

File No.: 04-1000-20-2023-403

August 2, 2023

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 July 7, 2023 under the ***Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*** for:

**Record of electronic submissions from the public to the "Shape Your City" inbox regarding development application DP-2022-00500 for 2086-2098 W 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 2091 W 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Date range: June 28, 2023 to July 4, 2023.**

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](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](mailto: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 (#04-1000-20-2023-403); 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](mailto:cobi.falconer@vancouver.ca)  
453 W. 12th Avenue Vancouver BC V5Y 1V4

If you have any questions, please email us at [foi@vancouver.ca](mailto:foi@vancouver.ca) and we will respond to you as soon as possible. Alternatively, you can call the FOI Case Manager at 604-871-6584.

Encl. (Response package)

:pm



**Respondent No:** 73

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 09:22:47 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 09:22:47 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This is not the place for this type of building. We have seen neighborhoods ruined over this - yaletown being the most recent. You are putting this directly across from a school in an area that previously, until it benefits the city to raise the building height. We are already seeing an increase of crime on the arbutus greenway and many of the surrounding houses have had break-in attempts

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 74

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 09:27:02 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 09:27:02 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

BC Housing now has about 4 - 6 years of history of putting these installations wherever they want in the face of public outcry with no community consultation whatsoever. They then hand the building off to organizations like RainCity to manage, and the places turn into crime-ridden cesspools. The managing organizations refuse to work with police and foster an environment of open-air criminality within and surrounding the buildings, with hand-to-hand drug dealing in the hallways, common rooms and outside the buildings, with the whole properties turning into a warehouse of stolen goods. Overdoses are pretty frequent at these properties.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 75

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 09:30:53 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 09:30:53 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This will be a disaster for St Augustines School, Delamont Park, Greenway users and the local neighbourhood. As well this site is a former Daycare that has not been adequately replaced.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 76

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 09:45:30 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 16:45:31 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am heavily opposed to this application. Frankly I am shocked that the city is ignoring the safety and needs of the children in the area. There are a number of schools in the surrounding area including a school directly across the road plus a kids park. Every child that is harmed and every future child that becomes an addict in the area is going to be the responsibility of everyone responsible for this application.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC,

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 77

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 12:02:13 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 12:02:13 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I appose, design is institutional and doesn't fit the neighborhood

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC,

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 78

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 12:03:08 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 12:03:08 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose the project

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) vancouver bc s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 79

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 12:16:57 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 12:16:57 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am concerned about the size and height of the proposed building. It is too close to a primary school

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC,

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 80

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jun 28, 2023 15:11:46 pm

Last Seen: Jun 29, 2023 17:54:51 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am extremely concerned with the fact the size of the building and resident being housed there is being placed in this part of Kitsilano. As a resident of Vancouver it leave me to believe our local government is not interested in the individual needs of the neighbourhoods of Vancouver. The building is to high and the residents should not be placed especially in such high number with no supports in front of an elementary school, play ground, day care, and women's recovery centre. The children and women and seniors in the area are a vulnerable group and the residents could be problematic. I live s.22(1) s.22(1) and I have seen the growth of people on the street or laying around outside of the building. I have seen people asleep in front of T&T store s.22(1). If this council thinks that the residents will stay in the building they are mistaken and actually tone deaf to those of us who live in areas where these building are. s.22(1) does not house as many as will be in this building. I have been following this and the city has not been transparent and tends to leave out important information painting the residents of Kitsilano as Nimby's. This is unfair as they just want the right social housing in the area. The city continues to deceive the public and an example is the photo you have on this site. It does not depict the area at all. The street is no wider as it seems. This council need to not only listen to the residents but the experts who have knowledge with this group of people to find the right housing from them. Without proper supports they will not improve their situation and will continue to suffer while taking down the area around it. The council is tone deaf, deceptive and are not living up to their work to look out for all vancouverites. They have their own agenda and I regret voting in this new council as they seem to have an agenda. This is the wrong size and resident mix for this area. They city has not been transparent and has tried to hide important information which was obvious by previous meetings. It makes us not trust them especially when they the province to intervene with a group that is challenging the council in court which is their right. They will do whatever it takes to warehouse people get them off the street in mass only with no care for them or the resident in the area. The police, Healthcare professionals, legal professional, educational expert in this area have all voiced their objections and the data that shows that this housing doesn't work yet council doesn't listen. We voted them in and if this happens and goes as experts expect causing injury to any of those children they will be blamed and will not remain in power. I am frustrated by resident being told they are important and the party is listening only to turn around and do what the previous group did. I also want to know how the company that will build this building is tied to the previous mayor Gregor Robertson who I consider one of many reasons for the growing problem of homelessness. This council need to reconsider this plan and build social housing that will benefit the residents of the building and allow them to be part of the community. If this goes through city hall will do this to every neighbourhood and disregard residents and professionals who have advise how these types of hard to house people need to be helped.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 81

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 16:52:02 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 16:52:02 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

If this locations has even half as many calls to 911 a day as Marguerite Ford does , where are fire trucks supposed to park without blocking the streets several times a day a preventing parents from picking up very young children. How is this going to be handled so the multiple calls a day will not be blocking access to the school?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 82

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 28, 2023 17:33:30 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 17:33:30 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

A hugely disproportionate number of fire emergency calls are made from supportive housing ( and before you do the normal share your city cut and paste comments that this is an unfair stereotype I suggest you review VFRS chief Karen Fry'S 2022 report). How are late firetrucks possibly going to enter this premise without blocking the street? This will be beside an extremely busy sky train station and traffic will already be completely overwhelming these small residential roads. What is the plan for the fire trucks that will be at this location on an almost daily basis?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 83

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 29, 2023 09:10:11 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 29, 2023 09:10:11 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Do you not consider it to be a major conflict of interest to be using a company partemered with Nexii, to build this building?. Gregor Robertson is the evp of nexii and it seems as though awarding him this contract has the appearance of favouritism especially as Gregor has presented himself as an advisor to premier Eby in business as dealings. <https://biv.com/article/2023/06/foi-records-reveal-planning-details-bc-premiers-meeting-washington-governor?amp>

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 84

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 29, 2023 09:45:56 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 29, 2023 09:45:56 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hello can you please provide details on how Gregor Robertson's company Nexii who is partnered with Nomadic was chosen to build this \$64M building? 1- how many bids were received in total? 2- why was a company that build their buildings in China using Chinese Labour and then shipped to BC which is extremely bad for our environment chosen over local companies using local labour? Please answer in detail the two questions. Regards s.22(1)

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 85

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 29, 2023 20:35:10 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 29, 2023 20:35:10 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I'm very concerned about the architecture, location and access to 100s of vulnerable children and seniors in the community. This location is and should be designated to lower income seniors, single moms who would have access to transit, schools and a safe community. You are taking a family friendly community and turning into an unsafe and hazardous neighborhood. Prevention is better than cure. Let's prevent children being hurt and then having to think of a cure for this problem. The magnitude of the building is daunting. The majority of the community does NOT support this and success only comes when a community is in support. Reconsider who will be accommodated in the building and size.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 86

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 29, 2023 22:07:18 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 29, 2023 22:07:18 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am in opposition of the proposed development permit of this social housing unit. It limits multi family/single family units that is also part of the affordable housing goals. It encourages a congregate housing model which has proven to not be sustainable or safe to the future residents. The height and number of units have not been done before which requires more due diligence given the limited in house support and care. In addition the location of low barrier housing is in close proximity to an elementary school and abstinence based women's recovery home next door. The low barrier housing unit will have an in-house drug consumption room and with limited resident support. The majority of the community was in opposition and requested this be brought back for review. However the city still passed the rezoning last summer 2022. The provincial government has overstepped their boundaries by enacting Bill 26 which aims to remove the community's input. This is a conflict of interest in the role of the province and has shown a lack of good faith to the community. This permit process should not go through given this. Finally, the city has discriminated the community by calling them "nimby" for opposing the proposed rezoning and type of housing.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 87

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 07:11:41 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 07:11:41 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This development has not been properly planned and conceived. There are not enough services in the vicinity of this planned development to support the residents of these social housing units. The community does not have the capacity to support this type of a facility. Further the location and the scale of this residence next to a school and a park and a family oriented neighborhood is not logical. I would support a much smaller facility, but something of this size and magnitude is a very poor idea. Consultation also seems to have been lacking sorely on this development. The City is not listening to local residents and neighbors. I am very much opposed to this project as it stands today.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 88

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 07:23:35 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 14:23:35 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

s.22(1) What is needed is social housing for seniors, families, people with disabilities who are struggling to pay rent in the area. Put a community police office on the ground floor so they are close to the new Arbutus transit station. To have a building for people with mental health and addictions issues with no supports across the street from 500 elementary children and a half block from 2 seniors buildings makes no sense.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 89

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 07:34:42 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 14:30:59 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Do not proceed with SRO Hirise at Arbutus and 7th

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 90

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 07:39:13 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 07:39:13 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

1. The proposed development will negatively effect the immediate community surroundings. The area does not have the necessary amenities (e.g., mental health supports, soup kitchens, community halls and gym/health facilities) to support the vast number and special requirements of the new population added to the community as a result of this development. I believe it sets this population up for failure and they will be forced to leave the community to find these supports. There needs to be a more wholistic approach that supplements the existing community infrastructure with these supports rather than just adding people. The proximity of this project to schools lends a great opportunity to change this project to support low-income families rather than single use adults. This would leverage existing community infrastructure (schools). More consultation needed. 2. I recognize that adding housing volume is a city priority but it needs to be done in a more thoughtful way and a one size fits all approach with single use occupancy isn't appropriate for every community, particularly this one which doesn't have enough community infrastructure to support that marginalized population. As you know, a roof over the head is only one part of a very complex puzzle. The location of this project also severely jeopardizes the successful Arbutus Greenway project which is a lynch pin in the city's green transportation initiatives and priorities. The immediate area around the ROW of the Arbutus Greenway (such as the proposed project lands) should be dedicated to park space and community infrastructure to complement this world class arbutus greenway project. 3. The concerns addressed above would be addressed by (1) a substantial investment in surrounding community infrastructure (community centres, park space, health clinics) to support this population, or (2) revise project to support low-income families rather than single use to leverage existing infrastructure.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 91

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 08:08:22 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 08:08:22 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I don't know if I'm reading these plans correctly because it appeared as though after the 2nd floor the building is basically Right on top of the sidewalk. If This is true this is extremely dangerous for people walking below in what is and will be more so with the coming sky train station. There is a history of people with mental health issues ( and yes it has already been stated many of the residents will be suffering from mental illness and /or addiction) throwing things out of their windows at SROs where a person was just severely injured this month by an item being thrown down at him. <https://globalnews.ca/news/9764449/one-man-arrested-for-throwing-objects-out-window-one-person-injured-vpd/amp/> Unlike that neighborhood, the arbutus has over 500 little kids walking by this going to go to school and daycare next door as well as even more walking to the adjacent delamont park. What happens if a little child has something thrown at them from 10 stories up?? They will likely be killed. This building clearly hasnt been thought out wisely and the building is way too large for the narrow space, so much so that it is being built right up to the sidewalk. This building is not compatible at all with the site and a full redesign needs to be done to protect pedestrians.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 92

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 08:23:34 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 08:23:34 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I live within blocks of this development am writing in strong opposition to this building permit. This is the most ill conceived plan that could possibly have been made for this site in every aspect: the built form is too large/overbearing for the space with inadequate road infrastructure to support the anticipated increase in emergency vehicles; the tenant mix of the "hardest to house" single men when the province has a severe shortage of housing for women and children; and the perpetuation of a model of large congregate housing that has proven in other areas of the city to be a failure (e.g. Marguerite Ford) and at a far inflated cost that building a different type of structure would cost. In addition it threatens the already existing women's abstinence based recovery home just a block away-how can these women continue their recovery and feel safe so close to this type of housing that allows open drug use? It is entirely out of keeping with the family oriented neighbourhood and it flies in the face of bylaws that limit proximity of cannabis stores near schools and instead proposes a building with open drug use meters from an elementary school and blocks from several others. Not to mention, how can someone living in this building ever hope to get better, surrounded by open drug use and limited support being available? From the beginning of this process, the city and province has displayed utter contempt and disregard for the neighbourhood that supports the right type of social housing and has proposed many preferable alternatives (that could have been built immediately with no rezoning application and in fact house more people). It made a mockery of the public hearing process, ignoring the 80% of the 220 speakers in opposition. And to continue with this application in the face of a legal challenge with the Supreme Court of BC shows yet again that the city / province has its own agenda and does not care about the the opinions of its residents. This application should be halted while that process is seen through.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 93

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 08:24:02 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 08:24:02 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This project is a disgrace in design, concept, and execution. The building should be shorter; the City of Vancouver does not allow any building to cast shadow on parkspace, but will allow this hideous dump to cast shadow on the tiny, heavily-used playground park across the street. It should be family-oriented social housing; there are amenities and supports for families in the area, and families would contribute to the area. The residents of the current program will require significant supports that are not available in the area. EXPECT SIGNIFICANT CONFLICT BETWEEN THIS SITE AND THE RESIDENTS OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD. The process by which this site is developed should be done legally and according to past precedent for process, not through the skulduggery and bullying used by the City of Vancouver and the BC Provincial Government. Lastly, this is a complete waste of taxpayer money. If the goal is to house more people, the value of this land to a private developer would pay for more housing on another site. If the City and Province truly cared about providing housing more than being seen as ideologically pure, they would sell this site and use the proceeds to build more housing units on another site that is not as problematic as this one. Shame on you hypocrites.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 94

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 09:06:31 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 09:06:31 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

lease find below a copy of the email I sent to s.22(1) councillor Colleen Hardwick on March 11, 2021. I have been advised by a member of the Kitsilano Coalition that the rezoning is being reviewed and may be changed, as the rezoning approval is NOT in the best interests of the community or the proposed residents of the building. I am extremely concerned about the proposed supportive housing at 7th and Arbutus. From what I have read, this project was not well thought through. I would very much appreciate your efforts to ensure that the Province, the City and especially the Council consider the following: Skytrain Station Safety. This building will be next to the new sky train station. It is widely understood that train and subway stations need to feel safe or they will not be successful. Stations that do not feel safe become hotbeds of crime, including muggings, drug use, etc. The proposed building will create the exact opposite effect of what is needed. The building's size, cheap modular design, facilities offered (drug addict support services) and intended residents will make people feel unsafe. We have all seen 'hard' drug users hallucinating and aggressively yelling at passers by. Attracting such users to the station for purposes of providing services will make people feel unsafe. Why not offer the housing to those with accessibility challenges, seniors and women, who are a much lower risk group to the broader community, and would benefit most from close proximity to public transportation? Park and School Safety. This building will be very close to parks, schools and daycares. We are all aware of the needles in parks and school grounds in East Vancouver. The proposed building will almost certainly bring this experience to Kitsilano. Please protect your constituents and their children by preventing this secondary effect. Neighborhood Crime. Abundant research has concluded that the proposed type of supportive housing greatly increases local robberies. Any benefits to the new building's residents will be greatly offset by the danger some of them will bring to the families of Kitsilano, especially those within the immediate 5-block radius. Arbutus Greenway. The building will be across the street from West Broadway liquor. The West Broadway liquor store already attracts alcoholics and vagrants that congregate in the area between the store and the Arbutus Greenway. The proposed building will almost certainly greatly increase the number of troubled persons congregating in this area, decreasing the feeling of safety for all users of the Greenway, especially children that take the path to school. See above regarding the need for the station to feel safe. If the approach corridors feel unsafe, this will also cause the station to be unsuccessful. Thank you for considering these issues and bringing them to the attention of other stakeholders.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 95

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 09:17:24 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 09:17:24 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The public hearing requirements in no way have been met in terms of this development. It is a shame that Council is not looking into how poorly the consultation with neighbors took place with respect to this. I strongly urge council to order a proper consultation process and not just push this through in an expedited fashion.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 96

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 09:21:10 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 09:21:10 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I do not want this building built. The height of the proposed building is too tall for the area, and I don't think this building should be built right across from an elementary school. s.22(1) and as an owner and resident, I do not want this building built.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 97

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 09:23:26 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 09:23:26 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This Development application does not address the community's concerns and perpetuates a failed model of housing those at risk and the most vulnerable. It is unclear why the COV continues to pursue a strategy that has never worked. Most import, it completely ignores the feedback provided through public consultation rendering the process meaningless, a complete waste of resources and an exercise conducted in bad faith. The fact that there is a legal challenge should give the COV reason to pause - when the people you represent are forced to challenged that representation in the courts, something is clearly very wrong.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





Respondent No: 98

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jun 30, 2023 09:48:57 am

Last Seen: Jun 30, 2023 16:48:58 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments:

I reside s.22(1). I am giving my feedback now since you are rushing the process to ensure we don't get a fair and adequate chance to give our views. This building is not suitable for the neighbourhood - too high and too dense for the area. Shadowing data has already been presented to council. The target clients will have absolutely NO SUPPORT from mental health or addictions teams. Kits Mental health team has moved to Kerrisdale. There are also no addiction services in the area. MPA will not have professional doctors or nurses in the building, only 2 mental health workers with minimal qualifications for 140 residents. They will be unable to deal with any crisis. Fire trucks, police and ambulances will be at the building constantly. Many of the tenants will be actively using substances, and have criminal histories. The City is deliberately ENDANGERING the vulnerable children, the disabled and the seniors in that area, exposing children to drug transactions and placing children in harmful situations. The area is too congested for the ambulances and fire trucks and police vehicles that will be in constant attendance there for overdoses and violent behaviours. There will only be limited parking there. In short, this is not a suitable location for this building or for first housing (straight from tent cities and encampments) for this complex population. You have already destroyed Gastown, Chinatown, Olympic Village, Yaletown, Granville strip and the Fairview areas. Please don't ruin Kits as well!

Q2. Street address

s.22(1)

Q3. Postal code

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. Your overall position about the application:

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 99

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 10:50:13 am

**Last Seen:** May 30, 2022 01:27:36 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The height of this building does not fit well within the neighbourhood - a four to six-storey building would be much more appropriate. This building is going to loom over everything. Seven parking spots for 129 units is ridiculous. There is already limited parking in the neighbourhood and this building will put a huge stress on the parking situation. Where are visitors to this building, as well as occupants, going to park? I am not opposed to social housing as long as that means families and seniors. But it is my understanding that hard-to-house people will be the occupants. This building is immediately adjacent to a primary school and a women's shelter. This is not appropriate for this neighbourhood. Please make this social housing for families and seniors only.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 100

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 10:59:14 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 10:59:14 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Wrong development for this location -too close to an elementary school, play ground, liquor store and transportation hub. - will bring increased property crime into the area therefore increased policing costs therefore increased property tax to pay for this -will be displacing a rehab Womens shelter

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver,BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 101

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 11:05:06 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 11:05:06 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Strongly oppose this development. Unsuitable for this location.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 102

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 11:34:15 am

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 11:34:15 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I feel that the project proposed does not suit the location; at the public inquiry there were knowledgeable /sound thoughts on this issue and suggestions for what could work to suit the greater needs as well as the local community. I feel that the project is being pushed forward so that it appears that things are being done re the housing crisis when there should be an apology for so little action for so long and that is why the crisis now. Council needs to think critically and long term and what works best for all and what is sustainable.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 103

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 12:13:18 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 19:23:14 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

How does the application affect the immediate surroundings? Negatively. Would you send your child to the school opposite? Would you allow your child to exit the Arbutus subway station alone at night? (At King Edward and Cambie, no problem. But, here, beside people with mental inconsistency, there is risk that is not worth taking.) If you lived nearby, would you put a fence up to prevent opportunistic theft? People who live in Vancouver and can afford to buy an apartment along Hastings near Main St., are choosing not to. Why then would they welcome a similar environment to be created where they live? The building is too large. It will influence the neighborhood, rather than the other way, in which neighbors help people in need. A smaller building or fewer resident could allow for the neighborhood residents to help the people who need help - with jobs, support, funds... How does the application fit with the City's goals and priorities? When it comes to mental health improvement and addiction reduction, the old plan to treat people at home may work. Many people who are bi-polar or alcoholic manage to live independently with support from family. Institutional housing, especially without the therapy provided for instance by the Union Gospel Mission, has proven to fail. Yet, in this project, the city believes in a solution that has been demonstrated, in Canada and elsewhere, to fail. The cost will be borne, not by city planners or the Director of Planning but by the residents and the neighbors. What are your concerns about the application and how should they be addressed? Degraded personal safety around the site Too large a building for the resident profile. (The building on 16th and Dunbar makes more sense) Prison like architecture Unfriendly streetscape

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 104

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 12:14:11 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 12:14:11 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

A building of this size and with only single person units is unacceptable so close to a school and toddler park and to the Santa Maria House for women trying to stay free from drugs and alcohol. The proposed development poses a risk to the safety of these vulnerable populations of children and women. The development should be scaled down to a smaller size and density that would fit in and can be handled by the neighbourhood and not pose a threat or overwhelming presence. There should be units for children and families, not just singles, as they are in desperate need of housing and there should be no dangerous drug-taking room in such a building. Such a revision of plans and design would fit into the neighbourhood and may even be welcomed. However, the plans as they stand are a disaster in the making. I am vehemently opposed to the present plans.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 105

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 12:24:11 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 12:24:11 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hello Could you please provide detailed info on how Gregor Robertson's company won the bid to build this building? How many other companies applied with a bid? Are there concerns with hiring the former mayor for this \$64M project? Hopefully these important details for taxpayers haven't gone the same way as previous info on contract bidding "Ramsay modified meeting minutes and routinely deleted text messages, despite the Office of the Comptroller General's explicit instructions to preserve records." <https://www.nexii.com/nomodic-partners-with-nexii-as-a-certified-installer-in-north-america/>

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 106

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 12:39:16 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 12:39:16 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The application is in no shape and form appropriate for the neighborhood. There are ways to meet the much needed housing requirements in our city in a safe and responsible way. This model and proposal puts our children, the community and the proposed residents of the residence in guaranteed harms way. Who will be responsible for keeping the children safe all day, every day?! And provide the residents of the proposes project the necessary care and support they require and deserve

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 107

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 12:55:15 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 19:55:15 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The Arbutus and 7th/8th site for up to 129 units of shelter rate housing with a common-use drug consumption room. The proposed project is right next to an elementary school with vulnerable young children. Drug use by the occupants of this shelter will result in difficulties in managing the behavior of some of the occupants who may cause harm to the students of St. Augustine's School. You only need one incident to ruin people's lives. At the very least, a change in the type of occupants and full-time 24/7 security staffing to safeguard the area and manage the occupants of the building is needed My s.22(1) and will be there for many years

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 108

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 14:48:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 21:48:19 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose this development. It does not belong here next to an elementary school and daycare in an area without mental health or addictions support. The whole process of pushing this through over the objections of so many local residents without waiting for pending court decisions is egregious and undemocratic. The recent provincial legislation arbitrarily dismissing the court case before it has even happened is appalling.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 109

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 15:01:52 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 21:48:19 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose this development. It does not belong here next to an elementary school and daycare in an area without mental health or addictions support. The whole process of pushing this through over the objections of so many local residents without waiting for pending court decisions is egregious and undemocratic. The recent provincial legislation arbitrarily dismissing the court case before it has even happened is appalling. In addition, the excessive height and limited setbacks of the proposed structure and resultant shadowing and inefficient use of space that could house more than 129 people if it were designed for families contravenes the City's own urban design goals and mandate to house as many people as possible. Additional concerns regarding public safety, traffic issues and more are discussed here:

s.22(1)

I share all of these concerns. This project should not proceed as planned. It should be reconfigured architecturally and be used to provide housing for families and children given the amenities already in place here for children.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

, Vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 110

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 16:23:08 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 16:23:08 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

With the surrounding by-zone law allowing 4 story development your proposed development will break the urban feel of this well established neighbourhood. So how is it that someone who pays no tax can be given a condo with a view from an upper story for free that any tax paying citizen couldn't even buy this view in the same area themselves? And how will this affect crime in the area, also given this development is across the street from a primary school? Does this development cast a shadow on the school yard? If it does, does that not alone disqualify your free housing project? Further, is the building properly staffed to ensure residents are being cared for? It appears you are enabling drug addicts with free accommodation to do whatever they please whenever they want, without addressing their trauma with proper rehabilitation services. Have proven that this kind of development has holistic benefit to the community? How does this affect property values? Are you compensating anyone with decreased property value due to your development? Although, since tax money is taken forcibly without negotiation I suppose any compensation would be at the expense of the taxpayer anyway. Burdening the tax payer with the problems of others may leave further resentment and bitterness in a citizenry that is already stretched to its limits. This is a band aid solution to a very complex problem and what you are proposing will only make it worse. It would even appear that is exactly your intent.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 111

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 17:15:20 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 17:15:20 pm

