commercial Drive's high street.

The "revised plan" is even taller than the original one. The "plaza" is just a paved area between the skytrain and Safeway -- it's not at all an open plaza where people can enjoy the outdoors to congregate, meet, reflect, or sit in the sun for a read or a lunch.

And who wants to live like a factory chicken? Only 14% of the units in the development will be below market, affordable. And I'm sure these "affordable" units will also be the least desirable in the development. This is not what we need.

The area of Commercial Drive and Grandview and Cedar Cottage has always been quirky and welcoming with many affordable suites and shared houses. These housing

towers will turn the Drive into a Brentwood-like development.

We, the people who live in this neighbourhood, want something green, land-oriented, affordable, beautiful. These towers are so ugly!

Please don't approve this plan. Please start over on this site and get the planners and architects to create something beautiful that will fit into the neighbourhood of Grandview/Cedar Cottage and will actually be a credit to Vancouver and its lovely natural surroundings.

Sincerely,

s.22(1)

Grandview resident

s.22(1)

PS - I did put my comments on the Shape Your City site, but it said there that my comments would not be posted publicly, but would be summarized and anonymized in a staff report for Council.

I'm sorry, but I don't trust the planning staff to summarize and "anonymize" my comments.