**IP Address:** n/a



**Q1. Your comments:**

Hundreds of neighbors and Vancouverites spoke and wrote letters in opposition to this project at the public hearing that lasted many days. A fewer number of people spoke and wrote in favor of it. I tuned in to the public hearing online, without initially having a strong opinion of my own. What I saw stunned me. Among other things, I learned that toxic drugs would be expected to be consumed in this building, steps away from the elementary and Montessori school, toddler park, and women's recovery home. Moreover, I saw concerned neighbors not only ignored but also openly criticized by public officials, including the now-disgraced former CEO of BC Housing Shayne Ramsay. This public hearing event, plus the passing of Bill C26, has shifted my view - as a former NDP supporter - of David Eby our premier, our current housing minister, BC Housing, and the current city administration and staff. How does the application affect the immediate surroundings? The application affects the immediate surroundings in some of the following ways: - It removes a wild and mature, treed green space that is an oasis of cool and tranquillity during the hottest summer days; This space is used and needed by those of us in the immediate neighborhood like myself without private yards or air conditioners. - It imposes a building that is too tall (equivalent to 18 stories) for the low-rise residential area, without the setbacks that even the Broadway Plan requires. The Broadway Plan itself is too imposing for the neighborhood and we haven't begun to feel the effects of it yet. To pass all of these changes at once is misguided in my view and unfair to current residents. - Its garbage and service (and emergency) vehicles, and vehicles required for visitors and support staff etc., will present additional logistical, traffic, noise, pollution, and road safety burdens on a 2-lane road (Arbutus) that is patently inadequate for the plans that the City has envisioned for it, including hosting the future subway station, and hundreds to thousands of new residential units along the Broadway Corridor. With the presence there of St Augustine's school and the road closures already imposed in the area for bike lanes and plazas, the combination of ALL of these new and as-of-yet unbuilt plans threatens to overwhelm the area and present untenable traffic jams and safety hazards. - It congregates a large number of individuals experiencing associated and interconnected challenges (poverty, addiction, mental health, housing insecurity) together, and it denies them the possibility of growing their families (i.e. living with partners and children), a known motivator of recovery and reintegration - Most importantly, it puts children and toddlers - and women in active recovery - in close, indeed immediate, proximity to a group of adult individuals actively using toxic drugs and (as a necessary result) experiencing mental health challenges. This has the potential to cause psychological and physical harm to all involved, the building's future adult residents included. Since the latter will be living in single occupancy studio units, necessarily without (their) children, we have to ask about how humane it is also for their sake to choose a child-centered location for this kind of permanent home. How does the application fit with the City's goals and priorities? The building will open 129 studio units for adult individuals experiencing or at risk of homelessness. To the extent that we have intersecting crises of homelessness, addiction, and mental health in our city and province (and indeed country), this building fits with the City's goals and priorities to provide more supportive housing to address these problems. However, this is an extraordinarily blunt way of going about solving problems. No one is disputing that supportive housing should be opened up, the question is how to do it well. A government unwilling to engage on those the details in the name of expediency and emergency is misguided and will not have my vote. What are your concerns about the application and how should they be addressed? - The application should be sent back to city staff to redesign in consultation with the community and scholarly voices that have already provided invaluable constructive feedback. A redesign should allow couples and/or parents with children (i.e. 1 and 2 bedroom units in the building) at risk of homelessness to be part of the tenant mix so that they can benefit from the child- and parent-centered immediate surroundings of the lot. More of the forest on 7th should be preserved, respecting principles of sustainable urban design in the coming age of accelerating climate change and heat islands. - More supportive housing units should be opened up ('scattered site') and supported at the shelter rate in the numerous new buildings that will be built along the Broadway Corridor and elsewhere in the city (indeed, in every neighborhood of Vancouver and the Lower Mainland) - I am very concerned that our former mayor (and self-declared advisor to David Eby) Gregor Robertson's modular housing company NEXII is set to become a major player in this project. I am deeply troubled that this fact may be part of the reason that our current leaders - premier, housing minister, BC Housing - have been so adamant in promoting this particular built form (i.e. studio units) and rejecting any substantive modifications. If this project is built out as currently proposed, I believe that NEXII must not be involved to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Q3. **Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. **Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 112

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 17:25:37 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 17:25:37 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

We need this project and many more like this in Vancouver, especially when funded by the province. We find ourselves in a dire housing crisis. For some s.22(1) young professionals, this means being able to afford rent, but being unable to start a family, to afford having a baby, or own a house (all our money goes towards rent, food, and other expenses). But for others, social housing makes the difference between having a roof over their head or sleep on the streets. We need to approve more housing, especially social housing, and streamline the process that allows social housing to be built. Low-income, vulnerable renters deserve to enjoy neighborhoods that so far have been reserved for single-family homes and wealthy residents. The first, real step towards solving this housing crisis is to build more rental-purpose, affordable (social) housing and prioritize that over condos. You will hear many comments about neighborhood character, safety, fear of change. But we do need change. We do need this project. If the City of Vancouver truly cares about its vulnerable residents, if it really stands for the values it preaches, then this project has to be passed and this housing has to be built. Please, do so for young residents who would like to build a life in this city and for those who are not yet here, but would like to. Let's not build gated communities, let's build communities of care and inclusion.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Support



**Respondent No:** 113

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 19:30:54 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 02:30:55 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I like everything about this application. It is close to transit and includes supports. More of this please.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Support



**Respondent No:** 114

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 20:36:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 30, 2023 20:36:19 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I have been a Kitsilano resident for s.22(1) and I am very distressed with the plans for this project. The housing model proposed is completely inappropriate for the area due to the height of the building and proximity to a children's playground and elementary school. The social housing element will bring in people who are drug addicts. Kitsilano homeless are mainly comprised of alcoholics and they have their own distinct community. Bringing people into this neighborhood with other addiction issues is going to cause a distinct negative change to the current culture and create more crime in the area. Kitsilano residents want to protect our existing community including those who live in social housing and the housing should ONLY be available to families, not troubled individuals who require something more supportive.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 115

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jun 30, 2023 21:15:46 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 04:15:47 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Please see the emails I have sent to the Director of Planning and to City Council. I have made my comments there in full. I object to the height of the proposed edifice & would like to see the site used for purposes more compatible with the other social housing projects nearby.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 116

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 01:33:56 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 08:33:57 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Please reject this proposed development application for a FAILED no-barrier supportive housing model which has proven to be unsafe in other neighbourhoods and cities for occupants and residents. Furthermore it does not fit within the family community of the neighbourhood. Offering no housing for couples nor their children. The safety of the children at the school across the street is of great concern. No other housing in the city of this sort is as close to a school as this one. Please reject this development proposal and ask the developers to come back with a proposal that better serves the residents and neighbourhood.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 117

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 08:29:39 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 08:29:39 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am opposed to this application. There is no specific plan for mitigating the impact of the development and its residents with the existing community. Without such mitigation the proposed development does not serve the interests of its proposed residents, let alone the residents of Kitsilano.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 118

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 09:09:31 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 15:56:05 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

No meaningful public consultation

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 119

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 10:29:20 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 10:29:20 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

One of the reasons we voted for the present administration was the hope that some of these absurd, failed housing projects around the city would be reconsidered. Instead, the overwhelming stupidity of ramming inappropriate projects into nice areas with the obvious potential to become nothing more than instant, dangerous dives will continue under the scrutiny of Mayor Ken Dim. There is nothing like the sweet view of Kindergarten and early elementary school kids wading through a sea of drug addicts as they try to make their way home or more likely to a parent's armored vehicle. Along the way they will be greeted by the bare, needle riddled posterior of an addict trying to shoot up on the outside of one of his/her legs which the city has so kindly encouraged these people to continue until their greatly mourned deaths. Ah yes lovely. Thank you so much for further beatifying our world class city, you developers who provided the backing for this administration's campaign as you now reap your rewards.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 120

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 10:33:12 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 10:33:12 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This proposal is lacking the good design relevant to successful, desirable social housing outcomes including the wellbeing for tenants, a sense of belonging for our communities and generating long-term value for the city. 1/ Design of social and community housing underpins the creation of better places that support the physical, social, cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing of the community. This proposed design is plainly and painfully institutional. The cold and abrupt appearance of the tower risks further stigmatizing those that dwell in it as being institutionalized. Its shocking appearance with zero setbacks does nothing to integrate into the immediate and tender public realm including a toddler park, elementary school playground and a women's shelter for those fleeing violence and reuniting with their young children. Action: Seek to amend the build form with the generous \$65M budget into one that yields a greater and gentler pride of place, a design that is warm and welcoming and potentially even bears a cheerful, cultural celebration. A successful example of this that garnered national headlines is the striking passive house, basket weave building by GBL (a \$55M project) planned for Grandview Woodlands. 2/ All development should seek to deepen a sense of belonging for our communities. The proposed site undoes belonging. Despite the location right next to a temporary shelter for women (that could act as a feeder site) and the cities' published equity framework that guarantees Vancouver to be a place where all women have full access to the resources provided in the city, this site excludes women if they are expecting or have given birth to a child. The units are single only and the MOU targets males only. None of the units are for families. The children at the six neighboring elementary schools, however they may wish to, will not be able to participate in deepening any sense of belonging with the dwellers. They simply will not be able to integrate with the population as they are not permitted on site. Action: Seek to amend the dwelling types into community housing with varied units inclusive of two bedroom units for families and seek to add a childcare facility within the amenity space. 3/ Create long term value for the partnership from the significant \$65M investment and to do well by this site design both inside and out one needs to unlock the gates of integration - KEY to the success of sites - and to eliminating the 'us' and 'them' divide. Do integrate community housing within market dwelling settings, BUT create a safe, connected environment. The lack of setbacks are an affront to a desired safe, connected environment. Dwellers of similar sites have been known to drop items out of windows, and without deeper setbacks the proposed would put children, families and other passersby at high risk of injury. Action: Increase setbacks to allow for increased safety, natural lighting and added benefit of green space on this busy arterial, transit hub, and school zone. It would add to the safe and independent passage of the 1700 school children to and from the area. Increase the setback along Arbutus to strongly influence how the development interacts with the public realm and the experience it creates on the public street by creating an appropriately scaled enclosure and active frontage.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 121

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 12:58:33 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 12:58:33 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This project(without afterthought)is doomed to fail from start to finish.The proposed residents will receive no support for rehabilitation while their physical and mental health will deteriorate.It is like putting over one hundred hard to house drug addicts and mentally ill people in one big enclosed area and hope for the best while those who wish to get off the vicious cycle become hopelessly trapped. it will be analogous to a revolving door for the most vulnerable citizens to move in and never come out alive. One question for the Vancouver major and councilors : Would you place your young child in a school or playground which are practically next door to this proposed building without an adequate protection strategy?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 122

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 13:18:10 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 13:18:10 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

As a longstanding Kitsilano resident, my gravest concern with the subject permit application is the obvious increase in local crime and diminished public safety this project will bring. Property and other crime in our community has increased over the past decade. If this project proceeds as currently configured, together with the new subway station, crime in the immediate area will explode! The project "harm reduction model" allowing space for on-site drug consumption, will achieve THE OPPOSITE result, facilitated by the nearby subway station (reliable statistics show crime rates to be much higher near stations). Think of the increased risk to nearby school children, used needles in the street and park; risks to women in an adjacent women's supportive recovery home; for seniors in nearby seniors housing; as well as for other residents. Creating a sub-community for low-barrier housing of residents with similar problems of mental health related to drug addiction, without onsite supervised mental health/addiction treatment, would be a disaster in no one's best interests, not least the resident addicts themselves. This project is best placed near supervised drug and mental health treatment facilities, not in the midst of a stable, quiet residential community with a nearby elementary school. Other reasons for rejecting this rezoning and development application are obvious. The proposed building would be an architecturally unappealing, institutional looking toxic mushroom springing up in an historic residential neighbourhood. It is manifestly ugly! It is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and does not meet the City's urban design goals and priorities. No community greenspace has been provided. No traffic analysis has been completed or shared. This development poses a significant traffic and safety challenge to school children and pedestrians. The intersection at Arbutus and 7th Ave is already a safety concern. The increased vehicle congestion will surely add multiple safety issues. Emergency response vehicles during peak traffic times coinciding with school pick-up/drop-off are forced to travel into oncoming traffic along Arbutus in an active school zone. And, emergency vehicles southbound are not able to turn eastbound on 7th Avenue due to the raised bike lane median. A project of this intrusive and highly contested nature deserves a proper, transparent public hearing process; not rammed through under the Province's ill-conceived Bill 26 legislation. I believe the City has failed to follow the rules of procedural fairness and natural justice at the rezoning public hearing and continues to show a lack of transparency and due process in the development application process. Only in June 2023, through the development permit signage, was the public informed that the development permit application was received 7 months earlier on November 16th 2022. The lack of information impedes a credible urban design analysis and honest consideration of the proposed development's impacts on its surroundings and makes it premature to proceed to development application at the present time. The decision of allowing this Development permit moving ahead, despite its obvious flaws and overwhelming Kitsilano neighbourhood opposition remains in the hands of our elected Council and Mayor. Bill 26 legislation does not abrogate their ultimate authority and duty to serve in the best interests of residents of neighbourhoods when projects like this are considered. To say that this highly controversial project, with its obvious adverse impacts on existing surrounding residents, is to be reviewed only by the Director of Planning, in an expedited process allowing only for written submissions rather than proper public discussion and debate, is unfair, lacks transparency and is undemocratic. To deem the public hearing requirements met simply because the Province has passed Bill 26 legislation is be proof of that. My central question is whether the Council and Mayor are willing and capable of listening to the reasoned voices of our community and not simply the flawed recommendations from City staff? Will decisions be based on the unfiltered facts, analysis, and evidence from those most affected – the local residents - and will decision-makers exercise proper moral judgment? I ask that they think through the consequences of this re-zoning and development permit application and "do the right thing" – listen to constituents – reject the flawed recommendations from City staff. Stop this project so that it can at least be re-configured to serve the interests of the community.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 123

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 13:48:49 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 13:48:49 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed social housing unit in the Kitsilano neighbourhood of Vancouver. While I understand the need for affordable housing options in our city, I believe that the location of this particular building raises significant concerns about its appropriateness and potential impact on the existing community. First and foremost, the proximity of this social housing unit to the elementary school and park is highly concerning. These are spaces that are specifically designed for children and families to enjoy, and they play a crucial role in creating a safe and nurturing environment for our youth. Introducing a housing unit known for accommodating individuals with drug addiction, mental health issues, and criminal backgrounds could potentially jeopardize the well-being and safety of the children and families who utilize these spaces. Furthermore, the proposed social housing unit does not align with the goals set forth by our city. Vancouver strives to foster inclusive and vibrant communities that promote the well-being of all residents. While I acknowledge the importance of providing housing opportunities for those in need, it is essential to consider the long-term impact of such decisions on the surrounding community. The current proposal does not adequately address the concerns of nearby residents who have invested in this neighbourhood and actively contribute to its growth. Instead, I would like to suggest an alternative approach that focuses on social housing for families, children, and low-income individuals. By constructing a building specifically designed to accommodate the needs of these groups, we can ensure a safer and more nurturing environment that promotes community integration. Moreover, this approach would maximize the utilization of the available space and allow for a greater number of individuals to benefit from affordable housing, as opposed to limiting it to 129 individuals. Additionally, it is important to note that the Kitsilano neighbourhood currently lacks sufficient mental health and addiction support services. While I recognize the need for social housing options for those facing these challenges, it is equally crucial to provide the necessary support systems within close proximity. A more holistic approach would involve developing housing units that are accompanied by accessible mental health and addiction support resources, allowing individuals to receive the assistance they need while promoting a safer and more inclusive community. In conclusion, I urge you to reconsider the proposed social housing unit in Kitsilano and instead explore alternative options that prioritize the well-being and safety of the existing community. By focusing on social housing for families, children, and low-income individuals and integrating essential support services, we can achieve a more balanced and inclusive approach to addressing the housing needs of our city. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will take into account the concerns of the Kitsilano community and make a decision that aligns with our shared vision of a prosperous and cohesive Vancouver.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 124

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 16:11:55 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 16:11:55 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

As a parent of an s.22(1) child, living s.22(1) I could not be happier to see it moving ahead! Shelter is a right and integral to the dignity all our neighbours deserve. Thank you to the city and province for the leadership.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Support





**Respondent No:** 125

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 01, 2023 18:05:11 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 18:05:11 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am concerned about the proposed tower, its design does not blend in with the neighbourhood. The vulnerable population it will be serving may well not benefit from living in this model. A high rise with little green space / patio surface is not conducive to community building. There is already on 7 th Avenue supportive housing for women in recovery. As well there is a Canadian legion seniors apartment, daycare, small playground and elementary school in very close proximity. This model has not proved successful and the location is inappropriate. I strongly oppose this initiative. I am sure and hopeful that the City has other property that they can use.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 126

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 06:01:36 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 06:01:36 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

My s.22(1) We have seen how the neighbourhood has changed in other areas such as Yaletown and Olympic Village where similar projects have been built and am concerned about the higher crime and drug use so close to the school. I understand the need for housing and the current housing crisis underway but the priority needs to be for safety of the students in schools nearby. My concerns are: 1. Increase in crime and drug use near school aged children 2. Results in other neighborhoods such as Yaletown where those residents are now left unsupported by Municipal leaders 3. Increase in garbage and human feces or drugs left near schools How should concerns be addressed: Move forward with the project but change it to support families and be a multiple bedroom set up to support families in need. This would better fit with the context of the site with its proximity to transit and schools. I truly hope the concerns of my family are heard. We are 2 hardworking parents with s.22(1) living in a small apartment. We are not "nimbys" but simply want to go to work each day knowing our child is safe. If this project moves forward without any regard for the schools nearby we will be forced to move out of the neighborhood so s.22(1) can attend a school that is safe. Lord Tennyson is a fantastic school and we would be incredibly sad to leave for this reason. Please reconsider the framework of this project and the impact it has on so many families with children attending the schools nearby. Thank you for reviewing my comments. Sincerely, s.22(1)

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 127

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 08:00:16 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 08:00:16 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am opposed to this due to the proximity of schools and children in the area.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 128

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 08:42:38 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 15:42:38 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I believe this proposed development is structurally and socially flawed and will not benefit anyone other than those developing and building it. It needs to be given more review by City and Council.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver.

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 129

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 09:02:44 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 01, 2023 22:46:49 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am concerned about how this building relates to the surrounding area including parks and a school plus the proximity to transit and concerns about pedestrian traffic. The sidewalks are far too narrow. The overhang of the building over the sidewalk is unsightly and could be dangerous. The choice of cladding is unsightly and not in keeping with the immediate area. This seems like a building designed for a city centre, not an area with heritage buildings and homes. I think this project needs to be looked at with an eye to how to create homes for people with mental problems that is unique in it's design and structure and includes humanity in its presentation. This building looks like it belongs near a hospital, not a community.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 130

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 09:27:37 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 16:27:38 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I encourage building assisted living/ social housing for the working poor and single parent families. I do not support providing housing for the homeless in this neighborhood, there are no resources for those people in our neighborhood, where as the working poor cannot find affordable housing in our neighborhood to enable them to work within a reasonable commute from their home

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 131

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 13:42:18 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 13:42:18 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

You will need more than 7 car parking spots for families.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 132

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 14:39:10 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 14:39:10 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Thank you for your valuable comments on this development. I understand the need for this type of housing but I think what is proposed is an urban slum in the making which will lead to conflict with local population, traffic and pedestrians . I also believe that assisted housing should include a mix of single, double and family units to truly be of value to the community. I think the architecture is quite brutal , more suited to the days of the USSR. Finally , where are the boulevard trees and green space that are so important to livability?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Mixed



**Respondent No:** 133

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 15:08:54 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 10, 2023 21:00:18 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The size of this development for high-needs people is totally inappropriate for the area, across the street from an elementary school, and two blocks from another.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 134

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 15:24:36 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 15:24:36 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am strongly opposed to the Arbutus and 7th/8th development. This proposal presents significant challenges and concerns that need to be thoroughly addressed before moving forward. I hope this letter finds you well. On behalf of the coalition, I am writing to express our firm opposition to the current rezoning application for the Arbutus and 7th/8th development. We believe that several critical concerns must be addressed before any decisions are made regarding this proposal. The lack of genuine consultation with the community regarding this rezoning application is deeply troubling. Authentic engagement with the community is paramount to building trust and ensuring that the concerns and needs of residents are given due consideration. City Council must prioritize open and transparent dialogue with the community before any decisions are made that directly impact our neighborhood. Perhaps most importantly, I am deeply concerned and opposed to the proposed supportive housing model. It appears to replicate the failed Single Room Occupancy (SRO) model from the Downtown Eastside, which has proven to have substantial safety issues and limited support systems. Introducing this model to other parts of the city, including the Arbutus and 7th/8th area, without rectifying its inherent flaws and shortcomings would be detrimental to both the residents and the surrounding community. Additionally, the proximity of the proposed site to a 450-child elementary school, toddler park, low-income seniors' homes and a Women's Supportive Recovery Home cannot be overlooked. This close proximity increases potential risks to these vulnerable groups and compromises the overall safety and well-being of the Arbutus community. It is essential to carefully consider these implications and engage relevant stakeholders, to ensure that the best practices for public safety are incorporated into any development plans. While we acknowledge the urgent issue of housing affordability in our city, it is crucial to highlight that this rezoning application does not adequately address this concern. The exclusive focus on low barrier supportive housing restricts access to a broader range of individuals and families in need of affordable housing, especially in the Arbutus/Broadway area. It is imperative to explore comprehensive solutions that cater to a diverse demographic, including single-parent and women-led families, seniors, and others who may not qualify for SRO housing. In conclusion, I request that Vancouver City Council carefully consider the community's concerns and opposition to the Arbutus and 7th/8th rezoning application. It is vital to prioritize the safety, well-being, and long-term sustainability of our city while seeking comprehensive and successful solutions to address the pressing issue of housing affordability. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I eagerly anticipate your thoughtful consideration and active engagement with the community before reaching any decisions. Sincerely, s.22(1)

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 135

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 16:38:59 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 16:38:59 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

There has already been extensive comment regarding the unsuitability of this model of housing for vulnerable populations which does not need to be elaborated upon here. There has also been extensive comment about the unsuitability of this particular site (across the street from an elementary school) for housing drug users. The expected adverse impact on the neighbourhood if this project goes ahead as per the DA will not be a surprise. Vancouver has plenty of evidence in this regard. I note that the City has not obtained a firm guarantee from the intended operators about staffing levels and I further note that the staffing levels concern only the needs of the residents, and not the neighbours. "The staffing model would take multiple factors into consideration including support services provided on and off site, the kinds of supports needed, number of residents, layout of building, programming, etc. BC Housing and the operator will work to ensure that staffing meets the needs of residents." In the circumstance, ensuring that only the needs of residents will be catered for provides no reassurance to anyone else. Yes, neighbours can contact the operator should they have any concerns but only the most naive would take comfort from that. In short: 1. provision of housing for the needy fits with the city's goals but it is not only single adults who require housing. There are families crying out for assistance as well as single adults. 2. if approved, the development will inevitably have an adverse impact on the neighbourhood UNLESS there is a strict NO DRUGS policy in operation. 3. housing for most vulnerable people (long term homeless, substance users, mentally ill, should be provided according to best practice, which clearly is not in congregate settings of this sort. I urge the City to go back to the drawing board for this site.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 136

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 17:09:37 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 00:09:38 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I support supportive and social housing , and think there should be more of it in the city. However, I don't support this development because of the vulnerable groups in close proximity. I also do not support the concept of for congregate housing. s.22(1) . It's a small house and it works really whereas the Arbutus project is so institutional. Its not a good idea to put so many people with similar problems together. Please do not pass this.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 137

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 21:05:32 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 04:05:33 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The proposed building at 7/8th is not only a doomed plan, it's anti-democratic. The vast majority of people who spoke to City Hall were vehemently against the project in its current form. It was not even close. This impending tragedy was warned against by a former judge from the DTES as well as a foremost expert in the social sciences, not to mention the voices from the nearby women's shelter. There's an elementary school right across the street as well as buildings housing severely physically disabled people. Is it fair to thrust this type of proposal onto innocent children and disabled people who will be in fear of simply going outside? The answer is a resounding NO!! It is absolutely stunning that the majority's opinion is being disregarded and overruled, it's unfathomable that this is happening in Canada. The fact that the city is potentially creating a decentralized DTES 2.0 is incredibly unfair to the neighbourhood, especially because so many of us are diametrically opposed to this idea. It's not too late to reverse the poor and uncalculated decision that was quite heavily handed down by Stewart Kennedy and his council. It bears reminding that the names attached to the ramming through of this proposal will forever be a part of its legacy. Once the SkyTrain is complete this area of the city will be in an extremely precarious and dangerous situation. This sentiment is shared by a vast majority of people who live and work in the Arbutus Ridge neighbourhood. Do right by the taxpayers and citizens of the Westside and cancel this preposterous ill-thought-out project. It's an affront to every single taxpayer and vulnerable citizen in the area and is dictatorial to the core. Cancel this horrible idea!!

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 138

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 21:08:55 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 21:08:55 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Whose idea was it to put such a massive building on such a tiny lot? The building basically hangs over the sidewalk. Sis anyone from the development office actually go and see the site? There are a huge amount of young children, strollers and elderly people with walkers. This is super dangerous and the city will become liable when a child is forced into traffic. This building should not proceed with the current size

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 139

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 21:13:02 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 21:13:02 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

It is quite concerning that this housing will be directly across the street from an elementary school, a playground/park, neighbour to a women's shelter, and one block away from a senior's home. I am not against this location being social housing. I just do not think it is the best location for 129 "hard to house men"

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 140

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 22:05:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 22:05:19 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I live in the neighbourhood s.22(1) I object to the form of the development that covers the entire site, from lot line to lot line on a heavily used pedestrian corridor for school children, that will become more intensely used by the public as the Broadway line is operational. A significant set back from Arbutus St to provide softening through landscape and increased boulevard width with amended public space would go along way to help integrate this proposal to the immediate surroundings. The location of the one and only building entry opposite the children's park on W7th is poorly considered. This unnecessarily loads the intersection of building occupants and park users on W7th, with potential overflow into the park, when a far more efficient and logical entry/ exit on W8th would provide access to the train station/Broadway services and direct building occupants away from the park. The height of the proposal is out of context with the current surroundings, shadowing the school to the west and the subsidised housing to the east. The rationale for increased floor to floor heights to achieve green objectives is not reasonable to offset real harm to the immediate surroundings. The building could be lower without affecting the number of units. I understand the DOP is only considering comments on the form of the proposal, but I object to the this model of SRO, housing vulnerable occupants vertically, removed and isolated from the street and the community.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 141

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 22:15:42 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 22:15:42 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hello, First, I want to say that I am not against social housing, but I am against the way this development has been designed and the lack of consideration for community input. We will have a (final stop) subway station, a few schools, and a bus terminal, all within a block, and everything is moving forward quickly without addressing some important practical issues. Briefly, my concerns are: Lack of Traffic Studies: there will be a big impact of increased traffic servicing the building (deliveries, services providers). Studies are required to determine traffic impacts from the Broadway Subway Project, Broadway Terminal Station, Broadway Plan, and proposed housing development, all within an active school zone. Emergency Vehicle Access: through Arbutus Street (that is a narrow arterial road) is currently posing issues for emergency vehicles and this does not appear to have been considered. Previous Issues Identified Not Yet Addressed: Conditions for approval required by City Council do not appear to be included in the development permit application. For example, most items in Appendix B Conditions of Approval, in the Rezoning Referral Report, have not been reflected within the development permit application, specifically related to Urban Design, Landscape and Engineering. If we could use a more collaborative approach to redesign this development, for a better outcome, we could reduce risks, traffic and health concerns, and offer a great opportunity of support and integration to many people. Thank you for your attention.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 142

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 22:48:45 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 05:48:45 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Many issues here. 13 storeys in 9 storeys higher than existing residences and will provide precedence for more future 13 storey buildings. It is too close to the school where the children play outside and the windows will open and face. It will destroy a natural wooded area and shadow over Delamont Park. It is too close to the sidewalk for comfort. It will allow drug use in sight of the school and park.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 143

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 02, 2023 23:22:52 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 02, 2023 23:22:52 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The process and hearing to rezone and approve this project was a failure of governance, lacked transparency and was undemocratic. The city did not listen to the community members and instead steamrolled them for their own agenda. You should be ashamed of yourselves. You are elected officials meant to act in the interests of your people and community and you have failed us. A new hearing needs to be held and the project should be halted until this has been done. This project has not been thought through and will irreparably change Kits for the worse permanently with vagrants coming to the beach from the city given the placement next to the new Broadway line.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 144

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 01:42:06 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 01:42:06 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

It appears that little has changed from all the input provided regarding the design of the suites being limited to bachelor suite and the overall design of the building including height and footprint at the public hearing almost a year ago. The building form and public interface has not improved from the initial proposal. The building remains institutional in form and an eye sore for residents. In the Memorandum of Understanding dated July 30, 2020 between the British Columbia Housing Management Commission ("BC Housing"), Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation ("CMHC") and the City of Vancouver (the "City") section 6.1 Permitting & Approvals states that ... the Director of Planning OR Development Permit Board, with their delegated authority from Council, may exercise discretionary power to relax the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw for these Developments where a minimum of 70% of all dwelling units are for low cost housing for persons receiving assistance. It is important that we don't just build for the sake of building (with political influence) but construct quality buildings that serve multiple uses if circumstances change in the future. Nobody has a crystal ball to predict what the future holds. There has been a lack of information provided relating to the competitive selection process for Nomadic, the builder chosen to design and construct the project. The majority of their work is 5 story projects and they appear to never have never built anything this large before. No information has been provided to indicate who else was allowed to bid on the project. Was Nexii excluded from the process due to the fact that a former mayor holds a positions on the board of directors? Similarly, there is no information relating to the process surrounding the selection of the third-party housing operator, MPA Society. They also have never managed a building of this size. In the end it appears that we are once again trying to recreate the wheel in order for there to be a lot of back patting. The housing crisis facing our city, province, and country has stemmed from a lot of finger pointing and no action over the last twenty years. The current design changes have not attempted to eliminate any shadowing on Delmont Park and the Elementary school, both 20m away. There has been no substantive study or evidence provided to show that this 2-block area has the capacity to handle such infrastructure growth from the Broadway Subway Terminal station, the proposed housing development, the future Broadway Plan density, the proximity to an elementary School, Delmont Park, and Sancta Maria house, a women's recovery shelter, and the Arbutus Greenway corridor. There has been no consideration around protecting trees on the property. The City owns Protection of Trees By-law 9958 which has been around since the late 80's has not been considered whatsoever as part of this project. Not one of the old trees within the limits of the property line will remain according to the renderings. No community public greenspace has been provided whatsoever. There is even no greenspace on the property itself. The building takes up the entire property from street corner to street corner. Amendments and commitments provided during public hearing, are not being reflected within this development permit. Specifically, amendments to explore health care options, and a variety of unit types haven been completely ignored in the development permit discussion. Traffic and Safety This development represents a significant traffic and safety challenge to the seniors, children, other pedestrians, and cyclists. The intersection at 7th and Arbutus in its current design, poses multiple safety issues as driver load is far too high. The intersection has two separate crossings on both the north and south side as well as an at grade concrete grade bike median. With all these possible interaction points drivers have too many obstacles to navigate. No consideration has been given to the increase in vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist traffic once the Broadway Subway project is complete along the major arterial thoroughfare, Arbutus Street. Studies are required to determine impacts from the Broadway Subway Project, future effects of the Broadway Plan but none have been provided so far. Arbutus Street is already a narrow arterial road currently posing issues for emergency vehicles. No regard has been given to access points for emergency response to both the proposed development and surrounding community. Emergency vehicles southbound are not able to turn Eastbound or Westbound on 7th Avenue due to the raised bike lane median. West of 7th is another disaster. With the location of the Broadway Subway terminal station right next to the proposed housing project this exposes many public safety concerns. There is basically no set-back from the sidewalk along Arbutus. The sidewalk is too narrow with this type of building going up. The sidewalks on most of East and WEst Broadway where there are large developments, the setback from the buildings is at least 10 feet while this building is 2 feet. Making the building work for the best interest of all affected residents would have helped to get the neighborhood behind the project versus feeling like the project was being forced down our throats and painting all Kitsilano residents as "nimby's" when we were just stating the obvious. In the end, want to see a housing solution thats makes sense in the long run for the community.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Q3. **Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. **Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 145

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 02:01:14 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 02:01:14 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

1. The building is institutional in design and is stigmatizing for the residents. 2. More than 129 people could reside on the property if the modular design approach was abandoned and the design was made to accommodate families and children. This would align with the city's goals to house as many people as possible. Wouldn't it be great to get more people off the streets? 3. Inadequate public hearings and inadequate development process. 4. Traffic impact to the children in the school across the street and pedestrians has not been conducted nor shared. Let's not run over our children! 5. Location near a skytrain terminus and the complex public safety issues have not been addressed. Scary! 6. The on site substance use room puts children at the school, the women at the adjacent recovery centre, seniors and the neighbourhood at risk. Policing requirements not addressed. The proposed development model has failed in other neighbourhoods and cities. This property is suited for families and children. Please reject this development proposal.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 146

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 03:20:47 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 10:20:47 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This building is totally in the Wrong Location! The height and mix of the units is to Constrictive! They are all for Single Use Occupancy! There should be No Drug use in this building because it is directly across from School! The neighbourhood does Not support it either! Do Not Approve It!

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 147

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 04:30:25 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 11:30:25 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

s.22(1) when the Grenfell Tower burned, killing 72. When it became known that the tower cladding did not meet published UK standards, I assured family and friends that "this can't happen in Canada because we have rigorous testing standards." Now I hear that the panels proposed for this building have NOT been tested to Canadian standards, and I worry, especially in a building housing folks with mental health issues. Not good enough.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 148

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 07:53:40 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 07:53:40 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose this development permit based on the following: Urban Design: does not fit into the "community", could access more housing for more individuals/families if not a SRO Inadequate public consultation: last council ignored the unanimous votes to oppose the rezoning), Public safety: this type of housing is not suitable directly across the street from an elementary school

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 149

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 08:52:42 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 15:52:43 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Narrow sidewalks, shadows on school and proximity to school, loss of mature trees, impacts on neighbours who have said they welcome low-income residents of families. A bad project anywhere that concentrates vulnerable individuals dealing with mental health and substance use problems in one building, and especially bad at this location.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 150

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 09:00:31 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 09:00:31 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building is too large for such a narrow lot. There are no setbacks for levels 2 to 13 of the tower form, and the Arbutus sidewalk remains narrow. This presents safety issues and an uninviting public realm for pedestrians. No traffic management plan has been presented and is critical given the coming adjacent bus loop and terminal subway station, and the amount of emergency service vehicles that will have to access the building. Updated architectural drawings of the podium and tower have not been submitted; no rainwater management plan is available for review. A smaller courtyard/greenhouse, replaced with a larger 3rd floor deck, would allow for acceptable building setbacks and widening the sidewalk on Arbutus. The building looks far more institutional and stigmatizing with the removal of the red brick on the podium, and the removal of the grey/blue grill on the tower. This project should be going to the Development Permit Review Board and not to only the Director.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 151

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 09:19:21 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 09:19:21 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The sidewalk on Arbutus remains too narrow, except for at the intersection of Arbutus and West 7th where the sidewalk is bumped out. This bump out at Arbutus and West 7th makes the street too narrow for vehicles to pass, especially given the triangular raised median that exists there. Levels 2 - 13 of the tower have no setbacks on the Arbutus side. This presents serious safety issues. There have been multiple reports in the media of people with mental health and substance use issues throwing items from windows and causing pedestrians injury. Many of the pedestrians here will be children going to the school across the street. The building form ought to be altered to allow for appropriate building setbacks and a wider sidewalk on Arbutus. The building lacks neighbourliness. It looks institutional and uninviting, especially with the changes to the exterior of the building (removal of the red brick from the podium and grey/blue grill from the tower). A different method of building or flexibility with the unit occupancy would have allowed housing targets to be achieved while adhering to architectural standards for setbacks.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 152

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 09:22:06 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 09:22:06 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose on this development. It doesn't fit in this neighborhood because: - quiet residential area with elementary school right next to it. - it is very dangerous with no traffic plan for the cars and pedestrians. - it is a kitslano prime land and even people with good salary cannot live this neighborhood. - Highrise building doesn't fit as walkable friendly neighborhood.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 153

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 09:43:13 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 09:43:13 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The neighbourliness of the building form, and the public interface, have not been improved. There are no setbacks on Arbutus Street for the tower. This is not only a serious urban design issue, but a safety issue. The building is institutional in architectural expression and stigmatizing for residents and thus does not meet the City's own urban design goals and priorities. It looks even more institutional with the removal of the warm brick for the podium and the blue facade on the tower. If the building was used for family and children, using non-modular technology, more than 129 people could be housed. This inefficiency is against City housing goals to house as many people as possible. Modular format does not allow for repurposing the building in the future. Current building design does not eliminate shadowing. The Arbutus Greenway will be in full shadow at 4pm during spring and fall equinoxes; Delamont Park will be in significant shadow during October to February at 2pm; and St. Augustine school will be in full shadow during morning. This shadowing does not accord with the City's policies of minimizing shadows on public spaces and independent schools. The urban design plan has not accounted for the layered impact of the Broadway Subway project, the housing development, future Broadway Plan density, and the proximity of the elementary school, preschool, Delamont Park and women's supportive recovery home. An adequate traffic plan has not been completed or shared. Amendments and commitments provided during the public hearing are not reflected in the application, such as amendments to explore health care options, different unit types and different funding streams. The inadequate public hearing is compounded by an inadequate development permit process. Detailed layouts and drawings have not been provided, impeding a credible urban design analysis and honest consideration of the proposed development's impacts on its surroundings.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 154**Login:** s.22(1)**Email:****Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 11:13:19 am**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 11:13:19 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Your comments:**

Creating the Perfect Storm - combining a Transit Hub with Social Housing for the Mentally Ill. CTV News reports on April 13, 2023 "Violence on transit has increased post-pandemic, police and union officials say." "It is absolutely vital that people be able to get to work, school and to do fun things around the community on transit and not have concerns about their safety when doing so. That's a goal that we have and that's something that all British Columbians deserve. This is a profoundly concerning incident," Premier David Eby said. "Violent attacks on public transit are reaching "crisis levels" across the country," according to Transit Union Canada (ATU) national president John Di Nino. People with mental health and addiction issues who are not getting supports they need elsewhere are seeking shelter on the transit systems. Transit systems are responsible for moving people. They don't have the skill sets when it comes to mental health, addictions and housing. How safe is your Vancouver neighbourhood? The Vancouver Police Department has launched a new interactive crime map of the city in a bid to provide the public with accurate crime data in their neighbourhoods. GeoDash, which stands for Geographic Data Analysis and Statistical Hub, is an "interactive crime mapping tool" that allows you to see crimes that were committed in your neighbourhood that were reported to the VPD. The map is similar to a system the police use themselves to track crime. MPA Society, the body intending to take over the proposed building is recognized in providing community based mental health service programs. It is one thing to have affordable housing placed in the area but for person's living with mental illness? This brings potential for crime and fear rather than safety to the community. There is no definitive arrangement for the proposed complex to be fully staffed and its residents fully monitored 24 hours. One would think more appropriate housing beside a school of any kind would be not be such but, rather, provide for elderly or groups that pose no threat to the school, church and surrounding community. Or, given the transit hub, provide housing for students attending UBC or higher educational institutions. The evidence is clear that the situation being created would be detrimental to the community. The police, city departments, transit and other agencies do not have the capacity nor are collaborating as current situations stand to monitor and control violence in the City. The hub proposed is in conflict with David Eby's statement. The situation in Vancouver and in other jurisdictions in BC are experiencing an upturn in violence that is out of control, in crisis and only getting worse. Whoever is making these decisions to combine a transit hub, social housing for the mentally ill with a community of families, and directly across from an elementary school, does not make sense. Persons making these decisions need to put themselves in the shoes of the people who live in the community where the sense of safety will be obliterated given the current day attacks on schools and church congregations and violent crimes using knives, guns, etc. The persons responsible for permitting this sort of development that destroys communities will be solely responsible for the recipe for disaster they are creating and the "tragedy in the making!" If this is the route that the City and their planners are taking, the City should then provide much increased police presence in the area and security for the school and the church when in session. The "tragedy in the making" is preventable by heeding the warnings signs. The parents and kids of an elementary school should not be the guinea pig for the City's trials in whether their policies of 1989 to 1991 for affordable housing works where they are set to distribute shelter in residential neighbourhoods per their mandate regardless of the obvious danger it brings and to the detriment of the neighbourhood.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 155

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 11:15:10 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 18:15:11 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The application fits with emergency measures to help house those who cannot afford Vancouver's rents. The immediate surroundings will provide good transport links for the residents. Concerns: What open green space is attached to the building? We've heard many times that seeing green from your window or being in greenness increase a feeling of well-being and promotes calmness. Plus consideration should be given to increase our canopy. Secondly, from what I've heard, the building is meant to support those in need of many provincial health services. Has there been consideration to use some of the floor space to embed a provincial resources office with 24hr staff to support the residents this building is supposed to be helping?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Mixed





**Respondent No:** 156

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 13:08:11 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 13:08:11 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I STRONGLY oppose this developement for the following reasons: 1.) next to an ELEMENTARY school, 2.) a skytrain station 3) a dominant residential area. This type of social housing cannot be a sound/healthy location as it will attract elements of drug use, underground criminal behaviour, and increase the number of destitute and dispossessed people thus exposing a vulnerable population (children) to the underbelly of humanity.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 157

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 03, 2023 13:10:23 pm

Last Seen: Jul 03, 2023 13:10:23 pm

IP Address: n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

1) This proposed building design is too institutional looking and lacks neighborliness. This neighborhood is surrounded by houses and low-rise apartments – most of the houses were built in the early 1900s with a traditional, craftsman style and many of these have been converted into affordable multi-unit homes, while still maintaining their heritage exterior. The many surrounding low rise apartment buildings are neutral in color and blend into the natural landscape of century-old trees and lush greenery. The surrounding schools and other public buildings between Broadway and 4th also reflect this traditional aesthetic. This proposed design does nothing to compliment the already-existing natural beauty of the immediate surrounding neighborhood and what has long been established over the past century. Walk around and you will not see painted brick on any of the surrounding brick buildings – yet this will be painted blue and iridescent with a stark white tower! Does anyone care about what the neighbors have to look at?! And what has happened to the Delamont park vision of affordable and sustainable, heritage rejuvenation? Delamont Park and the existing toddler playground and surrounding greenspace has been the life-blood of this community for growing families. Why not build upon this mind-set? Given the state of the tenants who will occupy this building, a homey and natural aesthetic that blends well within the already-existing life and beauty of the surrounding area, in a welcoming and vibrant neighborhood will offer peace and solace and respite from the stress from which the tenants have come. 2) This proposed building design does not allow larger sidewalks to be built along Arbutus to accommodate the increase in pedestrian traffic that the skytrain will bring. To widen the sidewalk along Arbutus, which is already a busy and narrow thoroughfare for traffic and emergency vehicles, there would have to be a change to Arbutus becoming a single lane in one direction. There simply is not enough room for the proposed setbacks of this building, wider sidewalks and two-way traffic. So something has to give. An increase in pedestrian traffic will definitely occur once the Arbutus Terminus Skytrain Station is operating. I know this because living only a few short blocks, s.22(1), there is already a tremendous number of people currently parking within the area and walking down Arbutus to Kits beach. With skytrain access, there will be more people coming directly from Broadway, walking down Arbutus to Kits beach. Currently the sidewalk is wide enough for two people walking side-by-side. And that is all. Some quick thinking is required when a passerby is coming up the sidewalk! On warmer days, and all summer long, with beachgoers and their supplies, it provides a lot of entertainment for onlookers, such as myself. However, too narrow sidewalks are already a danger with the current population of pedestrians walking down Arbutus to the beach. There is no margin for traffic error currently in this very narrow thoroughfare. And it will definitely become busier. Maybe the question should be if there really even needs to be vehicle access between 4th and Broadway. 3) This proposed building design with the tower portion extending to the property line right above the pedestrian sidewalk below is a safety concern as items can be thrown directly below onto pedestrians. This is a very family-friendly and child-oriented area with an elementary school to the West and a toddler park to the North. There are children, families, and teachers walking along Arbutus at all hours of the day. With the skytrain station, pedestrian traffic will increase. Given that the building was specifically designed with windows facing Arbutus Street specifically made smaller to prevent people from jumping out of them, what is to prevent things from being thrown out of them right onto the pedestrians below. 3) This proposed building design does not adequately account for rainwater management. With this building taking up most of the land mass on the two lots, there is little to absorb rainwater. With little to no setbacks from the property line for the tower, the sidewalk below will receive the downflow of water from the rain. If you are not already aware, currently during a heavy rainfall, Arbutus Street is practically a river flowing down Arbutus Street.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 158

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 13:13:22 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 13:13:22 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

To build a SRO for people with drug problems directly across a school, couple liquor stores, children's playground, and multiple close proximity day cares, elementary schools, as well as women and senior support homes is not a good option for this particular intersection. The people you are putting into this SRO should be in better proximity to facilities that offer help for drug addiction and rehabilitation back into society. To put them close to alcohol, and transit where drugs and alcohol can easily be accessible will only make the matter worse. For children to be easily exposed to needles and drugs is not acceptable. This housing will be better used for single parents, seniors who are on low income and need assistance from the government for housing.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 159

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 13:15:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 20:15:20 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The scale of this proposal, so anomalous in the community, the lack of appropriate on-site care and security and the lack of integrating a wide mix of tenants despite overwhelming examples of the benefits, are all reasons to re-consider this proposal.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 160

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 13:23:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 13:23:48 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I do not support the application for development at 2086 - 2098 W 7th Ave and 2091 W 8th Ave. Unsupported housing for unhoused and low income people will not properly meet their needs and will have a potentially dangerous outcome for the existing residents and the nearby school.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 161

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 13:39:10 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 20:39:10 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose this development application and have spoken against it previously to City Council. A high-rise, concrete 13+ storey tower is the wrong approach for social housing in the wrong location. Putting a social housing tower across from an elementary school and near more, across from a daycare and across from a shelter for women in operation for over 15 years makes no sense. Putting it next to a new SkyTrain Station also makes no sense. It is the wrong height for this neighbourhood, the wrong density, it warehouses those in need of help and it is vigorously opposed by the overwhelming majority in the neighbourhood and nearby.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 162

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 13:51:52 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 13:51:52 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I'm opposed on a number of grounds. (1) the building itself is far too large for this setting (2) The building itself does not have enough of a set back and is ugly - numerous alternative proposals have been put forward by architects and others that are better! (3) I don't believe that crowding all the people that need help in to one big building without assistance will help the overall housing issues. Dispersal of the housing throughout lots of development would be better. Otherwise you are just building what will become a slum. A lot of SROs on the downtown Eastside used to be nice and now they are not. I suspect this building will follow the same trajectory. (4) the taxpayers money - provincial, federal or municipal could be spent better - this just sends a huge FU to taxpayers to say that government does nothing to optimize the way the money is spent - It is time that OTHER municipalities in the Lower Mainland pitched in a LOT more to address this issue. Burnaby and Port Moody are huge laggards in this regard. Why isn't the province asking them to help?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

VANCOUVER

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 163

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 14:03:13 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 21:17:41 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This building is unharmonious with the neighborhood, being over 14 stories tall, compared to buildings 2-3 stories for blocks and blocks around. It will also have a safe injection site for drug users. It also will house over 100 people with emotional and chemical issues which make them seem more dangerous than the average neighbor. Plus it is directly opposite to a Pre K thru 8th grade school, with hundreds of students, putting them all at risk if one of the tenants has a breakdown. And, a children's & parent's park is also across the street and in danger of being overwhelmed by the volume of people being housed in this behemoth. Yes, we need to help the homeless. However, it shouldn't be done in such a dangerous way and placed in such a precious neighborhood. Might I add that there was tremendous resistance to this proposal when at the City Council, but most of the Councillors disregarded and didn't listen to the dissent and facts that stand against this facility, its placement, and its residents. Perhaps a smaller facility with spaces for single mothers with children would be more appropriate and fit right into the neighborhood.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 164

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 14:11:46 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 21:01:54 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am very concerned about this particular model that has been proposed as it will not provide the support for its tenants or the community that will be required. This model is not designed for families, children, or seniors, which our community is greatly populated with. A community social housing unit that was proposed by an architect in support of the Kitsilano Coalition designed a building that would not only house more tenants than this building, but it would also NOT create a shadow over the school playground or toddler park, it structurally fit on the lot more safely than the currently proposed building, AND it was designed to have 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms to accommodate all kinds of residents so that no one would be discriminated. I am SHOCKED that this building proposed by the Kitsilano Coalition was not even considered when it clearly is a much more beneficial option to the neighbourhood for all involved. It would benefit both the tenants, and the community. The current building proposal is structurally too large for the lot, will cast a shadow all year long over the school playground and toddler play park. The surrounding community does not have any treatment or rehabilitation centres or drug clinics to assist tenants who may require assistance. It is also of great concern that tenants will be allowed to use drugs in this building (according to David Eby, which he stated on the news) when this building is only 18m from an elementary school, 18m from a toddler play park and next door to a women's recovery shelter and across the street from a seniors home. There are also numerous other daycares and elementary schools in the surrounding neighbourhood. As a neighbour of this proposed building, and resident of Kitsilano s.22(1) I sincerely hope that the city will consider all of its residents when making this decision as it greatly impacts MANY lives. Please consider the well-being, health and safety of EVERYONE involved. A different model, like the one suggested by the Kitsilano Coalition, would be the BEST option for this neighbourhood. Thank you.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 165

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 14:17:41 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 21:17:41 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose the proposed BC Housing Project for Arbutus Avenue between 7th and 8th Avenues in Kitsilano for the following reasons: 1. To suggest that this project is only 13 stories is incorrect. It's actual height places it in the 15-story class. Nothing in this neighborhood or even nearby Broadway comes close to the size and scale of this proposed project. It will dwarf all other buildings in the area that are 2-3 story duplexes and townhouses. 2. Based on the Revised Shadow Study, the proposed Homeless tower will shade and block the sunlight across the entire neighborhood, including: St. Augustine's School & Schoolyard, Delamont Park (a park dedicated to small children), the Arbutus Greenway, and surrounding homes, townhouses and duplexes during a great part of the year. 3. According to BC Housing Guidelines for supportive housing sites, projects that are 50-60 units and offer proper support are more successful at serving the needs of residents as well as integrating their residents into the community and neighborhood. Sancta Maria House is a successful existing Supportive housing unit in our neighborhood, for women suffering from alcohol and drug abuse. It supports single parents and women with children, a much more endangered and abused segment of the homeless population compared to the Proposed Housing Tower on Arbutus, and is more suitable to the surrounding neighborhood. 4. The population of 140 low barrier homeless residents being housed (basically warehoused) in a giant building amidst this quiet neighborhood with probably less than 140 people per block in any direction is absurd and out of proportion. The neighborhood will be heavily impacted and its nature forever altered by this proposed housing project. 5. The site plan should be designed with much more neighborhood consultation. Surprisingly and disappointingly this coordination has not taken place. Is planning a gigantic homeless shelter with hardly any professional health support next to a kid's park and an elementary school a savvy urban planning strategy? While we are all in favor of helping the homeless, I can't support this specific Proposed project in its present form. Please stop this ill-advised project from moving forward. Also, when questioned about staffing, security, medical care, and supportive services to be provided by the City at the hearing and debate about this proposal, neither the City nor it's departments HAVE EVER answered any questions with a proposal of services, security, medical support or makeup of the residents. As it stands now, these elements which inform the neighbors about how this development will be run, how safe it would be, and what care would be provided have STILL been withheld. The City maintains that these questions will be answered before construction begins. That is putting the cart before the horse and the City is NOT addressing the concerns, questions, and objections of the neighbors, but plowing ahead full speed to build at any costs, not listening to our objections, or offering any consultation with the Neighbors, the School (with 650 students), the Church or it's parishioners, or the business community. This is not a responsive or responsible way for the City to behave. And, it could have disastrous results.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 166

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 14:19:49 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 14:19:49 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am opposed to this project due to the lack of information and public consultation on the type of housing that is proposed. The main concern is the well being and safety for the surrounding children in the elementary school, as well as the women's shelter as these are vulnerable citizens.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 167

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 14:35:38 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 21:34:48 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Placing 129 social housing units directly across the street from a primary school and a playground is irresponsible. The safety and well being of the children is paramount, and this reckless decision to place this building at this location should be overturned.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1), Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 168

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 03, 2023 14:52:45 pm

Last Seen: Jul 03, 2023 21:43:59 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I ask you to REJECT the development application for 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue. I live a s.22(1) at St. Augustine's school and friends who live in the neighbourhood, so I am familiar with the site, the neighbourhood and the proposal. While I strongly support recovery-oriented housing, I also support genuine, responsive public engagement that respects the wisdom and insights of neighbourhoods instead of dismissing them. I support good governance and decision making that is based upon facts and data, not political expediency, and I support solutions that are based upon proven success and the best research available. This proposal and the process followed to achieve it observe none of these principles. I'm sure you've already heard plenty about the myriad failures of this proposal: - It will create extensive shadows not only over the St. Augustine's elementary school yard, but also Delamont Park across 7th Avenue. I'm sure you'll remember that while proposing no new parks, the Broadway Plan did propose loose plans to expand and renew Delamont Park, a popular play spot in this dense, human-scale neighbourhood. If you approve this rezoning, Delamont Park will find itself shaded by this building for most of the afternoon, during our darkest days from October to March. Unfortunately, the flaccid solar access protections in the Broadway Plan do nothing to protect St. Augustine's schoolyard, nor Delamont park during these darker times of the year. - And, neither the City nor BC Housing has thoughtfully considered the concerns of Sancta Maria House, which helps vulnerable women flee violence and recover from mental health and addiction issues, and which is located adjacent to the proposed development. Sancta Maria has advised that none of the feedback it provided was contemplated in the proposal you are considering today. Most disheartening is the fact that contemporary research demonstrates that the model upon which this development is based won't help the very people it is intended to help. Dr. Julian Somers, a Clinical Psychologist and researcher at SFU, has performed extensive research into addiction and mental health issues, including the 20 years of success that Portugal has enjoyed in treating drug-addiction. Over the past 2 years, I have learned that Dr. Somers' research shows that the costly and morally questionable segregation of mental health patients, the drug-addicted and the homeless in this type of warehouse-style recovery-oriented housing creates a dangerous microcosm which reduces the rate of successful social reintegration, and excludes marginalized people from opportunity, dignity and happiness. This development will offer space for substance use and house not only people suffering with drug-addiction but also those experiencing homelessness and mental health issues. However, the research shows that congregate housing for people with mental illnesses and addictions is not successful. It requires residents to be resilient to the erratic behaviour and the drug use of others as they try to improve their lives – a strength they may not possess. High quality research clearly demonstrates the desirability and effectiveness of providing independent recovery-oriented housing that is scattered throughout neighbourhoods and cities. Independent Recovery Oriented Housing differs from congregate housing, in that it allows individuals suffering mental health and addictions to live independently as a small percent of building tenants. It is important to note that these research results were conveyed to Housing Minister David Eby by Dr. Somers, over two years ago. Which begs the question: Why are we continuing down this perilous path? Where is the City's integrity, wisdom and, more importantly, where is its compassion for the drug addicted? Are we more concerned with making meaningful progress, or checking boxes? With our deepening and tragic drug, mental health and homelessness crises, I don't understand how the City and province can afford to dismiss successful solutions. It is abundantly clear that, in this development application, the City has not conducted genuine, responsive public engagement that respects the wisdom and insights of the neighbourhood, nor have the City and BC Housing provided all of the facts and data required to make a good decision. What are they hiding? Furthermore, and most disappointingly, there is a clinical model which has a higher rate of success than the one employed by this proposal. Why aren't we using it? This application is deeply flawed and I ask you to REJECT it. Thank you.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1), Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 169

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 15:36:56 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 15:36:56 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hello, please advise why I cannot find the rainwater management plan (RWMP) ? Where am I able to locate it? With basically zero setback and living in a city with so much precipitation clearly this report needs to be provided to the public.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 170

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 15:51:41 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 15:51:41 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Please comment on whether the city considers it to be a conflict of interest that Gregor Robertson's partner company Nomadic/Nexii has been given this \$64M contract while at the same time being a financial donor to Ken Sim when he was a candidate for mayor ? <https://www.nexii.com/nomadic-partners-with-nexii-as-a-certified-installer-in-north-america/>

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 171

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 15:57:23 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 15:57:23 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Previously the building had a nice red brick facade purposely designed to blend in with the neighborhood and adjacent school 18M away. Why was this changed to, quite honestly a very ugly and institutional looking cold facade? Please provide full details. Thanks

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 172

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 16:19:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 16:19:19 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am very much pro this development. We need this as a city and even those who are low income deserve living in kitsilano.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Support



**Respondent No:** 173

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 16:32:24 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 16:32:24 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The neighbourliness of the building form and public interface are not improved from the previous proposal. The building is institutional in architectural expression and at public realm on all elevations, and is stigmatizing for the residents. This does not meet City's own urban design goals and priorities. If this building was used for family and children, not using modular technology, more than 129 people could be housed. This inefficiency is against City housing goals to house as many people as possible. The inadequate public hearing is being compounded by an inadequate Development Permit process. Adequate traffic analysis has NOT been completed or shared. This development represents a significant traffic and safety challenge to the school children and pedestrians. This does not meet City goals and priorities. The building design and location near a terminus station introduces complex public safety issues around crime and this has not been addressed in any forum. The building's harm reduction model with on-site substance use consumption room for the residents brings risk to the neighbourhood and is a risk for school children, for the women in the adjacent women's supportive recovery home, for seniors in the seniors housings close by, as well as to the residents. This building is better suited for families and children who can benefit from the location, which has significant family infrastructure, and help achieve City goals and priorities.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 174

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 16:34:29 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 16:34:29 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I don't think it's best plan for the quiet neighbors to become too busy.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 175

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 16:37:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 16:37:48 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I heard this development plan from my friend who lives nearby. I think this will cause more problems in the future.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 176

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 16:38:07 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 16:38:07 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

It doesn't fit in this area as traffic plan is not clear with elementary school right in front of it.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 177

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 17:07:09 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 17:07:09 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I voted for Ken Sim and the party because you promised common sense when building these kinds of social housing projects! Instead, you deceived myself and the friends and family I encouraged to vote for you. Shame on you and your party.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 178

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 17:20:51 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 17:20:51 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly, intensely oppose this development. The community around the proposed building has: an elementary school, a daycare for children, and homes for battered women fleeing domestic violence. There are NO mental health and addictions support nearby, and there will NOT (!!) be any addiction or mental health support in this proposed building. Instead, may I suggest a better option would be social housing for FAMILIES, children, and low - income seniors. You must know that 70% of seniors over the age of 65 must still work, because they can't afford to live in Vancouver. This area, where the proposed building is planned, is a family and child-focussed area. I oppose this development, intensely.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 179

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 17:24:25 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 00:24:25 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This type of facility should not be built in a neighbourhood next to a school, women's centre and children's park. The proper public consultation process was not followed and should not proceed until the court applications regarding the process are decided. Due process should not be legislated away by the Provincial Govt.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 180

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 17:34:17 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 17:34:17 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

We are vehemently opposed to this development application for the following reasons: First and foremost, the site is directly across the street from an Elementary School and a Park that has high traffic and is used by Children with their Parents. The intended residents of this building often require social or mental assistance of which there is none in the area. The City would better serve these intended residents by selling this property and buying a larger parcel that could accommodate more residents and offer onsite medical and mental care.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 181

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 17:55:12 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 17:55:12 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose this development application. There are several reasons for this, which have been amply described (and mostly ignored) in the earlier stages of this application. I will not re-iterate them in detail. Here is a summary: 1. No consideration given to public safety: • Building would house up to 100% residents with serious, untreated addictions and/or mental health issues. Consumption of heavy drugs would be allowed on-site. No medical treatment services would be provided on-site on ongoing basis. The proponent has refused to consider the many calls for a recovery-based model. • The proponent has also refused to consider the calls for a different tenant mix that would allow families and children at risk of homelessness to live in the building. • Housing up to 129 volatile, high-risk individuals adjacent to an elementary school and daycare, women's recovery home and seniors' homes will inevitably expose these vulnerable populations to violent and traumatizing incidents. 2. The unwillingness of the City of Vancouver to conduct a meaningful public consultation process that actually responds to people's concerns. • The public has been provided with incomplete and vague details about the application during the public hearing and during the development permit stages. • In an unprecedented step, the public was prevented from seeking judicial recourse by the City of Vancouver and Provincial Government (Bill 26). • The public was informed of the development permit stage only in June 2023 although the development permit application was received 7 months earlier on November 16, leaving a far too short period for comments. • Given the obvious and widespread public interest, the level of public engagement in the development permit stage is wholly inadequate and rushed. This application should be referred to the Development Permit Board whose meeting the public can attend, rather than the Director of Planning being the sole decision maker. 3. City of Vancouver has shown a concerning lack of attention to the design considerations and built form: • The discussion that took place during the Urban Design Panel meeting was heavily focused on social merits of the proposed development. Little or no attention was devoted to their core mandate of design considerations. • The revised design has been made even more institutional in nature and it ensures the building will never blend into its surroundings, clearly marking out as supportive housing and stigmatizing its residents. • The height of the building and the shadowing of the school is in direct contradiction of the Broadway Plan Broadway Plan policy. • The built form is against City housing goals to house as many people as possible. Modular design can never be modified to house more than 129 people in this location. If the building was built differently, including the units for families and children, more than 129 people could be housed. 4. No consideration was given to the increase in traffic in the area: • The intersection will be highly congested even without the proposed development, given it is adjacent to a busy school, terminus train station and bus loop. • Adding a huge building, with no setbacks and no adequate access points for emergency vehicles that are bound to frequent the building, will increase safety risk for school children and other pedestrians in the area.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 182

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 03, 2023 18:30:59 pm

Last Seen: Jul 03, 2023 18:30:59 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments:

s.22(1) I live a couple of blocks from the proposed site. I am strongly opposed to this development. First, there is a complete lack of attention to the public safety risks. Building would house up to 100% residents with serious, untreated addictions and/or mental health issues who will be able to consume heavy drugs on-site. There would be no ongoing recovery and treatment on-site. Housing a large number of volatile individuals in the vicinity of several seniors' homes will create safety issues for seniors like s.22(1) from dangerous situations. Running away is an option for younger folks, but it is no longer feasible for me and my peers. It is alarming that the City of Vancouver refuses to consider safety impacts of this building on seniors like us. In addition to the seniors, having this building right next to an elementary school, toddler park and women's recovery home puts several vulnerable populations at risk. I am also very concerned with the process that the City of Vancouver has conducted on this development. Only vague details are available even at this advanced stage of the application. The public has been prevented from accessing courts by the City of Vancouver and Provincial government via Bill 26, which is unprecedented. The development permit has been rushed despite an outpouring of opposition. The public has been made aware of this process with a seven months delay. I am old enough to tell you this is not the way to solve the complexities of the intertwined challenges of addictions, mental health and homelessness. It will only make things worse for everyone.

Q2. Street address

s.22(1)

Q3. Postal code

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. Your overall position about the application:

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 183

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 18:37:34 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 01:37:08 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

From what I can gather, the building is for supportive housing, not social housing. The plan itself is deeply flawed, putting people with serious drug and mental health issues together in one place, where the problem will certainly be grossly amplified. Add to that the fact that the occupants will have limited support, that the complex is next to an elementary school (really?), and in an area where many 'truly' vulnerable, such as seniors, live, and you have a recipe for disaster. This fiasco should not be allowed to continue.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 184

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 19:48:36 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 19:48:36 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose this development. Having lived in kitsialno s.22(1) I do not believe this has been well thought out. There has to be a better location and process for helping and housing people in need.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 185

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 19:56:47 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 02:56:48 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

the social housing for the "hard to house" proposed at 7th /8th at arbutus is too close to the elementary school and kids' playground. The safety of the next generation ( children) should be the government's first priority. Also the height of the building will cast a shadow onto the playground and park. Please please consider having this social housing for seniors and disadvantaged families not " hard to house" who suffer emotional and addiction problems.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 186

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 20:13:25 pm

**Last Seen:** Oct 31, 2021 17:03:58 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The site is too narrow for the building as proposed. The set back is zero feet to the sidewalk along the tower portion on Arbutus from the 2nd floor and above. This poses a high risk to persons using the sidewalk, which is illustrated by the recent incident in the DTES when someone was throwing objects from 10 floors up in an SRO, and pedestrians were struck and injured. Even if the City does not care about the safety of the constant flow of children, mothers with strollers, and the elderly on the busy Arbutus sidewalk, one would think that the City might care about government liability for injuries to sidewalk users. The inadequate setbacks were raised at the rezoning hearing a full year ago, but have still not been addressed.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 187

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 20:25:27 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 20:25:27 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

You've revised the exterior of the building to make it even uglier and more institutional than it was before. This will result in the residents being stigmatized. Observers will immediately perceive that people suffering substance abuse and mental illness are housed there. The main entrance continues to face Delamont Park, which will funnel building residents to consume drugs in the park. Possession of hard drugs for personal use is now legal, but no bylaws have been passed to restrict where drugs can be used. As such, the site of this project will result in drug use in a toddler park, which will destroy the ability of the public to use the park. Building tenants will also be able to use drugs on the sidewalks around the building, and on the Arbutus Greenway. In fact, they can use drugs on the sidewalk in front of the school. There are still almost NIL setbacks on Arbutus despite this design flaw being identified at the rezoning hearing. The development application should be rejected.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 188

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 20:34:24 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 20:34:24 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building is too large for the site. The setbacks are nil above the second floor. Items dropped (never mind thrown) out the windows will land on people using the Arbutus sidewalks. These sidewalks are already very well-utilized. What consideration has been given to the greatly-increased volume of pedestrian traffic that will come with the opening of the subway terminus station? If you widen the sidewalks as Chee Chan proposed at the rezoning hearing, emergency vehicles are not going to be able to make the corner from Arbutus to 7th, and traffic on Arbutus will be even more snarled that it is already, posing a risk to the 450 children to attend St. Augustine's. There has been no consideration of the safety of children using 7th Avenue when there will be frequent emergency vehicle attending the building. This development permit needs a public hearing. The City made a complete hash of the 2022 public hearing on the rezoning application and is highly disingenuous to point to that hearing as satisfying the obligation to allow the public to air concerns about the project in a development permit hearing.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 189

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 20:46:51 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 20:46:51 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

1. There are errors in the project stats sheet. How can the public fruitfully comment on a data sheet that has errors? The project stat sheet needs to be withdrawn and a corrected version published with a new public commentary period to follow.
2. The building does not fit the narrow site, and this results in inadequate setbacks. The building needs to be redesigned to properly fit the site. This issue came to light fully one year ago and has not been corrected.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 190

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 20:53:14 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 20:53:14 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This building could not be uglier if you tried to make it so. It will be a blight on the landscape. Would you want to live in such an institutional-looking tower? It is hostile architecture. The brick has been removed, which at least helped to make it fit in with the brick of the school. It will shadow the Catholic school, which is not permitted under the Broadway Plan. The setbacks are inadequate. The development application should be rejected and the project redesigned.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 191

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 21:37:58 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 21:37:58 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Do the planners realise that mayor sim is on record stating he did not agree with the project and if elected would make sure the community would have a "seat at the table" prior to the project seeing any movement. Funny how once he was elected he completely changed his tuned. He is on record lying and this recording will be provided to a particular journalist. How disgusting that the head of our city would literally lie his way into office and then through an entire neighborhood in the garbage.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 192

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 21:50:52 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 04:50:52 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In consideration of the development's impact on the immediate surroundings, it will have a negative impact on the residents of the neighbouring Sancta Maria House, which helps vulnerable women flee violence and recover from mental health and addiction issues. The proposed building with its common use drug consumption room, creates risk for Sancta Maria's residents who are just overcoming from these challenges themselves. The City's description of the development as a place that provides "new warm, safe homes with supports" is something that sounds nice, but it does not do enough to effectively address the City's priority of adequately supporting people with mental health and/or addiction concerns. That is because contemporary research demonstrates that congregate housing, the model upon which this development is based, won't adequately help people with mental health and addiction challenges. Research shows that the segregation and warehousing of drug-addicted, mental health patients and the homeless together in recovery-oriented housing creates a dangerous, inescapable microcosm which reduces the rate of successful social reintegration. Inversely, research demonstrates the desirability and effectiveness of providing independent recovery-oriented housing that is scattered throughout neighbourhoods. Independent recovery oriented housing differs from congregate housing, in that it allows individuals suffering mental health and addictions to live independently as a small percent of building tenants. The Director of Planning needs to reject this development application in favour of creating a new plan of supportive housing in Vancouver, one that is based on recovery-oriented housing that is dispersed throughout neighbourhoods.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 193

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 21:57:45 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 21:57:45 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Have any studies been conducted or does the City of Vancouver have any evidence as to how this proposal will impact mean ambient radiant temperature in the surrounding environs? Do any studies account for possible increases in the local heat index or in wet bulb temperature? What is true is that an area, currently covered with soil and shaded by trees, may be replaced with one that is covered with concrete, metal, and glass and that will be devoid of any shade. What will occur if local residents, travelers, and students suffer from heat-related illness? If these effects can be linked to the removal of trees and the shade and cooling properties they provide, how will the City amend this issue and mitigate problems? Green space reduces urban heat islands and is critical for healthy communities. Removing these spaces is contrary to the City's climate goals. Furthermore, removing green spaces leads to higher levels of stress, greater incidence of asthma, and increased risk of heart disease. The City and BC Housing chose this location knowing full well that construction noise and population density will increase; that a preschool, elementary school, women's recovery home, and numerous senior citizens are in the immediate area; and that residents of the proposed supportive housing location will be within 500 meters of multiple liquor stores and a major transit hub. How can removing green space, which will cause higher levels of stress, be a good idea? <https://spph.ubc.ca/parks-big-and-small-needed-for-public-health/> <https://www.unicef.org/documents/necessity-urban-green-space-childrens-optimal-development> <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/145305/green-space-is-good-for-mental-health> <https://vancouverpublicspace.ca/2017/07/14/getting-to-the-bottom-of-vancouvers-green-spaces-a-review-of-green-space-metrics/> <https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/6-reasons-children-need-to-play-outside-2018052213880>

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 194

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 22:17:09 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 03, 2023 22:17:09 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This proposal will negatively impact the immediate surroundings at this location, most particularly the abstinence-based recovery home next door to the site, the children's park across 7th, and the elementary school across Arbutus. The area around this site is geared for children and families and has no mental health or addictions support nearby. Social Housing for families, children and low-income people would be a vastly more beneficial approach, and could be implemented in a building form that could house more than 129 individuals, and could serve a more diverse population of people. Public Health and Communities: The building's harm reduction model with on-site substance use consumption room for the residents brings risk to the neighbourhood and is a risk for school children, for the women in the adjacent women's supportive recovery home, for seniors in the seniors housings close by, as well as to the residents. This building is better suited for families and children who can benefit from the location, which has significant family infrastructure, and help achieve City goals and priorities. Details on the housing agreement, tenancing and associated supports are not defined or provided. · BC Housing and City of Vancouver staff maintain that approximately half of the units in the proposed development would be operated as supportive housing, and the other half as units for deeply affordable social housing. However, based on the terms of the proposed tenancing in Referral Report, 100% of the units may operate as supportive housing. This was confirmed in the public hearing by the Rezoning Planner to be true. · Incompatibility with existing vulnerable populations (school children, women's recovery home and seniors) creates potential negative impacts for all parties. · Much needed housing for low-income families and seniors is not provided at a site that lends itself to this group. · Congregating a large number of low-barrier housing residents with similar problems of mental health and/or addictions in a harm reduction model without the proper treatment and supports in a harm reduction environment will only exacerbate the problems, and does not lead them on a path to recovery. Process: This proposal has been subject to inadequate public consultation and is being compounded by an inadequate Development Permit process. the City of Vancouver failed to follow the rules of procedural fairness and natural justice at the rezoning public hearing, and continues to show a lack of transparency and due process in the development application process. Only in June 2023, through the development permit signage, was the public informed that the development permit application was received 7 months earlier on November 16, 2022. The development permit signage also states that a decision will be solely made by the Director of Planning. This application is of significant importance because of its scale, complexity and the public interest it has garnered, and ought to be referred to the Development Permit Board whose meeting the public can attend. Traffic: Adequate traffic analysis has NOT been completed or shared. This development represents a significant traffic and safety challenge to the school children and pedestrians. This does not meet City goals and priorities. Public Safety: Building design and location near terminus station introduces complex public safety issues around crime and this has not been addressed in any forum.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 195

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 23:17:30 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 06:17:30 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Supportive housing for those who have mental illness and drug or alcohol addictions is totally inappropriate for a building next door to a school, daycare, and playground in an area that has a very high concentration of school and preschool age children. Fire hazards are an extreme risk to occupants of high-rise buildings. People who use alcohol or other drugs are at greater risk for injury as substance use can affect your judgment, vision, and coordination. This poses risk to themselves and those in the community. There has been an increased theft, house break-ins, assault, and car break-ins in neighborhoods in Vancouver where similar buildings have been placed, such as Olympic Village, Yaletown, and East Vancouver. You could create a lot more "warm, safe homes" on a cheaper real estate. This is inefficient use of public money. More social housing is needed in rural and remote communities where many homeless originate from.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 196

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 03, 2023 23:53:34 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 06:53:35 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Housing is a necessity and an emergency in Vancouver. There are a number of homeless people who lack the minimum shelter required for a dignified living, and I'm happy the city is working to address homelessness. My concern with the model proposed by this application is the fact that it's just putting a temporary patch for those living in the streets. Moving from the street into a tiny apartment, surrounded by a number of neighbors who will be struggling to get away from using substances, does not sound like a good shelter to me. Packing 129 people into a building and calling it a "solution" sounds like a marketing or PR strategy by the officials. There are so many things wrong with this project, and it's incredibly frustrating to see city council staff ignore the issues that this project will cause, and to refuse to work to improve it. They want to create 129 homes, and if a developer offered 129 branches on top of a pine tree they may vote yes to it, without even considering how ridiculous the project is. It is sad to see how politicized this issue has become, instead of the council working with residents of the neighborhood, listening, and coming up with a model that will shelter, create a home, and provided an opportunity for each person living there to improve their health, potentially find work, and even build a family. s.22(1) and have always thought this was a country where democracy prevailed. Now, as I watch the city council totally disregard the opinion of so many people who oppose this project and voice their concerns, it reminds me of s.22(1) where the government manipulates laws to approve its projects. I've heard residents of the area voicing their concerns, I watched the city council's meetings last year, where they didn't answer questions in a clear way, as if they were hiding information, or didn't know how to answer. I ask that you kindly consult your head and your heart, instead of going with what is being pushed to you. Let's build homes that will solve problems, instead of creating new ones.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 197

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 00:45:21 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 00:45:21 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hi This development is wrong for the city and area. After what has come to light with the ex bc housing bod and insider trading why not cut the corruption now and actually plan and build housing for what is needed. Very much opposed to this development. Sincerely s.22(1)

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 198

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 01:18:37 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 01:18:37 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I have concerns about the rainwater management plan. With climate change, there is greater risk of having atmospheric rivers. Much of the lot is covered by building and there is not enough ground area to absorb the water and not overwhelm the sewers or the streets. I especially have concerns rainwater being directed down the tower on Arbutus Street, onto the sidewalk and onto the street because the building hangs over the edge of the sidewalk. The West 8th Ave side of the property also has a low capacity to absorb rainwater and has potential to overflow the sidewalk and bus loop. My understanding is that the Rainwater Management Agreement has to be accepted by the General Manager of Engineering Services, but he has not been included in a DP Review Board. Has anyone from Engineering reviewed this challenge to water management from the Arbutus Street side? Do they believe that a detention tank on the north side of the project is going to absorb rainfall and prevent it from streaming onto the sidewalk on Arbutus? Does this meet the Engineering Department's best practices in residential water management? With a setback of 0.3 m on West 7th Ave, there is limited land mass to absorb rainfall. How does the rainfall get into the detention tank on this side of the property? What is the volume of the detention tank, its life expectancy and how does it get replaced if it fails? What happens to the water if the tank volume is exceeded? Will it go onto the street or flood the building? How will rain be redirected from the bus loop and Arbutus Greenway so as to avoid flooding these travel routes? There is no information on how rainwater is going to be managed from the roof top garden and how water infiltration will be prevented over a 60 year + building life expectancy. It is vital to review the quality of design, as historically BC Housing-funded projects receive little maintenance after the building has been completed. Why a Rainwater Management Agreement is not included for review in this Shape Your City DP survey, especially when there are many rain management issues on this site?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 199

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 01:38:25 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 01:38:25 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

During the final public hearing day in July 2022, Councillor Carr passed a motion about a traffic safety plan for the area, including a flashing traffic light at 7th and Arbutus, considering how really busy pedestrian crossings are when school is let out. Councillor Wiebe agreed and said that when a transit hub was placed by one of his restaurants, the pedestrian foot traffic became enormously busy. There is one shot to develop the surrounding sidewalks properly on West 7th, West 8th and Arbutus for the next 30 years of population growth as the Broadway Plan intensely densifies the area. So, the sidewalk and traffic infrastructure plan needs to happen before anything is built on this supportive housing lot. From what I've read, the Arbutus St sidewalk is only going to be widened by 60 cm, which really won't help increased pedestrian traffic to Delamont Park for all the new families or to 4th Ave to shop or to Kits Beach. There isn't anything about widening the sidewalks on West 7th or West 8th. Nothing is mentioned about the flashing traffic light at Arbutus and 7th. So, infrastructure needs haven't been thought of as a priority in this part of Kitsilano. Infrastructure is one of the most important responsibilities for a city. Did city staff research sidewalk widths in modern cities with high densities and nearby major transit claiming to process at least 15,000 people per day? It really doesn't look like you're preparing for this eventuality. Sidewalk and traffic safety infrastructure is more important than a politically motivated push for expensive steel modular technology. There will be thousands of more people, including those in strollers or using mobility aids, on these sidewalks, not just 129 people living in this building for the next 60 years. This building doesn't even fit properly on the city lot. The high rise lines up with the sidewalk on Arbutus Street. When people talk about neighborhood fit, this isn't it. A building needs to fit inside of a property, have setbacks proportional to the building and have landscaping. That is neighborhood fit in a residential area.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 200

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 01:54:20 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 01:54:20 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building is clearly too large for the size and shape of the lot. There are barely any setbacks, except for that required by Engineering on the Greenway. The proportions are not at all attractive. Setbacks with good landscaping makes a property attractive. Until this is accepted by city planners, people will feel angry when they look at this building. The Greenway is an obstacle to this building fitting in here. The Greenway should have been relocated so a driveway could be placed on 7th Avenue and the building placed in the center and not on the property line. The podium idea doesn't look good. There should have been just one building there. Also, I don't like the new colors of white and black. This looks extreme. Nothing else around there looks like this. A white terracotta tile will get dirty and no one's going to maintain it. BC Housing doesn't maintain buildings after they've been built. What was wrong with the old colors? Also, I don't believe that you're going to plant any trees or bushes. There's no room for them around the building. Thank you.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 201

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 03:23:30 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 03:23:30 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

There has been no change to the look or shape of the building. It looks very institutional and the chosen colours of white and dark blue don't look good at all. How does this look like Kitsilano? It's not warm or friendly. I read with amusement the project brochure from Human Studio about how the outside of the building is sophisticated and playful and the inside is full of nature tones and is good for mental health. Why not make it all nature tones? The way the outside looks now makes me feel stressed. The loss of trees and greenery is tragic. Also, Arbutus side of the building is sitting on the property line. Isn't this illegal? Why can't you build something inside of the property line? I don't want to walk under the edge of the high rise part of the building and hit my head or have something dropped on it. Please build this building inside of the property line, and change the colours or put it somewhere, where it actually fits with the lot size.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 202

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 03:37:07 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 03:37:07 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I looked at the staff report and I saw that the west side of the building has no setbacks. There is also a tree inside of the building. This is so frivolous putting a tree inside of a building, but not having enough room to plant trees outside of a building. Other apartment buildings in the area are landscaped with grass, bushes and flower beds. Put them outside so we can see them. The apartments on the west side of the building actually touch the property line. That is incredible. Building in the usual way without modules would've gotten you more apartments and actual landscaping around the building. I don't understand the color change to black and white. This reminds me of an armory. Without government intervention, I don't see how this building plan could have progressed so far on its own merits. Please have an independent architect and landscape architect unassociated with BC Housing review this plan.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 203

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 03:47:20 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 03:47:20 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I disagree with the size and institutional appearance of this building on an undersized lot. This does not fit in Kitsilano. Residential high rises in Kitsilano have generous and beautiful landscaping. There is no room for any landscaping here. In fact, the Arbutus Street side it's right beside the sidewalk. If you could slim the building down, there are finishes that would make the building look better than currently proposed. The white color on the high rise part adds to the bulkiness and is the wrong choice. A more natural choice that would look good for the school across the street would be a sky blue tile with some gradually lighter patches of tile to mimic clouds in the sky. This would camouflage the building and resemble the landscape that's being replaced. The dark blue podium looks wrong, like a nautical theme. A natural stone podium would be more attractive. Limestone with possible random fossils would make the podium interesting and educational for children. Although the May 2022 staff referral report did not support a green wall system, sturdy and interesting vines like grape or wisteria, would provide some landscaping, visual interest for pedestrians and a gardening activity for building residents. These types of changes would soften the building's appearance and give it an original, yet 'playful' treatment for an area full of families with young children.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 204

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 04:20:30 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 04:20:30 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building looks the same as before except the high rise part is white and the bottom brick part is blue. Some of the windows in the blue part are vertical instead of horizontal. That is a strange color combination. I think this will upset a lot of people. I wouldn't even see this on an elementary school. The new schools choose classic, neutral colors. Probably there's been research that these colors don't agitate people. I don't think the planners understand that public realm to people means trees and plants landscaped around the building, especially on Arbutus and 7th. We don't want to see funny-colored brick, bricks jutting out, different windows. We want to see plants and trees, not blue brick. Whatever happened to Vancouver being the greenest city? I've read that the apartment part of the tower is aligned with the sidewalk. How can this be acceptable? How can you design a building like this? The building needs to be pushed away from the sidewalk. The building on the sidewalk look is bad. It looks oversized and oppressive. The other proposed modular projects on Grandview and Marine Drive fit on their lots and have grass and bushes around them like a normal apartment building. If there is an apartment fire, having that apartment above you on the sidewalk is a really bad idea. I've read that Nexii, who supplies modular panels to Nomadic, is being sued by Americans over quality issues including fireproofing. There needs to be choice made here. Either the street car idea needs to be shelved and this building is pushed back towards the Greenway, or keep the street car idea and build the building well inside the property, which means using regular building techniques, not modular. Public safety needs to come first, not pushing a modular housing agenda. I don't see modular making anything easy or safe to build here.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 205

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 06:24:33 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:55:21 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building proposed is not appropriate for this location. The building proposed by the Kitsilano Coalition would be a better option. High-rise towers tend to be community dead zones, so it is better to have a lower building form that could house more people than 129 individuals. To take into account the context of the local neighbourhood, this new building should be for social housing of families and children with low income. The area is geared toward children and families and has no mental health or addictions support nearby, so putting single individuals with mental health issues in a high-rise tower setting in this location would severely impact the nearby school environment and the local neighbourhood.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 206

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 07:31:53 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 07:31:53 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

As a long term Kitsilano resident and tax payer, I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to this proposed development by the City of Vancouver. The development does not align with the terms under which the property was to be utilized as GREEN SPACE for the community when it was purchased from Canadian Pacific. In addition, the proposed size of the development is not in keeping with the height restrictions that have historically been in place for the community, almost doubling the size and density which would be deemed as unacceptable if proposed by a private developer. Further, the lack of parking will aggravate an already impossible situation that currently exists on the streets of Kitsilano. Finally, the proposed use as social housing that accepts and encourages open drug use provides an unacceptable safety and security risk to the adjacent elementary school and to the community at large which is already seeing increasing rates of theft and vandalism. This development should not and cannot proceed.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 207

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 07:41:28 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 14:41:29 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I feel that this is a very large development for this area. I am concerned that not more social, addiction and mental health supports are being planned.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Mixed



**Respondent No:** 208

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 07:45:16 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 07:45:16 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building proposed is not appropriate for this location, and a better option has been . proposed by the Kitsilano Coalition. This new building should be for social housing of families and children with low income. The area is geared toward children and families and has no mental health or addictions support nearby, so putting single individuals with mental health issues in a high-rise tower setting in this location would severely impact the nearby school environment and the local neighbourhood.

OPPOSED

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 209

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 07:57:51 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 07:57:51 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hi, when this occurs at this site and hits s.22(1) 18M away everyday, please tell me who will be legally liable; Mayor Sim, councillors or Theresa O'Donnell personally? Thanks <https://globalnews.ca/news/9764449/one-man-arrested-for-throwing-objects-out-window-one-person-injured-vpd/amp/>

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 210

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 08:05:00 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 08:05:00 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The social housing will end up a lot like the building on 7th and Fir: with many of the building's patrons sitting outside all day smoking and/or drinking. It is a terrible example for the children across the street at the elementary school and it's uncomfortable for young women such as myself who have lived safely in the neighborhood for s.22(1), only to now be ogled/catcalled everytime I walk past. That's not even the worst of it, but it's not right to put that many unsupported people in need in a spot like this, especially with the new legalization of illicit substances.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 211

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 08:19:50 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 08:19:50 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

As a long standing Kitsilano community resident, I am extremely disappointed to find out that after multiple attempts to provide feedback and other viable options for this project, through the passing of Bill 26 to fast tract this project and silence the community feedback, we are now at a place where a potential building permit will be approved. My concern for this project remains unchanged - this area of Kitsilano is geared towards children and families - there is an elementary school and a park frequented by toddlers and little children right across the street from this development and a daycare 1 block away! There are no mental health or addictions support nearby and the City and BC Housing have not committed to provide the operator of the building with adequate resources to support and service the potentially complex needs of residents in a manner that recognizes the proximity of thousands of children that frequent this area. I recognize as a long standing Vancouver resident that we have a vulnerable population living on the streets and we need to provide a means to address the housing needs of this group but at the cost of the children, who can't protect themselves that live in this community? A better option vs this development would be to provide social housing for families, children and low-income, in a building form that would be more suitable to this area. I am writing to urge you once again to reject the rezoning application because it is quite simply the wrong model in the wrong place. We have many other supportive and social housing developments in Kitsilano that work because they are properly scaled. But not this one. In fact it feels more like warehousing than supportive housing.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 212

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 08:54:15 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 08:54:15 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building is clearly too big and too institutional-looking. It needs to be set back towards the Greenway. I've heard about the "future street car" but nobody wants a street car rumbling by their apartment. Everyone wants people power on the Greenway. So, get over the street car, and move this building away from Arbutus Street. I am actually concerned about the untested steel modular tower construction that's a "first of its kind." This is being built by Nomadic that uses Nexii modular panels. Business in Vancouver had a recent article about Nexii's legal problems with their panels being heavier than competitors' panels and that the panels haven't had legitimate fire and water-resistance testing. Residents can store their bicycles in their apartments. There have been so many apartment fires in the past year from e-bike batteries exploding. Now these modular panels may not have proper fire resistance and e-bikes could be stored inside of apartments. With this type of problem, why are the apartments on the property line on Arbutus Street? The modular technology and safety issues need to be reviewed by an engineer. Why City Head of Engineering Lon LaClaire was excluded from this DP review? He was included in the Chinatown DP board review. You really need an engineer to address these concerns. Theresa O'Donnell doesn't have this type of expertise.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 213

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 08:55:15 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 08:55:15 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

My family is OPPOSED to this development for multiple reasons, including the safety of the children at the school & park, the size of the building and lack of infrastructure (no lane), the increased congestion (traffic will grind to a halt), Difficult for Emergency vehicles to get to/thru, the shadow it casts on the school & park. This is a totally unsuitable location for a development like this.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 214

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 09:07:08 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 09:07:08 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose this project due to the size and scale of the building. It is oversized for the neighborhood and I would be more in favour of a smaller building design.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 215

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 09:14:17 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 09:14:17 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I have safety concerns for the neighborhood. There is a concern that there will not be enough support systems in place to address mental health and addiction issues of many of the tenants that will be residing in the development.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 216

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 09:14:44 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 18:09:05 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose this application on the ground that it is inappropriate for the vicinity. With a school just opposite the streets (and a few more within a 4 block diameter) and total lack of support services for folks with addiction and/or mental health issues, a home for them in that location is entirely misconceived. They need not just a place to sleep but also adequate support and space nearby to stretch out. Clearly they cannot expect that in the densely build out area at Arbutus X Broadway. When the skytrain extension is completed the human traffic would be even heavier and that would make life worse for that group. The site could have been used for much better purpose like home for families with children ( which we have many in need in this city!). I respectfully ask your office to heed the many oppositions raised on this and abort the present plan, to make way for another one which will benefit more people in need and enrich our city better.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 217

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 09:29:52 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 09:29:52 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

As a retired s.22(1), this proposed development is a recipe for disaster without supports for the residents and their addictions. Across the street from an elementary school and a Skytrain station and next door to a women's recovery house, emergency calls to police and paramedics and fire and rescue services will spike. The focus of the development needs to be away from single men to family focused living.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 218

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 09:31:33 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 09:31:33 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

While the need for additional social housing and mental health services is well known, this development is a flawed attempt at resolution. It has been shown that simply providing a bed does little to solve long term needs of this challenged segment of our population. This is warehousing focused on putting up numbers rather than the proper application of scarce resources to a segment of our population that deserves better. As noted in the FAQ "What support services are being offered by the operator to building tenants?", there are currently NO planned resources! They are TBD even after all of this time. Cancel this project , send it back to the drawing board where the FIRST consideration is the provision of needed services rather than, in this case, the last consideration. Inconsiderate and disgraceful. Oh, and maybe take into consideration that this particular location is highly questionable: a kiddy park right across the street - really folks? One block from a liquor store - hmmm. And across the street from an elementary school? Again, like the treatment of the potential residents of this project, disgraceful and inconsiderate of the neighbourhood. We, as a city and a province, can do better for our most vulnerable.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 219

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 09:35:03 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 09:35:03 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This buildings is totally unacceptable. It is at end of the Subway line. Drug dealers paradise. School fir young children across the street, playgrounds on W7th and an abused women's home would be neighbors '. From the plan this is an SRO building. We need housing fir needy families. Not separate rooms for each family member. There is no provision for onsite help for people with a drug, alcohol or mental problems.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 220

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:04:00 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:04:00 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

There were no changes to the building set-backs along Arbutus posing safety concerns to pedestrians trying to navigate along a busy arterial road, Arbutus Street. With the location of the Broadway Subway terminal station right next to the proposed housing project this exposes many public safety concerns. Based on Geodash crime map data, SkyTrain and subway stations around the city have a significantly higher crime rates, with terminal stations showing an even higher density. With no set-back from the sidewalk along Arbutus, this leaves pedestrians navigating along the sidewalk exposed to hazards that may come from directly above windows of the proposed housing development.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 221

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:04:03 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:04:03 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I understand the need for affordable housing in Vancouver, but I question the logic behind this proposal for a few reasons. First, this is expensive real estate. What these people need is safety and shelter - rather than build 129 units just 10 blocks away from Kits Beach, why not build twice as many units in a less expensive area in the city? Secondly, these units would be right across the street from an elementary school and a Montessori. If my kids went there, I would not want them to be exposed to people smoking or potentially using other substances. Finally, these units would also be beside a bike lane which is difficult to cross at the best of times. It is a windy bike lane that has very limited visibility, with cyclists silently flying by. I s.22(1). I think this poses a significant risk to those with disabilities or who may be on substances, as well as the cyclists that use that path. All in all, as a lifelong Vancouverite, I feel like those who proposed this project are far out of touch with this city. Affordable housing is important, but developing in one of the most sought after neighbourhoods in the city is not what the residents here want, nor does it provide these people in need the marginal benefit they would enjoy from having more units elsewhere.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 222

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:08:55 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:08:55 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am writing not only as a concerned resident, but as a practicing professional engineer. No consideration has been given to the increase in vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist traffic once the Broadway Subway project is complete along the major arterial thoroughfare, Arbutus Street. Traffic studies and modeling have not been conducted to account for the significant changes within this 2-block area. Studies are required to determine impacts from the Broadway Subway Project, Broadway Terminal Station, Broadway Plan, and proposed housing development, all within 20m from an elementary school in an active school zone. Currently the intersection at Arbutus and 7th is one of the most hazardous points of safety for the community. In its current design it poses multiple safety issues as driver load is far too high. The intersection has two separate crossings on both the north and south side as well as an at grade concrete grade bike median. With all these possible interaction points drivers have too many obstacles to navigate. Arbutus Street is already a narrow arterial road currently posing issues for emergency vehicles. No regard has been given to access points for emergency response to both the proposed development and surrounding community. Emergency response teams, during peak traffic times that coincide with school children pick-up and drop-off times, are forced to travel into oncoming traffic along Arbutus in an active school zone. In some cases, emergency vehicles have become trapped behind traffic with no opportunity to pass, further posing safety concerns to the public. Emergency vehicles southbound are not able to turn eastbound on 7th Avenue due to the raised bike lane median. Amendments and commitments provided during public hearing included requirement of a flashing pedestrian-controlled traffic light at 7th and Arbutus. This has not been reflected within the development permit application. There are too many questions and not enough answers. It's time due diligence was done as the City will be held liable.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 223

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:12:20 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:12:20 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This proposal flies in the face of any semblance of democratic process with a mandated outcome by the BC NDP. It totally ignores the welfare of the the hundreds of elementary students who may be affected by challenged residence who are intended to reside across the street. This so called social crises is one of the NDP.s own making.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 224

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:18:56 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:18:56 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This proposal is the wrong model, wrong size, wrong location.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 225

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:19:47 am

**Last Seen:** Feb 28, 2023 18:22:22 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Dear staff, I'm against this project as it stands right now. While I have no problem with social housing or that social housing be on this site, I am concerned about the size and scope of this proposed building. It is simply far too tall will house too many people. Its proximity to the school and daycare as well as a little children's park is problematic to me. The building will dwarf those around it and shadow the school yard and park. It's makeup of residents with substance abuse issues and the allowance that they can use onsite is also extremely problematic for this are full of families, seniors and a women's recovery centre a stoves throw away. Please reconsider the size and scale of this project and its makeup of residents so that it fits better in the neighbourhood.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





Respondent No: 226

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 11:26:37 am

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 18:26:38 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

As a s.22(1) I am disappointed to see no changes have been properly made since the public hearing process. I have put together some pointed comments that should be reviewed as too many people will be impacted by this development and they deserve better. This includes the individuals you plan to house. These are my comments: Inefficient with floor space utilization in its current design and is against City goals of housing as many people as possible. A building of this height could house significantly more people than 129 if there were mixed unit configurations for families and children. Traditional building (wood or concrete) would house more people than 129. Modular format also does not allow for repurposing of the building in the future. Current design changes have not eliminated shadowing. The Arbutus Greenway is in full shadow at 4pm during both spring and fall equinoxes; Delamont Park will be in significant shadow during the months of October to February at 2pm; and St. Augustine School will be in full shadow during the morning and in partial shadow at recess. This shadowing does not accord with the City's policies of minimizing shadows on public parks, public spaces and public and independent schools. The Broadway Plan policy requires that no school and school yard be shaded by any new building development. This building as proposed does not accord with the City's shadowing policies. The tower portion has no setbacks along Arbutus St, there were no changes to improve the public realm. This architectural condition has a significant impact on the neighborliness of the building and does not meet City urban design goals and policies. Most items in Appendix B Conditions of Approval, in Rezoning Referral Report <https://council.vancouver.ca/20220517/documents/rr3.pdf#page=22>, have not been reflected within the development permit application, specifically related to Urban Design, Landscape and Engineering. The applicants have replaced the warm orange brick on the lower building component and have also removed the blue facade on the tower component, making the proposed development look even more institutional. The design of the proposed development is not consistent with the character of the surrounding area, and does not meet City urban design goals and priorities. Urban design plan has not accounted for the layered impact exposure of the Broadway Subway Project terminal station, Proposed housing development, future Broadway Plan density, Elementary School proximity, Delmont Park immediacy, women's recovery home location, and Arbutus Greenway corridor. Show substantive study evidence that this 2-block area has the capacity to handle such infrastructure growth. Pedestrian experience enhancement along 7th and Arbutus is stated within Appendix B of the Referral Report. Currently the intersection at Arbutus and 7th is one of the most hazardous points of safety for the community. In its current design, it poses multiple safety issues as driver load is far too high. The intersection has two separate crossings on both the north and south side as well as an at grade concrete grade bike median. With all these possible interaction points drivers have too many obstacles to navigate. No community public greenspace has been provided.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 227

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:30:00 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:26:38 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

As s.22(1) it's disappointing to see that none of the public hearing amendments have been put in place. The public is well aware of what's going on and the City will be held liable for it's lack of planning. My comments are as follows: 1. There were no changes to the building set-backs along Arbutus posing safety concerns to pedestrians trying to navigate along a busy arterial road, Arbutus Street. 2. With the location of the Broadway Subway terminal station right next to the proposed housing project this exposes many public safety concerns. Based on Geodash crime map data, SkyTrain and subway stations around the city have a significantly higher crime rates, with terminal stations showing an even higher density. 3. With no set-back from the sidewalk along Arbutus, this leaves pedestrians navigating along the sidewalk exposed to hazards that may come from directly above windows of the proposed housing development. 4. Details on the housing agreement, tenancing and associated supports are not defined or provided. 5. BC Housing and City of Vancouver staff maintain that approximately half of the units in the proposed development would be operated as supportive housing, and the other half as units for deeply affordable social housing. However, based on the terms of the proposed tenancing in Referral Report, 100% of the units may operate as supportive housing. This was confirmed in the public hearing by the Rezoning Planner to be true. 6. Incompatibility with existing vulnerable populations (school children, women's recovery home and seniors) creates potential negative impacts for all parties. 7. Much needed housing for low-income families and seniors is not provided at a site that lends itself to this group. 8. Congregating a large number of low-barrier housing residents with similar problems of mental health and/or addictions in a harm reduction model without the proper treatment and supports in a harm reduction environment will only exacerbate the problems, and does not lead them on a path to recovery.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 228

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:33:27 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:33:27 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Why have none of the amendments been incorporated into the new plan? Please see my itemized list of comments: - Inefficient with floor space utilization in its current design and is against City goals of housing as many people as possible. A building of this height could house significantly more people than 129 if there were mixed unit configurations for families and children. - Traditional building (wood or concrete) would house more people than 129. Modular format also does not allow for repurposing of the building in the future. - Current design changes have not eliminated shadowing. The Arbutus Greenway is in full shadow at 4pm during both spring and fall equinoxes; Delamont Park will be in significant shadow during the months of October to February at 2pm; and St. Augustine School will be in full shadow during the morning and in partial shadow at recess. This shadowing does not accord with the City's policies of minimizing shadows on public parks, public spaces and public and independent schools. The Broadway Plan policy requires that no school and school yard be shaded by any new building development. This building as proposed does not accord with the City's shadowing policies. - The tower portion has no setbacks along Arbutus St, there were no changes to improve the public realm. This architectural condition has a significant impact on the neighborliness of the building and does not meet City urban design goals and policies. - Most items in Appendix B Conditions of Approval, in Rezoning Referral Report <https://council.vancouver.ca/20220517/documents/rr3.pdf#page=22>, have not been reflected within the development permit application, specifically related to Urban Design, Landscape and Engineering. - The applicants have replaced the warm orange brick on the lower building component and have also removed the blue facade on the tower component, making the proposed development look even more institutional. The design of the proposed development is not consistent with the character of the surrounding area, and does not meet City urban design goals and priorities. - Urban design plan has not accounted for the layered impact exposure of the Broadway Subway Project terminal station, Proposed housing development, future Broadway Plan density, Elementary School proximity, Delmont Park immediacy, women's recovery home location, and Arbutus Greenway corridor. Show substantive study evidence that this 2-block area has the capacity to handle such infrastructure growth. - Pedestrian experience enhancement along 7th and Arbutus is stated within Appendix B of the Referral Report. Currently the intersection at Arbutus and 7th is one of the most hazardous points of safety for the community. In its current design, it poses multiple safety issues as driver load is far too high. The intersection has two separate crossings on both the north and south side as well as an at grade concrete grade bike median. With all these possible interaction points drivers have too many obstacles to navigate. - No community public greenspace has been provided.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 229

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:39:53 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:39:53 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Although I think supportive housing is needed in Vancouver, I don't think that this type of supportive housing, or this type of building is appropriate for this location. Thank you.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 230

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:46:40 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:41:03 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Our children attended s.22(1) and now elementary school directly across the street. This proposal needs amending not cancelling. Smaller building, better outline of the exact type of residents and more supports. Current contractor admits they will have the least amount of support staff per resident that they have ever had in a residence of this type! Change the eligible residents to family, single mothers and non drug addicted to better fit with the heavily family and children environments. Please do not have an injection site or any drug facilities at this site. I know they are needed but this location is not the correct place. Please think of the dignity of the residents. They have already had challenging lives, packing them in to a large, understaffed, under resourced housing project that could threaten the safety of more vulnerable residents is not helping them. No one is addressing the fact that this is also not a good fit for the individuals it's proposing to help. There is no one size fits all and that is what's being proposed here. The women and children of this community also have rights and are also vulnerable and the local and provincial governments need to adjust this proposal so that it is a success not a failed experiment that everyone will regret now it's too late to fix!!

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 231

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:48:36 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:48:36 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Traffic: Adequate traffic analysis has NOT been completed or shared. This development represents a significant traffic and safety challenge to the school children and pedestrians. This does not meet City goals and priorities. Process: Inadequate public hearing is being compounded by an inadequate Development Permit process. Public Safety: Building design and location near terminus station introduces complex public safety issues around crime and this has not been addressed in any forum. The location is next to a liquor store and gas station which draws more neighborhood concerns. Public Health and Communities: The building's harm reduction model with on-site substance use consumption room for the residents brings risk to the neighbourhood. and is a risk for school children, for the women in the adjacent women's supportive recovery home, for seniors in the seniors housings close by, as well as to the residents. This building is better suited for families and children who can benefit from the location, which has significant family infrastructure, and help achieve City goals and priorities. Urban Design: The neighbourliness of the building form and public interface are not improved from the previous proposal. The building is institutional in architectural expression and at public realm on all elevations, and is stigmatizing for the residents. This does not meet City's own urban design goals and priorities. If this building was used for family and children, not using modular technology, more than 129 people could be housed. This inefficiency is against City housing goals to house as many people as possible.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 232

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:48:46 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:48:46 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

It's too tall for the the area; it's a poor choice of the building across from an elementary school, which blocks out the morning sun.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 233

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 11:48:49 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 11:48:49 am

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose this development application. I feel the immediate surroundings of the building, should it be erected, will suffer from congestion and the safety of the children at the school will be at risk due to the high traffic area. I support a housing model with lower height and dedicated inhabitants to the community (whatever their status or background may be). I feel if there are various needs to the people living in the building those needs should be supported AT the location. Therefore a smaller building will allow for support of more people in a life altering way as opposed to filling a higher building with more people without offering enough support. The process in which this development application has reached this point seems undemocratic and the plans seem questionable and not concrete. I cannot understand why this would be moved forward (other than political motives) without more specific evidence based planning that is in line with the best interests for the people living in the building and in the community. Thank you

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 234

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:06:29 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 12:06:29 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Here are my dire concerns to oppose this development: 1. I appreciate the intent to take 'hard-to-house' individuals away from a harmful area such as downtown east side, but you are defeating the purpose by still allowing a safe injection clinic on the site. 2. The fact that the building residents or others in the neighbourhood, or others coming to building just to use the safe injection site is detrimental and traumatizing not only to the neighbours who have specifically chosen to live in this otherwise SAFE neighbourhood, but also to the children who are in the school just across the street ! 3. There is no other housing of this type next to any child care/education facilities in Vancouver and yet this is being built right across from a elementary school and park playground on the other corner. The safety of these children are at risk from violent, paedophilia and drug behaviour that will be on the streets around their school. Drug users will NOT just simply sit in their apartments. 4. There are women's shelters and other safe houses in the neighbourhood that may be tempted to go back to drug use if the injection site opens up. Also they are afraid their abusers might be the ones moving into the building. 5. The apartments are only studio size. Thus limits any availability for low income families who could benefit to live next to a school and playground and skytrain. 6. There is no indication of any health care amenity within the building. Persons that are dire enough to require housing support, also require much needed LOCALIZED health attention - especially mental health. These persons are ONLY being shipped away to another community, but not solving their true health needs to improve their quality of life. 7. The building itself is too large for the site. There is no set back from street. Items from windows could easily be thrown out and hit someone on the street below. There is no set back from the Arbutus Greenway - all trees, plants will be cut back and defeats the intent of a nature oriented Greenway. 8. There is no back alley/emergency vehicle access - so ambulances and police will be parking on Arbutus and altercating with residents all in FULL VIEW by young impressionable children in the school and the adjacent park playground. 9. Since this site has not been in use for years, there is now a good ecosystem and mature trees that will need to be cut down in order to build. This goes against the environmental, good air quality and shade planning laid out by City. I oppose this development, but could be modified with the following: 1. Front entrance/main entrance and emergency vehicle entrance on 8th ave, not arbutus. 2. Mixed size apartments to allow families for their children to grow up in a nice safer neighbourhood. 3. Add health clinic - more specifically counselling or mental health drug support. 4. Delete safe injection site. Do not draw in more drug users and drug dealers to this neighbourhood. 5. Keep some trees, greenery for Arbutus Greenway pedestrians, cyclists, for the residents in the building, for other neighbours. Thank you.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 235

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:20:32 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:20:33 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This proposed project is inappropriate and poorly conceived. As Julian Somers, a clinical psychologist and international expert on public policies related to addiction and mental health states, points out: "Congregating people with mental health and addiction issues in a single building does not work .... People with mental illness and addiction have limited opportunities to recover when they are forced to live with others who struggle with the same issues. When they are asked, the vast majority prefer independent housing. Clinical experience and evidence clearly demonstrate that if you concentrate people who are mentally unwell and addicted into a single building the chances of success are virtually non-existent." Not to mention the fact that the proposed project is across the street from a playground and a school. The proposed building would comprise only studio suites only, thereby precluding companionship and families, including vulnerable women-led families with children.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 236

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:23 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:23 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I strongly oppose the development at 2086-2098 W 7th Ave and 2091 W 8th Ave. Reasons for my opposition: 1. Public safety: • residents with untreated addictions and/or mental health issues should not be opposite a school and daycare. Heavy drugs would be allowed on-site. The proponent refuses to consider a recovery-based model and a different tenant mix. 2. The City of Vancouver refuses meaningful public consultation and dismisses valid concerns: • In an unprecedented step, the public would be prevented from seeking judicial recourse by the City of Vancouver and the Provincial Government (Bill 26). • The public was informed of the development permit stage only in June 2023. • Public engagement in the development permit stage is inadequate and City has made clear they won't tweak the project in any meaningful way. This application should be referred to the Development Permit Board whose meeting the public can attend, rather than the Director of Planning being the sole decision maker. 3. Lack of attention to design considerations and built form: • Urban Design Panel meeting was focused on the social merits of the proposal. No attention was devoted to their core mandate of design considerations. I listened in, it was a grotesque display of virtue signaling. • Design clearly marks out the building and stigmatizes residents. • The shadowing of the school is in direct contradiction of the Broadway Plan. • The built form is against City housing goals to house as many people as possible. Modular design can never be modified. 4. No consideration was given to congestion in the area: • Adjacent to a busy school, terminus train station, and bus loop. • No setbacks and no adequate access points for emergency vehicles that are bound to frequent the building.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 237

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:58 pm

**Last Seen:** Apr 26, 2023 20:14:53 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In a country that prides itself on supporting open and honest due process, I am incredibly disappointed that the opinions of local residents are being ignored in this development. It's being portrayed as a NIMBY situation whereas we are asking that proper due diligence be undertaken to consider the health, safety and well-being of the children who go to school and play in the park across from this inappropriately large and unsupported population that will suddenly be moving in. There have been numerous requests to shrink the size of this development, provide better matching of the population (mothers and children), or providing more support to this transient population, all of which have been ignored. As a resident of this area with a small child, I would hope that my safety and the safety of my child would be at least as important as that of someone coming in from outside our community, but this doesn't seem to be the case. I would ask that the city allow due diligence and process to be followed and listen to the voting citizens of this city.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 238

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:58 pm

**Last Seen:** Apr 26, 2023 20:14:53 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In a country that prides itself on supporting open and honest due process, I am incredibly disappointed that the opinions of local residents are being ignored in this development. It's being portrayed as a NIMBY situation whereas we are asking that proper due diligence be undertaken to consider the health, safety and well-being of the children who go to school and play in the park across from this inappropriately large and unsupported population that will suddenly be moving in. There have been numerous requests to shrink the size of this development, provide better matching of the population (mothers and children), or providing more support to this transient population, all of which have been ignored. As a resident of this area with a small child, I would hope that my safety and the safety of my child would be at least as important as that of someone coming in from outside our community, but this doesn't seem to be the case. I would ask that the city allow due diligence and process to be followed and listen to the voting citizens of this city.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 239

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:58 pm

**Last Seen:** Apr 26, 2023 20:14:53 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In a country that prides itself on supporting open and honest due process, I am incredibly disappointed that the opinions of local residents are being ignored in this development. It's being portrayed as a NIMBY situation whereas we are asking that proper due diligence be undertaken to consider the health, safety and well-being of the children who go to school and play in the park across from this inappropriately large and unsupported population that will suddenly be moving in. There have been numerous requests to shrink the size of this development, provide better matching of the population (mothers and children), or providing more support to this transient population, all of which have been ignored. As a resident of this area with a small child, I would hope that my safety and the safety of my child would be at least as important as that of someone coming in from outside our community, but this doesn't seem to be the case. I would ask that the city allow due diligence and process to be followed and listen to the voting citizens of this city.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 240

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:58 pm

**Last Seen:** Apr 26, 2023 20:14:53 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In a country that prides itself on supporting open and honest due process, I am incredibly disappointed that the opinions of local residents are being ignored in this development. It's being portrayed as a NIMBY situation whereas we are asking that proper due diligence be undertaken to consider the health, safety and well-being of the children who go to school and play in the park across from this inappropriately large and unsupported population that will suddenly be moving in. There have been numerous requests to shrink the size of this development, provide better matching of the population (mothers and children), or providing more support to this transient population, all of which have been ignored. As a resident of this area with a small child, I would hope that my safety and the safety of my child would be at least as important as that of someone coming in from outside our community, but this doesn't seem to be the case. I would ask that the city allow due diligence and process to be followed and listen to the voting citizens of this city.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 241

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:59 pm

**Last Seen:** Apr 26, 2023 20:14:53 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In a country that prides itself on supporting open and honest due process, I am incredibly disappointed that the opinions of local residents are being ignored in this development. It's being portrayed as a NIMBY situation whereas we are asking that proper due diligence be undertaken to consider the health, safety and well-being of the children who go to school and play in the park across from this inappropriately large and unsupported population that will suddenly be moving in. There have been numerous requests to shrink the size of this development, provide better matching of the population (mothers and children), or providing more support to this transient population, all of which have been ignored. As a resident of this area with a small child, I would hope that my safety and the safety of my child would be at least as important as that of someone coming in from outside our community, but this doesn't seem to be the case. I would ask that the city allow due diligence and process to be followed and listen to the voting citizens of this city.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 242

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:23:59 pm

**Last Seen:** Apr 26, 2023 20:14:53 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

In a country that prides itself on supporting open and honest due process, I am incredibly disappointed that the opinions of local residents are being ignored in this development. It's being portrayed as a NIMBY situation whereas we are asking that proper due diligence be undertaken to consider the health, safety and well-being of the children who go to school and play in the park across from this inappropriately large and unsupported population that will suddenly be moving in. There have been numerous requests to shrink the size of this development, provide better matching of the population (mothers and children), or providing more support to this transient population, all of which have been ignored. As a resident of this area with a small child, I would hope that my safety and the safety of my child would be at least as important as that of someone coming in from outside our community, but this doesn't seem to be the case. I would ask that the city allow due diligence and process to be followed and listen to the voting citizens of this city.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 243

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:28:33 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 12:28:33 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I'm a longtime Vancouver resident and have lived in Kitsilano for many years. This development will be s.22(1) so I believe my feedback will be very relevant to you. I implore you to oppose this new development. Increasing supportive housing units in the city is important - it is, of course, vital that we help our underhoused citizens. However, the the site of this particular development is a very poor choice. The plans of the new building show that the front door opening onto a very highly frequented kids' playground (Delamont Park). Literally opposite across the street is a large elementary school. There is also a large daycare centre one block away, who have put extensive work into renovations in the past year. I have major concerns firstly that this supportive housing development as it stands will motivate parents not to enroll their kids at these schools or let them play in the park, hollowing out our community. There are also considerable safety concerns. At other supportive housing sites around the city (e.g. that in Olympic Village), there are well vocalized problems with dropped needles and drug abuse around the sites, as well as residents having bad mental health days that cause harassment, abuse, and disturbances in the area. Putting this new site between three very high-traffic areas for young kids (a daycare, an elementary school, and a K-6 playpark) is a terrible idea. Also, for those residents who may be struggling with sobriety, there are two liquor stores in very close proximity, including a BCL 100m away. The prospective operators of this development do not have the experience to operate something this big. There will be a lack of clinical care on-site and there are no clinical mental health or addictions services nearby. The site could much better be used for social housing for families, children, and low-income residents. Please reconsider this application and choose a path that will help people in the best way possible, not create a ghetto with no services and supports and on a site where playing kids will be impacted.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 244

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:32:43 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 12:32:43 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

My serious concern is the issue of public safety in the Kits community. The City of Vancouver and BC Housing plan to provide housing for people suffering from drug addiction and mental health issues, but isn't it most important to support how they get back on their feet? It is not the container that matters, but what is inside. Ploughing the field, and forgetting the seed. A Buddha is made, but his soul is not put in. The City of Vancouver should take full responsibility for any public safety issues that arise as a result of the implementation of this project in Kitsilano community.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 245

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:35:18 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 12:35:18 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This project s is nothing more than a political tool designed to show that the government will target more affluent areas to insulate itself from criticism from other neighborhoods that are struggling with failed government models. If this was really about effective service and housing delivery, the land would be sold at market rates and the proceeds directed to lower land cost areas and areas where homelessness and substance abuse is greater (ie., wouldn't 500 units in a less costly area be better than 129 units in Kits if the goal was housing?). Underscoring the political aspect of this and the purposeful misleading of the public, one only has to look at the description of the project above. "Social housing" with no mention of the more accurate "Supportive housing". That said, even if "supportive" was used, the general populace isn't aware that in this case it means a large number of units dedicated to those hardest to house (ie., those suffering from severe addictions and mental health issues). Or that the units were designed for single occupancy and that no families would live together. As was cited ad infinitum in the original city council hearings, the science (Dr. Somers) is against this project model. The Steven Harper government was vilified for muzzling or ignoring its own climate scientists, yet this government seems content to follow this same practice. Lastly, this is not only about the future residents of the project, but the eco systems that prey on them (drug dealers, prostitution, stolen good, etc.). This will all be directly across the street from an elementary school, daycare, women's recovery home. You can't make this up.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





Respondent No: 246

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 12:40:23 pm

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 19:40:24 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

Q1. Your comments:

I OPPOSE this application, because of its effect on our immediate surroundings. s.22(1)

s.22(1) There are a number of safety issues surrounding this project. THE SCALE OF BUILDING IS TOO LARGE FOR SITE The building is too big for the site. Sidewalks are still very narrow and the Arbutus Street side of the tower form sits on the property line. In fact, the floors as designed for the apartment tower cannot be built without contacting the property line. PEDESTRIAN CONGESTION There is no traffic management plan to have adequate sidewalk width and setbacks for neighboring streets to accept 15,000 daily transit users from the adjacent bus loop and terminal subway station, or the many more thousands of people who will live in this immediate area as it densifies under the Broadway Plan. This flow of foot traffic will be increased during the summer months by continual crowds heading for Kits Beach. TRAFFIC CONGESTION School pick ups and drop offs, deliveries, emergency services, handy darts, bus loops and taxis all sharing a very narrow street with crowds of Kits beachers, and a street car, do not a viable option make. ABSENCE OF SETBACKS AND PUBLIC SAFETY Given this scale of project, why does it fail to adhere to expected architectural standards, in particular, the absence of setbacks for Levels 2 to 13 of the tower form? On Arbutus, there is 0.83 m setback from the sidewalk to the building podium, but from Level 2 to 13 of the tower form, the setback is ZERO. On West 7th Ave, the setback is 0.3 m and West 8th Ave it's 0.25 m.. It will be so easy for things to be dropped out of windows onto whoever is passing by. Cats and television sets have been dropped out of supportive towers in Vancouver, cigarette butts all the time. Sidewalks around the building are so narrow that people will have to suddenly step into the road or into the path of a streetcar, to get away from whatever falls. Public Safety standards are not being met. PUBLIC SAFETY FROM DROPPED OBJECTS ON THE GREENWAY The greenway has been consistently referred to as SAFE. The HEALTHY CITY STRATEGY (2014) among others clearly stated that "People are unlikely to walk or cycle if it feels unpleasant or unsafe, or if distances make it impractical compared to driving. By making these modes safe, convenient, accessible, comfortable and delightful, we can positively affect the health and well being of citizens of all ages. A 47m building rising straight up from the Greenway, with no grassed verges to catch dropped objects cannot be considered safe. RAINWATER MANAGEMENT This building project consumes most of the land mass on the two lots, leaving little to absorb rainwater. From page 33 of the May 3, 2022 staff referral report, a rainwater management plan (RWMP) is a mandatory requirement. Levels 2 to 13 of the tower, with no setback from the property line, would allow rainwater to flow down like a waterfall from the tower side on Arbutus, right onto the sidewalk with the pedestrians and then onto the street and perhaps sewers. NO RESIDENTS GARDEN Because the building is on far too large a scale, there is no room for a resident's garden. This is usually supplied in Supportive and Social housing towers, in order to provide both privacy and security for residents. There is not even a square foot of land left over to improve landscaping NO SPACE FOR COMMUNITY GARDENING Neither is there space for community gardening. While Human Studio seems to think that garden boxes could be placed by the greenway, deep shadow caused by the building itself in the afternoon, and tree shadow from the Women's shelter garden in the morning, will make it impossible to grow veggies.. In addition, the heavy foot/cyclist traffic caused by people taking short cuts to the station make this totally unfeasible. LOW BARRIER IN A KIDS' HUB The building is low barrier in a 500 kids hub. Three local licensed preschools also use Delamont Park on sunny days. If residents' uses do not coincide with parental ideas of safety, who cares? Toddlers will just have to sit at home and watch TV. Playschools will have to focus on indoor activities. After all doesn't it always rain in Vancouver? SHADOW Just as a 47m high building shadow on a school doesn't count- after all clouds cast shadow too. Supportive towers trump schools that have been in Vancouver since 1910 any day. And of course mentally unstable residents with nothing else to do all day but watch a kids playground, is not a security risk either. DELAMONT PARK -THE TODDLER PARK GIFTED TO RESIDENTS: Because there is no private outdoor space provided, Residents will make full use of the small toddler park across the road. It has all of five wooden benches-hey why not use them? Everyone has the right to use a public park -don't they? For whatever uses they choose, including meeting up with mates, or with those who prey on the mentally ill -by making use of easy subway access. DELAMONT PARK Why are so many locals worried about Delamont Park? Yes, it looks worn around the edges. It is not well maintained with a shiny new pipe slide, useful only for line-ups. BUT Delamont Park was very well designed back in its day (the 80s). Following the latest in playground guidelines at the time, it is not railed in but mounds of grassed earth are used to block those fast toddler

escapes onto the road. These mounds in turn have become imaginary castles, sailing ships or simply picnic grounds for young imaginations. The large playground is covered with sand to prevent injuries, while at the same time providing sand for buckets or pouring equipment. The play apparatus is sturdy and made of wood. So many kids enjoy playing there, running around and climbing and swinging., by themselves. However best of all in rainy Vancouver is the PUDDLE, much loved by two year olds who love jumping into it. Magical. (Fathers hold their hand as they do so, and bring them wearing rubber boots.) WHY IS THIS UNFAIR TO THE COMMUNITY? Because it represents a rising inequity, and a greater social isolation among young mothers and fathers. This area of Kits is highly populated. It is a low rental area of 3-4 storey walk ups and aging cooperatives. Single moms and dads will particularly feel the lack of a space for their kids to play. So too will couples who take turns working day and night shifts. I often see young fathers taking their kids out to play at Delamont Park before putting them to bed. Their mothers are at work on overnight shifts. I see new mothers with their strollers gathering together at 10am, combatting their incipient social isolation and depression through peer communication. Furthermore newcomers, minorities and immigrants WHO are often underserved and unsure how to access opportunities can communicate together in small parks, where they feel less under social threat. It seems so unfair that the only toddlers who can play outside in the open air in our beautiful, wealthy Vancouver, are those whose parents own their own backyards. (The hill down to Kits beach is far too steep for strollers (and walkers). Please don't say that there is a plan to enlarge Delamont Park by demolishing several heritage homes, and thus making enough room for the two groups (DTES and toddlers) to co-exist. Not only will this be 10 years in the future, but parents will NOT take their kids to a park where there is a risk of finding syringes in the sand. THE GREENWAY AND STREETCAR SETBACKS A 4.5 m setback from the Arbutus Greenway is mandatory in order to fit a proposed future streetcar. From the diagrams of single occupancy modules on Levels 2 and upwards, 2 rows of such apartment modules can't fit in the building without the building sitting on the property line. Based upon this building design, have zoning bylaws been changed lately so that buildings can sit on the property line? THE GREENWAY AND POCKET REMNANT WOODLAND. Since 1995 the Arbutus greenway has been considered a KEYSTONE in the creation of a network of greenways across Vancouver. It was referred to as "not just a corridor, but a destination or series of connected spaces". This included parkland and natural pocket woodlands. The BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY (2016) for example recommended that opportunities should be explored to incorporate small natural areas and wildflower meadows for bees and other pollinators, and improve connectivity between parks and natural areas The Parks and Recreation Master Plan specifically included "Remnant woodland and native plantings". THE BLUEBELL WOOD and THE HEAT DOME The project site itself is home to a remnant of CPR woodland, dating back more than a 100 years. It was planted at some time in the past with crocuses, and bluebells which flower abundantly in Spring. It provided so much welcome coolness during the heat dome, that grateful residents built and prettily painted benches under its shade. There are a number of three-storey walk ups close by, which felt the heat quite badly, being heat islands. (Yes, heat islands do exist in this part of Kitsilano along Arbutus and are shown clearly on the maps.) Delamont Park, the toddler playground opposite, because of its silica sand floor, absorbed heat and was still warm at midnight. Sure enough, - if you look at the DTES heat map from the City's Urban Forest Strategy pdf this woodland shows up as a pale blue rectangle 2 blocks below Broadway on Arbutus. s.22(1) on the 5 red rectangles classified as "Land Surface Temperature on a hot summer day (degrees C) 42-49 (Senior non-profits) MAPPING URBAN HEAT p11 p17" Where Seniors live. These are splendid ancient trees logged down to stumps, which then, showing great resilience grew up again. This is virgin greenfield land, untouched by cement. Ancient deep tree roots which direct water deep into the aquifers. THE BLUEBELL WOOD AND THE INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION PROCESS. In summer, of a Sunday afternoon indigenous musicians gather here and quietly play their music in a shady corner under the trees, without fanfare. The wood has unique untouched qualities. The greenway has long been considered to be "a world-class destination that is connected to the neighbourhoods through which it passes, grounded in its traditional uses, and designed in harmony with nature." It has also been considered "a way to build on Vancouver's reconciliation process with the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh Nations, who are interested in collaborating with the City in naming, wayfinding, ethnobotanical, and public art opportunities." These wonderful old trees will be cut down because they interfere with "supportive housing" and redevelopment. As will many of the trees in Kitsilano. Just another of the many inequities in Vancouver. The Broadway plan development towers will bring heavy densification to the area, and will require parks and recreation areas, which would be logically served by this city owned patch of woodland and dog park, which doubles as a Xmas tree patch in December. And serves as a place for the creation of indigenous music within an urban setting.

Q2. Street address

s.22(1)

Q3. **Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. **Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 247

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 12:45:05 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 12:45:05 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This is a disaster waiting to happen, and when it does, everyone will say,"why was this development next to 700 elementary children + daycares + parks + seniors?"Anyone with any sense can foresee this risk, and nobody will be accountable, especially David Eby. He needs to go, and any COV council who supports this needs to go. This is simply head-shaking. Seniors are most at risk of being homeless in this neighbourhood because of greedy landlords, and those who have contributed to the economy and neighborhood of Kitsilano should be housed there. They have been forced out of their rented homes for years because of skyrocketing rents and those are most in need of housing in Kits. They should be prioritized. AND they will not be a risk to hundreds of vulnerable children. WAKE UP!!!!!! But, I expect this comment will be in the trash folder. This is an exercise in futility, as David Eby has made up his mind and will bully and mute comments or opinions that differ from his. If this plan moves ahead, I am leaving the City of Vancouver and moving to a municipality that will listen to its residents. You will not see a penny in revenue from me as a contributor to local economy,, taxes, parking.....the list goes on. Many others will do the same.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 248

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:04:42 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:04:42 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The architect selected for this project doesn't understand the Kitsilano look. The area is full of low-rise apartments landscaped with laurel, rhododendrons and other lush, year-round greenery. The lot in its current state is lush and green. People want to see a building fronted by lush greenery, not a brick wall sitting on the sidewalk. No amount of decorating the brick wall will help. Why a blue brick wall? This building is way too close to Arbutus Street. There isn't enough land space to absorb rain water. The rain is going to stream off of the high rise part and flood the sidewalk and street. This is poor design. The sidewalks are too narrow for future use. The area will get a lot busier once the subway and bus loop is operational and when more people will live here with the towers coming up due to the Broadway Plan. There will be more children and strollers on the sidewalks once Delamont Park is expanded. You need to plan for this future first before building on this lot. The city already passed a motion for city staff to work with the area on a traffic safety plan and a flashing traffic light at Arbutus and 7th.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 249

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:10:56 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:10:56 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

For a \$64 million dollar building, I'm really disappointed with the design of this building. For that money, you should be able to house more people and if you can't do it here because of shadowing on a park, it should be built somewhere else. There's a lot of sprawl in the podium. All of that should have been contained inside of a tower. I don't know why you need to have any car parking inside the building. All you need is a loading zone for garbage pick up, deliveries, fire truck, etc. Right now this building is so tightly squeezed into this lot that the apartments are on the property line. Is this new building standard in Vancouver? Squeeze a monstrously tall building on a wrong-sized lot and push it onto the sidewalk? About that sidewalk, Councillors Wiebe and Carr said there needs to be wider sidewalks, a traffic safety plan and a flashing light at Arbutus and 7th. Where is that in the development permit documents attached to this survey? This should have gone onto a DP board hearing like there was in Chinatown. The building as concocted has too many problems with it.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 250

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:16:57 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:16:57 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Forcing a women's recovery house on to close to make room for an open drug use room is disgusting. Why is it okay to turn our backs on women? Say no. Our women (the most vulnerable) need our support now.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 251

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:17:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:17:48 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am opposed to this for a number of reasons. The main being that the plan is to house the same demographic of people who need wrap around services and this building doesn't accommodate for this. The same type of building went up in Nanaimo and Surrey and they have not been successful models. If we need housing for people with mental health and addiction issues we need wrap around services. It is too close to a school, daycare and a women's safe house shelter. Housing people who need mental health supports needs a more mindful approach.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 252

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:20:59 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:20:59 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose this development. The tower portion has no setbacks along Arbutus St, there were no changes to improve the public realm. This architectural condition has a significant impact on the neighbourliness of the building and does not meet City urban design goals and policies.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 253

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:24:31 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:24:31 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Forcing the Sancta Maria house to close, is terrible. We can't turn our backs on women

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 254

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:44:01 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 13:44:01 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

No rainwater management plan has been completed for this development application. In order for this application to be approved, a rainwater management plan needs to exist. If this application is approved without due diligence and without proper paperwork and studies, including a rainwater management plan, the approval process will be flawed and the City may invite a legal challenge.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 255

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 13:55:16 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 07, 2023 17:28:11 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am opposed to this project. It was approved before the consultation process began. Overwhelming opposition has been ignored. The lack of transparency has been concerning. Despite improvements to the project design and change in occupant demographic to allow 50% low income rentals, major concerns remain. These include: 1) The Location is Completely Inappropriate for housing individuals requiring support for mental health and substance abuse issues due to the extremely close proximity of the elementary school, daycare, toddler playground and liquor store. 2) Safety Concerns - Due to its proximity to the school, toddler playground and the many seniors and young families in the area, the proposed housing should be for residents who do not suffer from substance abuse issues. Despite increased theft, house and car break-ins, harassment, property damage, assault, drug consumption and 911 calls that have occurred where similar buildings have been placed, these concerns have been dismissed as false notions. I respectfully do not in any way suggest that all persons with substance issues commit crimes, but neither can the City suggest that there is no increased probability of such problems associated with substance abuse. Consultation with the Vancouver Police Department as to the potential impacts of this project and how best to manage them would be valuable. 3) Preference for Senior and Family Housing - The proposed 50% supportive housing (approx 65 individuals) remains inappropriate in this family-oriented location. A better and more welcome fit would be to eliminate or further decrease supportive housing to 5%, increase low-income rentals to 95%, and include housing for single-parent and women-led families. 4) Scale - The modular tower remains too high as the St. Augustine Elementary School and its playground will be in morning shadow throughout the year. 5) Setbacks: (a) Levels 2-13 of the modular tower have zero setback from the property line, and I am concerned that this would set a precedent for zoning bylaws to be changed to allow future buildings in the city to sit on the property line. A zero setback should not be approved. (b) It is stated that existing street trees along Arbutus St have been retained, but with zero setback I am concerned that large trees may be at risk because including existing mature trees in other plans has not prevented their destruction for convenience. As the neighbourhood is about to lose a precious grove of mature trees and peaceful healing green area, further loss of trees would be devastating. (c) With frequent rain and zero setback I am concerned about downpouring of rainwater from floors 2-13 of the modular building directly onto the sidewalk on Arbutus. Sewers in the area become flooded in winter and I wonder if this design will cause large pools of water to collect and cause problems for pedestrians and drivers. 6) Courtyard - A wonderful idea, especially if the tree is an existing tree, but will the courtyard be in almost constant shadow or could there be a wrought iron fence in place of a wall on the east side to allow more light? 7) Landscaping - I hope there will be permeable soil garden beds along the east side rather than planters on concrete so the Greenway remains green. My wish would be for the north half of this property to be adjoined to the Arbutus Greenway as a tiny but much-needed park to benefit the thousands of new occupants of future towers and to fit with the city's goal of making Broadway a great street by providing a valuable connection to nature that is critical for reducing stress and sustaining mental health for public wellbeing. Failing that, I suggest that this location is well-suited for a project redesign to provide low-income housing for seniors, single-parent and women-led families, single adults, and people with disabilities.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





Respondent No: 256

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 14:39:13 pm

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 14:39:13 pm

IP Address: n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am a s.22(1) . I am opposed to the Arbutus Project as a low-barrier, harm reduction supportive modular housing model of 120 units with very low staff support for the intended clientele. Here are my reasons: This building of 13 stories because of its modular design with high ceilings will have the height of 18 stories; Far too big for the area, with far too many people with serious mental health and drug-related challenges housed within it. A building of this size, both in structure and capacity of residents, should not be 17.5 metres from an elementary school, nursery school, and toddler park. The children's playground is directly across the street, and separated by just a few metres. From my understanding (I listened to the 3 evenings of hearings last summer), many of the clientele would be men with difficult mental health, and drug related challenges. Their behaviour can be unpredictable. During the hearings we heard from judges, psychiatric nurses, and doctors, who gave detailed accounts and reasons why this building should not be in such close proximity to children. Many of these men as I have understood would have children of their own from whom they are estranged. Their children would not be able to visit them as children are not allowed in a building of this kind. Imagine how a father would feel seeing other people's children playing at recess and at lunch, every weekday, while knowing his children cannot visit with him at home? A building with harm reduction and a room where drugs are administered attract drug dealers. Do we really want children to be exposed to such an environment? This building is directly across the street from a toddler park, where parents and children gather not only on weekdays, but also on weekends. It is a community gathering spot for parents and children. The area has no other such place, unless one walks a considerable distance to Kitsilano Beach. The Project will kill this park as it is currently used. I am sure parents will not congregate there as the residents from the Project would, since there would be no other place for the residents to congregate. The beautiful wild "Blue Bell" wooded area would be destroyed for the construction of the Project, thus leaving the residents with no outdoor space. Another major reason why this Arbutus Project is not a good fit for the area is that it is too close to a subway/bus terminal station. It will be too congested, both for pedestrians, and traffic. The Project will house 120 men, there will be some staff, visitors, delivery personnel, and other people coming and going in a very tight area. Add this to the thousands of people who would be using the new subway and bus terminal at that same location only metres away, plus a school across the street. Arbutus is very narrow north of Broadway. This will be an over-congested area., both for pedestrians and traffic. There will be a constant coming and going of traffic, delivery trucks, sanitation trucks, visitors, parents picking up & dropping off children, neighbourhood residents trying to get to their homes and businesses, and buses coming in and out of the terminal. Were engineers consulted????Further, drug dealers, from my experience s.22(1) s.22(1) and will especially here with a harm reduction facility nearby. This is a recipe for deconstructing a safe and vibrant neighbourhood, having a terrible first start for a new subway station, and leaving young impressionable children vulnerable, as even getting to their school could be a very challenging experience given how busy and chaotic that location will be. Is the city prepared to deal with the consequences of accidents occurring at or near the intersections of 7th and 8th, and Arbutus? Surely a better location could have been found for residents who have sensitive needs., a place where they could also receive the treatment they need and deserve. The neighbourhood does not have the resources needed for such complex care. Finally, this project as currently proposed represents a missed opportunity to leverage existing community character and resources to help another vulnerable population in Vancouver: mothers and children experiencing poverty and recovering from addiction. Just today we read in CBC news of the Union Gospel Mission's Women's and Family Centre in the DTES, which has a waiting list. It frankly makes no sense for the city to be housing mothers in recovery and their children in the DTES while planning to bring single residents of the DTES (and other areas) to a child-focused neighbourhood like Delmont Park.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 257

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 14:43:11 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 21:42:24 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building is too large for the narrow site. There are no setbacks for levels 2 to 13 of the tower form. Also, the Arbutus sidewalk remains narrow. This presents an uninviting public realm and safety issues for pedestrians (there are documented cases of items being thrown from building windows and injuring pedestrians below). There will be many pedestrians in the area given the neighbouring preschool, school, park and skytrain terminus station. The building is far too institutional looking and stigmatizing for residents. The red brick on the podium and the grey/blue grill on the tower should not have been removed. The building lacks neighbourliness. A smaller courtyard/greenhouse, replaced with a larger deck on the 3rd floor, would allow for acceptable building setbacks and widening of the sidewalk on Arbutus. The building uses most of the land mass on the two lots, leaving little to absorb rainwater. With no setbacks from the property line on Arbutus, rainwater would flow down like a waterfall from the tower side onto the street - right onto the sidewalk. No traffic management plan has been presented and is critical given the coming bus loop and skytrain terminus station, and the amount of emergency service vehicles that will have to access the building. This project should be going to the Development Permit Review Board and not to only the Director.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 258

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 14:47:43 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 21:37:39 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

As s.22(1) I am opposed to the format of this building. I will not feel safe in my neighborhood walking to get groceries and to s.22(1) Also a bad location across from a daycare and elementary school. I am for social housing there for seniors, families and people with disabilities who can't afford to rent in the area anymore like myself. To have 129 people with mental health and addiction issues with or without supports makes no sense. I hope council truly listens to the majority of the residents of this area and doesn't just try to put a band aid on and ram this through. Thank you.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 259

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 14:53:42 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 14:53:42 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The site is too narrow for the building as it was mentioned by the City and warned by experts. There needs to be greater effort to make the building fit the site. The building face is too close to the narrow sidewalk, which forces pedestrians onto what's already a busy street. There is public safety concerns from tenants dropping items from their windows onto the busy sidewalk and causing harm to pedestrians. Is the City willing to take on this is huge risk and liability?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 260

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 14:59:37 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 21:42:24 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I remain opposed to this building for a variety of reasons. The current form and use of the building, particularly given its planned onsite active drug consumption site, will adversely impact the adjacent Sancta Maria House and Delamont Park. Exposure to fentanyl can kill a child using the park. This is not a trivial matter. The building form is institutional. It looks like a prison. With only single studio units, the rooms doesn't provide integration with the current community of families and children. With the right type of supportive housing, we could have on site housing that would help women experiencing homelessness/substance use, get better and reunite with their children. There are no setbacks for the tower form on Arbutus Street. This is a safety issue for pedestrians who could be harmed by items being thrown out of the building's windows. Again, this is not a trivial matter. These types of incidents have been documented in the news. Insufficient attention has been paid to traffic and public safety issues, particularly with the coming bus loop and skytrain terminus station. The sidewalks of Arbutus and the street itself are too narrow.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 261

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 15:00:24 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 22:00:24 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building lacks neighbourliness, is exclusionary to families, lacks mental health and addiction supports, is beside a school, has no traffic management plan (already overloaded, and this is before the subway opens), compromises women seeking treatment in an adjacent site, will shade the playground of the school children, lacks appropriate setbacks. Why was this site and form chosen?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 262

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 15:01:03 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 22:00:24 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

The building lacks neighbourliness, is exclusionary to families, lacks mental health and addiction supports, is beside a school, has no traffic management plan (already overloaded, and this is before the subway opens), compromises women seeking treatment in an adjacent site, will shade the playground of the school children, lacks appropriate setbacks. Why was this site and form chosen?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 263

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 15:13:50 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 15:13:50 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Community safety concerns about this site being adjacent to or in close proximity to multiple schools, daycares, a toddler/family park, Women's Supportive Recovery Housing and a liquor store, have been willfully ignored. Social Housing options for families, single parents and children at risk, could(and should) be built without any rezoning application

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 264

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 15:40:28 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 15:40:28 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

64 million!., warehousing the vulnerable, bringing drugs to a family neighbourhood, across the street from a children's play ground and elementary school, neighbour to a safe house for women, single occupancy forever for males only, subway station, liquor store, what could possibly go wrong? 64 million for supportive housing for families would be a better fit for this area with single units for those that want rehab with support.. It is going to hurt when the bandaid is ripped off..

**Q2. Street address**



**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 265

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 15:43:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 22:43:49 pm

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Considering ALL the past, latest and ongoing issues that BC Housing has had with management, violence, destruction, fire, murders, assaults at their facilities, it is extremely disturbing that City of Vancouver has not put ANY sort of minimum guidelines for occupants and or listened to the surrounding neighbourhood of their concerns. Considering the track record of BC Housing, you would assume that the City of Vancouver would consider it common sense to protect the immediate school children by stipulating that this property should be designed for those in need most, that pose the least risk to themselves and the community (family, seniors) Its funny how the City of Victoria did have the common sense when they put social housing across from a school, it was the first thing on the agenda. This example now houses seniors, on the path of recovery. This property will be viewed as an extreme failure in the years to come. Being designed like it is a penitentiary in downtown Manhattan (no setbacks, horrendous design, no supports). Oh well, push it through, even when you have a MAJORITY opposing to serve your own political agenda. There are better ways, better process, better outcome, better locations but no one seems to actually care.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver B.C

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 266

Login: s.22(1)

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 16:16:51 pm

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 23:16:52 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

We wish to register our objection to the Development Plan for the subject location. As stated by the community during the rezoning process, locating this project here is incompatible with the family-friendly character of the neighborhood. The Development Plan has done nothing to mitigate those concerns. In particular, we wish to point out that the current Development Plan puts the main building entrance along 7th Avenue just east of Arbutus. This street frontage is a very child-intensive area, with a popular playground at Delamont Park directly across 7th Avenue. In addition, the sidewalk of 7th Avenue is a frequent pedestrian route for St. Augustine kindergarten and grade school students walking frequently between the school and St. Augustine parish church. We have all seen that entrances to buildings such as this are popular sites for building residents to congregate and invariably harass innocent passers-by including children. For the safety of the children in the neighborhood and in the school, this potential risk needs to be eliminated. Some of the older project proposals had shown the building entrance at a more appropriate location along 8th Avenue directly facing the transit station. This will be more convenient for building residents and much less impactful on the children in the neighborhood. We strongly suggest that the site plan be reconfigured to again locate the building entrance on 8th Avenue, and that the 7th Avenue frontage be completely closed to eliminate any opportunities for interaction between building residents and the children frequenting 7th Avenue. s.22(1)

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 267

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 16:39:08 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 16:39:08 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am opposed to the current development for the following reasons Design: a) The proposed 13-storey building ( which because of the planned permanent Modular building style is actually equivalent to 18 storeys will tower over the two--three store buildings in this neighbourhood. The proposed height will not only be out of character for the area but will also at various times throughout the day and year block the sunlight on its neighbours: St. Augustine School to the west, The Arbutus Greenway and Maple Creek Housing Co-op to the east and Delamont Park to the north. b) Setbacks . The lack of setbacks on Arbutus Street and the fact that there is no community green space makes the size of the building even more imposing. Lack of information about support within the building: Has MPA Society experience managing a model of this size with two categories of renters? I feel that there has not been enough detailed information given about the support that will be available for those tenants who will be living in the tower because they qualify for the low-barrier component of the building. Compatibility with Surroundings: I do not believe this is the best site for such a large, single unit adult only, low-barrier supportive housing project. The property is located directly across the street from an elementary school and preschool. The arbutus Greenway is right next to it on the other side. Across the street to the north there is a toddlers' park. A women's recovery home is close by. I think a far better option for this location would be Social Housing for families with children , and for people with low incomes.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 268

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 16:39:42 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 16:39:42 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development application for the properties located at 2086-2098 W 7th Ave and 2091 W 8th Ave. After carefully reviewing the plans and considering the potential impacts, it is evident that this development would have significant negative impacts on the existing community and is fundamentally inappropriate for the neighbourhood. Allow me to elaborate and suggest a more suitable alternative: - Misalignment with City's Affordable Housing Projects: The proposed development is misaligned with the City's commitment to addressing critical housing affordability and fostering sustainable communities. The proposed development does not address much-needed affordable housing for families and children, as well as low-income seniors. Furthermore, the absence of nearby mental health and addiction support services highlights a significant oversight, considering the current proposed development's requirements for comprehensive infrastructure. - Better Option & Social Housing for Families and Low-Income Seniors: A more suitable alternative for the development site would be the construction of affordable housing that caters to families & children, and low-income seniors. By embracing a building form capable of accommodating a larger number of residents than the proposed 129 individuals, the development can contribute to addressing the pressing need for affordable housing in the city. This approach would also align with the existing demographic composition of the neighbourhood and help further foster an inclusive community. I strongly urge you to reject the proposed development application for 2086-2098 W 7th Ave and 2091 W 8th Ave in its current form. The neighbourhood deserves a development that respects its character and addresses the needs of families and low-income seniors struggling with affordability. By pursuing a more thoughtful and inclusive approach, we can ensure the long-term sustainability of our city. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 269

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 16:47:10 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 16:47:10 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Yet another removal of limited green space in our area. Why not renovate the area and make it into an actual dog park and give something back to the tax payer.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 270

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 16:54:43 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 16:54:43 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

While we understand the need for affordable housing in this city, this particular project does not seem to be thoughtfully considered for this neighbourhood and immediate location. There is an elementary school, a toddler's playground, and a women's shelter. What kind of screening will applicants for the housing project be required to complete before moving in? What kind of support system and security will the project provide? Who will take responsibility for any confrontations? There is a lack of information on public and tenant safety. More detailed information should be required. In a family friendly area, it would be more reasonable to provide housing for families in need over single occupancy units. With the subway station already under construction, what is the traffic management plan during construction?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 271

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 17:05:28 pm

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 17:05:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments:

I feel that the proposal has been confusing and even duplicitous. I can't abide the circuitous language. Is the plan to house mentally ill recovering addicts in this new building? If so I strongly object. The building will be next to an elementary school and a metro station. People who are anxious to recover from addiction will be housed next to an easy train trip from the DTES? The temptation offered to these residents and to potential drug dealers who are in the business of making them fall off the sobriety wagon should be obvious. I feel, frankly, that those who have consistently failed to solve the problems of the DTES – indeed their incompetence has made things worse – now want to spread the problem all over the city rather than solve it. The argument has been made that 'those nimbys' don't want social housing in their neighbourhood. Bizarre, given who actually lives here. That fact has been so misrepresented one has to wonder whether the proponents have ever actually ever been here. The accusation is manipulative, deliberately misleading - in fact, genuinely cruel.. I'm a longtime resident in the area, s.22(1)

s.22(1) I'm totally s.22(1) for my modest living. s.22(1)

s.22(1) All of my neighbours

are elderly. s.22(1) This neighbourhood is chock-a-block with "social housing" if by that you mean rent subsidized housing for seniors and others who can't afford \$2000 rent per month. Kitsilano is not Pt Grey or Dunbar and the eastern part is particularly different from anything further west. Individual houses are split into multi-plexes containing many suites, and within walking distance of the 7/8th Ave & Arbutus development proposal are dozens of subsidized premises occupied by hundreds of vulnerable low income seniors and disabled residents. The entire area is already a beacon of social housing. Here is the list of the nearby buildings, location & owners, right beside and/or within easy walking distance of the proposed development: LOW INCOME SENIORS / DISABLED HOUSING = Maple Crest Housing - Maple/7th Ave -- Shalom / Legion = Seven Maples Housing 7th Arbutus>Maple -- BCHousing = Arbutus Court 5th/Arbutus -- Brightside Foundation = Blair Court - 10th /Arbutus -- VRS (Vancouver Resource Society) = Woodcroft 2nd /Cypress -- BCHsg = Red Oaks Place - 7th @ Vine -- Kits Neighbourhood House = Linden Tree - 8th @ Vine -- Kits House = Cypress Walk - Cypress & Bwy = Burrard Manor 8th/ Balsam -- Brightside Fdtn = Moreland Kennedy House 3rd/ Larch -- Brightside Fdtn CO-OPS (just a very few samples here - noting that \*co-ops aren't very low income anymore, but - still multi-generational diverse family premises) = Juniper Co-op / Vine House -- 7th & Maple = Kitsun Co-op -- Broadway & Vine = Inti Co-op -- Cypress & W 1st Ave = Community Alternatives Co-op -- 1937 W. 2nd Maple/Cypres I am not "privileged". I am not "upper class". This neighbourhood is not some sort of gated enclave for the rich. These kinds of insulting implications between the lines of much of the presentations has not escaped my attention.

Q2. Street address

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

Q3. Postal code

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. Your overall position about the application:

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 272

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 17:10:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 17:10:48 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This development permit should not be approved because, among other reasons, it does not meet the project's primary goal - "to create a welcoming building that residents are proud to call home". Physically speaking, this building is institutional looking. Additionally for a building to be welcoming, as stated by the PMSHI principles of design within a neighbourhood context, it must be consistent with the character of the surrounding area. This development as proposed it completely inconsistent with its surrounds. Finally, this building would be across the greenway from a woman's recovery home. The women in the home need to find affordable housing for themselves and often their children, when they leave recovery. Since the proposed building would not allow children inside (due to design and form) it would be akin to having a neighbour whose house you couldn't visit. That is the opposite of neighbourly. That is exclusionary.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 273

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 17:24:45 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 00:24:45 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to this project in its current form. Why do you insist in building something that goes against everything that the experts are recommending? Didn't you see the strong opposition from the vast majority of the people (including mental health and addictions specialists) who participated in the public hearing about a year ago? Putting a 13-story building is not the right way to solve this problem, it will help neither the residents nor the neighbours. And this is not about NIMBY, you can house the same number and type of people in Kitsilano, but you need to distribute them around the area if you want to give the residents a chance at recovery. Also, there is no other building in the area that is even remotely close to a 13-story building, what happened to urban design, fit and following plans that have already been approved? The shadowing of the school playground and public park is contrary to City policies, including the Broadway Plan.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 274

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 17:25:28 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 00:24:45 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to this project in its current form. Why do you insist in building something that goes against everything that the experts are recommending? Didn't you see the strong opposition from the vast majority of the people (including mental health and addictions specialists) who participated in the public hearing about a year ago? Putting a 13-story building is not the right way to solve this problem, it will help neither the residents nor the neighbours. And this is not about NIMBY, you can house the same number and type of people in Kitsilano, but you need to distribute them around the area if you want to give the residents a chance at recovery. Also, there is no other building in the area that is even remotely close to a 13-story building, what happened to urban design, fit and following plans that have already been approved? The shadowing of the school playground and public park is contrary to City policies, including the Broadway Plan.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 275

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 17:29:55 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 17:29:55 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

The appearance of this building is an eye sore. Has the design team ever visited this site? With a budget of \$64 million, I expect better than this! Considering the people that will be housed within, the look of this building further stigmatizes the inhabitants as being "institutionalized"? Meaningful effort needs to be put into a building design that blends with the surrounding decades-old neighborhood that has evolved organically over many years. This is one of the reasons this community is much-loved by residents and visitors from around the world. I live here and my neighbors are from all walks of life, all ages, and all income levels, and it works because our homes blend together in a cohesive fashion, creating a peaceful sense of inclusivity within the community. Isn't that what everybody wants in their surrounding neighborhood?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 276

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:11:34 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:11:34 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

My family and I are strongly opposed to the proposed development as it is not suitable for the neighbourhood. Locating a building of this size for single, at-risk of homelessness occupants adjacent to an elementary school, a park and a women's shelter is inappropriate and reckless. The City should not allow this permit application to proceed.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 277

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:13:00 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:13:00 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This is the last thing the neighborhood needs

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 278

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:14:43 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 01:14:43 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Why are the homes so small? You cannot house a family in a studio suite. These seem to be studios for single people only and since some support is being offered, we can only guess that there will be residents with addiction and mental health issues. Does the city really support this location opposite a primary school and right around the corner from housing for women? It seems as though the location is better suited to low income families or couples especially as the "support" offered is so minimal. BC Housing has a terrible record and I don't believe it will be well managed and I hope for the neighbourhoods' sake, that drug use and needles will not be obvious to the students. As a tax payer, I would really resent having taxpayer money used in lawsuits brought by area residents and businesses.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 279

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:15:38 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 01:15:39 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am a local resident. s.22(1). Like us, many of the children go to delemont park after school. This development will have a negative impact on the area and our children. It only takes one unpleasant individual or incident to have a profound impact on the life of a child and family. This development should be geared towards income tested housing, not single occupancy.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 280

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:15:39 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 01:15:39 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I am a local resident. s.22(1) Like us, many of the children go to delemont park after school. This development will have a negative impact on the area and our children. It only takes one unpleasant individual or incident to have a profound impact on the life of a child and family. This development should be geared towards income tested housing, not single occupancy.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 281

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:23:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:23:19 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I'd like to express my significant concern around the proposed development's immediate impact on its surroundings, notably the St. Augustine's school and the children that go there. Kids should be able to attend school in a safe environment, and if the proposed development goes through, this will be comprising right. Why risk the historical success of the surrounding community (school, plus Women's shelter, and kids park) with a development that would disrupt this. Having seen the level of overthinking that takes place with simple, straightforward developments, the complete lack of thought that has gone into this development is disappointing. Please provide information on screening process for applicants, security protocols in the building, protocols and ownership for when there is a security or safety breach, traffic management plan, and an explanation of architecture and urban planning showing a building and landscape design that supports the community.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 282

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:27:54 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:27:54 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Much needed housing for low-income families and seniors is not provided at a site that already has infrastructure and services that support these groups.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 283

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:38:05 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 03:00:28 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

School safety is a big issue for my grandchildren and I think the active use of drugs by the residents of this facility will one day make it an issue for the young children at St. Augustine's school

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 284

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:52:49 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 01:52:50 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This looks like it would not fit in with the other surrounding buildings the general area. 13 stories would be much higher than any other building and similar developments of this size have all be turned down in recent years. Why the change now for social housing? A proposed 11 storey building was recently rejected by the city because of its height at the intersection of Broadway and Arbutus. If one 13 storey building is approved, others will apply for similar rezoning and why would they not also be approved? This could displace even more people in the area. If this is the beginning of increasing the density in the neighbourhood, is all the other infrastructure in place - i.e. storm, sanitary sewer, water , gas, hydro etc.? Or what are the plans to address the increased demand that would be put on these utilities? Street Parking in the neighbourhood is also already at a premium and hard to find. With 6 parking stalls it sounds as if the assumption is that the residents won't own a vehicle? Or that any visitors will also not arrive in a vehicle? This doesn't seem realistic and will put even more pressure on the already limited parking in the area. Lastly, is the best place for social housing next to an elementary school with young kids? Thanks for your consideration.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 285

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:53:07 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 18:53:07 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I think it is important for the City to provide social housing, but I think this Development Application is ill-conceived. From my reading of and listening to information, debates and public and private comments, including in the rezoning hearings conducted by the previous City Council, the concentration of so many people with the special needs of those whom it is intended to house in this development will lead to failure of what is intended for those people. I believe it has been shown conclusively that success will only be achieved if these people in unfortunate circumstances are spread among residential buildings also housing people not from such unfortunate circumstances, so that those unfortunate circumstances can be left behind and a normal life can be resumed. I am also concerned about the effects that such concentration of people with special needs will have on the people in the nearby women's shelter who are recovering from their own troubled backgrounds.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 286

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 18:53:22 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 01:52:50 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This looks like it would not fit in with the other surrounding buildings the general area. 13 stories would be much higher than any other building and similar developments of this size have all be turned down in recent years. Why the change now for social housing? A proposed 11 storey building was recently rejected by the city because of its height at the intersection of Broadway and Arbutus. If one 13 storey building is approved, others will apply for similar rezoning and why would they not also be approved? This could displace even more people in the area. If this is the beginning of increasing the density in the neighbourhood, is all the other infrastructure in place - i.e. storm, sanitary sewer, water , gas, hydro etc.? Or what are the plans to address the increased demand that would be put on these utilities? Street Parking in the neighbourhood is also already at a premium and hard to find. With 6 parking stalls it sounds as if the assumption is that the residents won't own a vehicle? Or that any visitors will also not arrive in a vehicle? This doesn't seem realistic and will put even more pressure on the already limited parking in the area. Lastly, is the best place for social housing next to an elementary school with young kids? Thanks for your consideration.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 287

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:11:11 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 03:36:42 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

How will you keep the children across the street safe? I do not believe any operator will be able to do so.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 288

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:26:19 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:26:19 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Do you not think there is any safety issue with a low barrier drug consumption site 17 meters from our kids? And who will be liable from a legal perspective if a child is harmed?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 289

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:26:35 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:26:35 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

s.22(1) and I have some very serious concerns about this development. I don't understand how the amendments and commitments provided during public hearing, are not being reflected within this development permit. Specifically, amendments to explore health care options, different unit types and different funding streams. s.22(1) it's clear that adequate traffic analysis has NOT been completed or shared. This development represents a significant traffic and safety challenge to the school children and pedestrians.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 290

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:29:21 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:29:21 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

With such a huge black market for stolen bicycles, I'm curious why there is 188 parking spots for only 129 residents? Do homeless people who can't afford a home normally own more than one bicycle?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 291

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:32:27 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:32:27 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Urban design plan has not accounted for the layered impact exposure of the Broadway Subway Project terminal station, Proposed housing development, future Broadway Plan density, Elementary School proximity, Delmont Park immediacy, women's recovery home location, and Arbutus Greenway corridor. Show substantive study evidence that this 2-block area has the capacity to handle such infrastructure growth. It was said multiple times during the public hearing that the subway station proximity is a positive for the residents, yet has the city spoken to the VPD to understand that being near a terminus station introduces complex public safety issues around crime and this has not been addressed in any forum.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 292

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:40:16 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:40:16 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose this. Building is too tall for the area. There is no setback, which is unsafe when the windows above open directly above your head. The shadows from the building will cover the playground across the street. Units should be for families with multiple bedrooms, not individual single rooms only. Because of the scale of the building, there is no greenscape.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 293

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 19:54:41 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 19:54:41 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This development would have a negative impact on the immediate surroundings and local community. It is directly opposite an elementary school, a daycare and a playground. Seems like a terrible mix that will set up future conflicts.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

Vancouver BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 294

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:01:57 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 20:01:57 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This is an awful idea. s.22(1) because there was so much mental health issues and we were basically scared to take our kids outside and now that we have moved out of that chaos it is following us. PLEASE RECONSIDER THE LOCATION. Can't that money go much further much more east? Shouldnt a building like this be far from the rest of the community? Like how Riverview was designed? To ask the average person to blend into the community with people with mental health/drug problems is a recipe for disaster and NOT community building. It is causing a lot of frustration and hostility towards this issue, when in fact we should be increasing empathy. Throwing money at this problem is not going to fix their mental health/drug problems. They need treatment.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 295

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:03:31 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 20:03:31 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Who chose this lot for this scale of project, given its failure to adhere to expected architectural standards, in particular, the absence of setbacks for Levels 2 to 13 of the tower form? There is no traffic management plan to have adequate sidewalk width and setbacks for neighbouring streets to accept 15,000 daily transit users from the adjacent bus loop and terminal subway station, or the many more thousands of people who will live in this immediate area as it densifies under the Broadway Plan. There is no rainwater management plan. How is this project at this stage with so many unknowns? No other developer would be allowed to get to this stage with this many unknowns. Chief Planner Theresa O'Donnell has admitted that the building lacks neighbourliness and I agree. Its shadow looming over the playground and park across the streets and its domineering tower bullying all the other surrounding buildings exemplifies the governments' power shoving this project down the throats of the community that has opposed it.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 296

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:09:31 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 03:09:31 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This development does not benefit anyone involved. This is harmful to the neighbourhood - it introduces a criminal element, it does not fit with the current urban design (i.e. local building height restrictions), and it casts a shadow on a school ground. This is harmful to the building inhabitant as well - it does not address the personal traumas which cause their problems in the first place, and it actually enables their poor behaviour (any psychologist would tell you this same thing, and I have confirmed this with a highly qualified RCC). How much money has the City already thrown at this issue, only to see it get progressively worse? And your solution? Throw more money at it using the same failed techniques. In fact there seems to be no problem the government has thrown money at that has ever improved without a proper plan in place, and this does not address the root cause of societal trauma which is plaguing these people in the first place.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 297

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:10:09 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 03:09:31 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

This development does not benefit anyone involved. This is harmful to the neighbourhood - it introduces a criminal element, it does not fit with the current urban design (i.e. local building height restrictions), and it casts a shadow on a school ground. This is harmful to the building inhabitant as well - it does not address the personal traumas which cause their problems in the first place, and it actually enables their poor behaviour (any psychologist would tell you this same thing, and I have confirmed this with a highly qualified RCC). How much money has the City already thrown at this issue, only to see it get progressively worse? And your solution? Throw more money at it using the same failed techniques. In fact there seems to be no problem the government has thrown money at that has ever improved without a proper plan in place, and this does not address the root cause of societal trauma which is plaguing these people in the first place.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 298

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:12:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 20:12:48 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Who chose this lot for this scale of project, given its failure to adhere to expected architectural standards, in particular, the absence of setbacks for Levels 2 to 13 of the tower form? There is no traffic management plan to have adequate sidewalk width and setbacks for neighbouring streets to accept 15,000 daily transit users from the adjacent bus loop and terminal subway station, or the many more thousands of people who will live in this immediate area as it densifies under the Broadway Plan. There is no rainwater management plan. How is this project at this stage with so many unknowns? No other developer would be allowed to get to this stage with this many unknowns. Chief Planner Theresa O'Donnell has admitted that the building lacks neighbourliness and I agree. Its shadow looming over the playground and park across the streets and its domineering tower bullying all the other surrounding buildings exemplifies the governments' power shoving this project down the throats of the community that has opposed it. Units should be multiple bedrooms to fit into the community makeup, not 129 individual units. Why have the needs of 129 individuals been prioritized over hundreds more children and community members who have opposed this?

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 299

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:24:32 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 20:24:32 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

School is closed for the summer now but this location is the most vibrant and walked through section of the neighborhood. With multiple daycares, an elementary school, playgrounds, community gardens, the green way and bike paths all congregating on the same block, this particular location is used by families with young children from morning to night. The planned project will fundamentally damage the livability and threaten the livelihood of all the families in the immediate surroundings, and those who travel to this neighborhood for daily childcare. The building is institutional in nature, the city would be sacrificing the safety of our children for adults who can be housed more securely elsewhere. The design is not effective for this neighborhood and would not be impactful as intended because the city has not truly listened to the thoughtful comments of local residents. The traffic at 7th/8th and Arbutus is troublesome as is, adding this massive building at this growing intersection would cause havoc and have consequences the city staff would not be able to handle.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 300

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 20:44:04 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 20:44:04 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

This supportive housing development is incompatible with existing vulnerable populations of school children, women's recovery home and seniors, their needs are being ignored to fulfil the mandate of the City's low barrier housing tower. How can the City in good conscience put this model of housing with open drug use on-site right next to the Women's recovery supportive home Sancta Maria House, that is abstinence based free from drugs and alcohol? And many of whom are fleeing from violence and abuse and need to be in a place that they can feel safe and at peace. Having this large scale building with 129 residents suffering from mental illness, substance abuse use and with no criminal background checks for violent crime, next to the Sancta Maria Home is setting them up for failure and will eventually force them to shut down.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 301

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 21:07:13 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 04:42:09 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I just can't believe after all of the opposition to this development that the city would want to still go ahead. It's unbelievable that the city could plan to build this in an area down the street from a school. This will totally change the area we live in. women and children will no longer be able to walk the neighbourhood streets safely. We will constantly be listening to sirens of fire engines and first responders attending that location. Yes, these people need a place to live but it shouldn't be in the heart of Kitsilano., it should be in an area they're familiar with like the downtown east side. If this continues to be pushed ahead, I'll be voting for another mayoralty platform next election.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 302

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 21:22:35 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2023 04:21:09 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

6 storeys is allowed under current zoning rules. The building should comply with that. It was decided on that height for a reason. The adjacent school yard will always be in shade for the whole year. It will be cold and windy due to wind tunnelling and unusable. This is unacceptable. It is also mean spirited on the part of decision makers to do this to the children of this city. I have read certain politicians suggested it's ok because it's Catholic children. That they are an elite who should be exposed to the 'other aspects of life in Vancouver'. This is "othering". Would it be ok to say this about Chinese Canadians or Jewish children? This is not ok. Seriously and emphatically not ok. "The proposal asks for a 50 m high building with an FST of 4.42 - that is more than 2 1/2 times as high and almost 50% more space than the maximums wowed by the existing zoning. The building will accommodate 129 singles - men only - no single women or women with families. " "Design is 'like a shipping container with a bathroom...saving no flexibility for future arrangement should the client change" I personally encourage every neighbourhood in Vancouver to provide supports for their own community with regard to mental health. My proposal would see 3 levels of care: stage one - detox, stage two - 90 days clean and sober with ZERO tolerance and with 24/7 support, and stage three - long term housing for those with volunteer or work who are returning to live as functioning, tax paying members of the community. Unfortunately, as I often found when talking to BCHMC and other advocacy groups, there is a blinkered approach to care which denies the fundamental necessity of NOT ENABLING. This design feeds into an ideologically blind and frankly wrong view of mental health and addiction that enabling is ok. They will come round when they want to. Yes they have to hit rock bottom. But they can't do that if they are offered the drug that is destroying them. By design. This is shocking to me. And it's my tax dollars that are enabling the behaviour. I am strongly opposed. I would draw your attention to the building at Dunbar and 16th for an alternative approach. It is for 90 day clean and sober with a committee comprised of Vancouver Coastal Health, admin staff and a neighbourhood representative. They discuss issues as they arrive and come to a mutually agreed solution always keeping in mind the concerns of the local community. This facility is considered to be a fine example of best practises and yet is not used by the provincial government anywhere else. Now why would that be? Ideological blinkers? It clearly works. And yet, as it is laid out, this facility could not be designed to work in this way. The design is flawed and must be changed.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 303

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 21:23:46 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 21:23:46 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

s.22(1) In that time I have witnessed the brokenness that drugs and alcohol can do to women in particular. While I do admit that abstinence is so difficult, I do not agree that the way forward is to allow people to stay in their addiction, as this will crush them even further in the long run. s.22(1) who have fallen on hard times and relapsed. With regards to the proposed new building that is to be erected next to our property, I feel that it will affect our women to be living once again in an environment where people are using and drinking. We have a strict policy in the house for the women not to go to using areas, and I'm afraid that with the erection of this building the women will be once again exposed. While I agree that facilities are being built in Vancouver, I feel it very unfair that they should be built right next to our building where the women are working so hard to maintain their sobriety. It is unfair for them as it will affect them from going out in the neighbourhood, where they are safe and totally accepted in a community, where they are respected and loved. They will be exposed and triggered to substances on a daily basis. Kindly review your plans, as we have worked so hard to keep our women safe for many years now, and have had success in our programming. Yours sincerely -: s.22(1)

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 304

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 21:33:28 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 21:33:28 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Hello, My family and I as well as a great many in the Kitsilano community are very concerned and opposed to the proposed development. The echelon of people that will be moving into our neighbourhood pose a great risk not only to the school children who are directly across the street, but also to the community at large. As it is, when the homeless moved in several years ago after being evicted from the downtown east side, our community suddenly had a rash of break-ins, open drug use as well as physical attacks on people for things as simple as not having a cigarette to offer them! It will also make it scary and pose a threat for anyone, especially women and/or children walking to a store towards/in the evening. That is very bad. We cannot, must not have this proposal go ahead and pose a larger threat to our community. Will you accept responsibility when a great many more graffiti, drug use, threats, physical assaults and break-ins, etc. happen? Would you be comfortable having your children, wife, or mother live in the same area and walk down the street knowing there is a whole community of these people around you now?! As well, there will inevitably be a much greater increase in noise from police, ambulances and fire trucks racing down Broadway in response to the various incidents. That is already bad enough! It is incumbent upon you to stop this! We trust you will do the right thing in which case you can count on our support in the next municipal election. Regards, One of a great many concerned citizens

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 305

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 21:40:15 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 26, 2023 03:07:06 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

- I fully support this proposal as it has met the conditions that were required following the rezoning approval, and it is an improvement on the original as well. - I also support the height, massing, and density, as approved by city council - This homes should be built as soon as possible, as they are desperately needed - I feel like this building acts as a nice bridge between the existing neighbourhood and how the community is expected to change under the Broadway Plan, as it takes elements from both. - The rounded corner on the southwest makes the building more inviting, especially with the new seating. - The public realm is much more active and feels safer with the addition of windows - the transition to the Arbutus Greenway is much nicer with the landscaping along that side - Getting rid of the screening makes the building less bulky, but it also looks more boring. - Changing the colour of the tower to white instead lessens the impact it has in the sky, which might appeal to some, but I do think it was nice to have the building stand out - I really like the brick along the podium, as it fits in with the surrounding neighbourhood. Making it blue instead gives the building its own sense of flair - Having an "Arbutus" sign really creates some visual interest to the podium, and builds a connection with the Hollywood sign It would be nice if the wall facing the bus loop had a mural or if some interesting materials/colours were added, as it looks really boring now - It might be nice to add sun shades to the west and east sides as a form of passive sustainability, and to make it more visually interesting

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver, BC

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Support



**Respondent No:** 306

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 22:12:48 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 22:12:48 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

s.22(1) I am often in this neighborhood s.22(1). I have planned to move to this neighborhood, but due to this overbearing, unsafe building, I feel I can't move here anymore. s.22(1) s.22(1) will be vulnerable and unsafe with such a tower and no extra precautions offered to the community. I can't imagine how young families feel or how the children all around the neighborhood will be impacted. You will bring in and help people who are at risk of homelessness, but at the same time, you will put children, young families and senior citizens all at risk. Is this not contrary to what you are trying to do? You will drive great thousands out of this community in order to assist 129 citizens who likely will not use the housing due to the modular building, miniscule units and much more. It's disturbing to know you will put all categories of people at risk and overlook the communities protest against this building, just to house people who will use the transit system and head back downtown to wear their colleagues are. You must consider other categories of people to house in this building, lower income families, single moms who can have their children attend the vast school in the community, new comers who will have access to sky train and once again many options of school for their children. Why house people in a robust community where they will not use the great options (schools, parks, family friendly stores, and so on). We oppose and I hope the voices of the Vancouver people will be heard!

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





Respondent No: 307

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 22:12:58 pm

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 22:08:34 pm

IP Address: s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

I would like to submit comments on both the substance of the project proposal, as well as the way this project has been conducted so far by the city. Firstly, there are some key elements of the project, as proposed in the design documents, that are not satisfactory. 1. I am concerned that the building continues to retain a studio-only floor plan. The design document speaks of designing within the neighborhood context. The neighborhood in this area is filled with many families. To have a building in this area that is deemed inappropriate for children, and not designed for families, has no alignment with the character of this neighborhood. Why can the building not be designed to include dwelling for families, particularly given the vulnerability of mothers at risk of experiencing homelessness? 2. Setbacks - the building continues to have very minimal set back on the Arbutus side (.85 m) in a high-traffic pedestrian area. When we look at pedestrian-friendly, family oriented and high-density neighborhoods in Vancouver like the West End, the building set backs make a world of difference in creating walkable, high-density neighborhoods. The architects make reference to other changes to accommodate the pedestrian experience (brick material, "playful" windows) - why can the setback similarly not be reconsidered to improve the experience of those walking by at ground level? 3. Tower design - the design documents make note of "particular attention paid to mitigating larger forms, massing, and excessive repetition." While this has been improved and achieved to some extent for the podium, the tower is excessively repetitive as designed, and does not meet the ideal of "designing for simplicity + beauty". It is monochromatic with nothing to break up the facade. How does this tower currently meet the principle of mitigating massing and excessive repetition? Secondly, I am concerned about the continued lack of engagement and transparency on this project. While the documents indicate the permit proposal was submitted in November, the sign was not posted at the site until late May or early June 2023 (more than 6 months later) s.22(1) and there were no indications at the time, on the site or elsewhere in the community, that this application had been in process. That the city waited to transparently provide these documents until 6 months later, and with only weeks to submit feedback, seems to indicate a trend with this project where the community seems to be purposely excluded from meaningful consultation. I am unhappy with the city's engagement approach and feel information was intentionally withheld. Why did the city not post any signage on the site until only the past month? If a more family-oriented housing project were proposed with necessary on-site medical supports for mental health, and better integrated with design for pedestrians, I would expect to support this project. However, as proposed, and with the poor transparency of the City, I currently oppose.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 308

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 22:26:36 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 28, 2023 06:34:56 am

**IP Address:** s.22(1)

**Q1. Your comments:**

Support - I believe the conditions of the rezoning approval have generally been satisfied - This development application represents an improvement from what was proposed at the rezoning stage - The added windows make the public realm around the building now feel more active, safe, and appropriate for a residential neighbourhood - The southwest corner of the property seems far more friendly thanks to the building's rounded corner, the added seating, and the unique pavers - The landscaping along the east side of the building provides a nice transition to the Arbutus Greenway - The "Arbutus" sign along the building's east side successfully adds interest to the podium of the building, and, like the Hollywood sign, creates the impression that this is a special landmark. - The added windows to the towers south façade make it feel less solid, and imposing, though a variation in their placement, or in their opacity, would help create more visual interest - The use of brick in the podium reflects the character of the area, while the blue colour sets it apart in a respectful manner - The white colour of the tower makes it have less of a presence in the skyline, though I was fine with the previous concept - The removal of the screen has lessened the perceived bulk of the tower, but also has unfortunately diminished its visual interest - I feel this concept fits in with the existing community, and the changes it will experience in the years ahead as envisioned by the Broadway Plan Other - Perhaps adding solar shading on the east and west facades could create more visual interest, and also act as a passive sustainability measure - The long blank wall facing the future Arbutus bus loop / Broadway line station could benefit from a mural, or a greater variation in the colour palette of the materials. - These homes are badly need in our city and should be approved as soon as possible - I support the height, massing, and density, while acknowledging that these matters have already been decided/approved by city council

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1) Vancouver

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Support





**Respondent No:** 309

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 22:27:13 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 22:27:13 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I oppose. Like myself and many other families, s.22(1) from the schools in the neighborhoods nearby. If you have a family/children, you can't imagine how hard it is to withdraw your child from a beloved school, find new housing and start a new life, all due to the fact we need to keep our families SAFE. If city of Vancouver can't consider this for young families, then why should we invest in the city/community that doesn't take care of it's citizens. My children and s.22(1) feel unsafe knowing there are many at risk people several feed away from us. I will not wait for something to happen to my children due to someone under influence or categorized as mental health. The building is overpowering our neighborhood, kids won't be able to walk to school safely with vehicle traffic, bus and sky train congestion and a daunting/massive modular building that isn't designed for families, vulnerable women, children. If I can't place my head on the pillow at night and feel safe, then I can't invest any longer in this community. Best of luck housing the minority when the majority live in this community and the majority oppose it. If majority opposes a project, as a city, you should step-back and re-evaluate your plan and reconsider who you are housing and who you are silencing.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed



Respondent No: 310

Login: s.22(1)

Email:

Responded At: Jul 04, 2023 22:47:38 pm

Last Seen: Jul 04, 2023 22:47:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Your comments:

I cannot even believe this is still being pushed through, with so much very clear and well reasoned opposition by people living in this neighbourhood. Has anyone involved even walked around this area? It's across from a school and a playground, and next to a green space with mature trees people SAFELY enjoy sitting quietly reading or having a picnic or simply enjoying the quiet. It's not some bunch of spoilt squeaky clean Karens just complaining. No one here has an issue with young people or pot smoking or sitting having a drink outside. If this were merely rental housing it would be met with cheers, or if it were supportive housing for women escaping violence, for example. Or how bout affordable rental housing for just average people who work every day and still can't afford a decent and safe place to live? But this is clearly the sort of building that will bring crime and police callouts day and night to the area as you well know from experience with other buildings like this. s.22(1) -- the only place I can afford-- and certainly would have an exceptionally difficult time finding other accommodation. This is not simply a 'rich neighbourhood' you obviously think is suffering from nimbyism. There are a LOT of low/moderate income renters here who could not afford to move even if any housing were available which it is not! If this neighbourhood suddenly changes from a fairly quiet, pretty safe area into a place full of discarded drug paraphernalia and constant break-ins and theft, where do we all go? This has to be one of the worst considered things this city has ever done, and the fact you are forcing it through against the wishes of people simply trying to make ends meet in a safe area in which we feel comfortable living and walking the streets is just shocking.

Q2. Street address

s.22(1)

Q3. Postal code

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

Q4. Your overall position about the application:

Opposed



**Respondent No:** 311

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 23:26:42 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 23:26:42 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

Current design changes have not eliminated shadowing. The Arbutus Greenway is in full shadow at 4pm during both spring and fall equinoxes; Delamont Park will be in significant shadow during the months of October to February at 2pm; and St. Augustine School will be in full shadow during the morning and in partial shadow at recess. This shadowing does not comply with the City's policies of minimizing shadows on public parks, public spaces and public and independent schools. The Broadway Plan policy requires that no school and school yard be shaded by any new building development. This building as proposed does not comply with the City's shadowing policies.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed





**Respondent No:** 312

**Login:** s.22(1)

**Email:**

**Responded At:** Jul 04, 2023 23:51:51 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 04, 2023 23:51:51 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Your comments:**

I have several reasons to oppose this project. This project doesn't exploit the opportunities this neighbourhood offers. This neighbourhood is low rise, mixed income, family friendly. It offers the benefits of the beach, the schools and quiet parks. It would appeal to families and older couples. But this project is designed for single people. Most single people wouldn't choose this neighbourhood. It has little to offer them, so why are we designing a building with them in mind? It is entirely single units. And no, housing two individuals in adjacent units is not appropriate for a couple, they won't take you up on this if it means being separated. This project is too big. Much bigger than any other building in the neighbourhood. It won't blend in; it will be an eyesore and a source of neighbourhood resentment rather than pride. A building design for a downtown site shouldn't just be transplanted to an incongruous site. The project has minimal security requirements. Given its location adjacent to an elementary school and close to a women's shelter it seems odd that it will have a no-bar approach to drug use and no on site security presence. The current long term users of the area shouldn't be cast aside so easily. We want to use the public transport next door and continue to walk home alone at night in a neighbourhood that has been our home for many years. We want our kids to continue to walk a few blocks to school and hang out at the park after. This project will increase the environmental risks to our families and neighbours. A no - bar drug use policy allows large scale pervasive drug use in our neighbourhood and increases all of our risk. Exposure and opportunity makes fentanyl addicts; there is nothing different about them, it is not a question of will power or determination. We are all at risk, particularly our young people, and once exposed their futures are stolen and they have little chance of ever recovering. It is selfish of course to want to limit their exposure; but I care for my neighbourhood and my family and I would like to protect them in the same way I would from toxic factory emissions if that were proposed. Spreading the burden across the city so we are all equally exposed is an often discussed approach but doesn't make sense if viewed with that lens.

**Q2. Street address**

s.22(1)

**Q3. Postal code**

Vancouver, BC, s.22(1)

**Q4. Your overall position about the application:**

Opposed