

[#LiveabilityFirst](#)

DENY the [601 BEACH CRESCENT](#) REZONING DUE TO SIGNIFICANT LIVEABILITY ISSUES

GOAL: We urge Council to turn down the rezoning of [601 Beach Crescent](#), and retain the current zoning for a 17-story social housing development, until new options for the site are identified that prioritize [#liveabilityfirst](#) for residents, and visitors that live, work and recreate in and around this iconic Vancouver landscape **WHY?**

1. The [Higher Buildings Policy](#) (HBP), 1990, under which this tower is being proposed, is outdated and increasingly [controversial](#), especially vis-à-vis [making cities more liveable](#). **We urge Council to do a 20 year review of the HBP, with credible consultation, before any more spot rezonings for buildings over 425'.**



Higher buildings may work in the CBD but don't belong within a few blocks of the water, where they impact scarce and valued public amenities. We don't need "Gateway" bridgehead buildings; we have the mountains as our gateways to nature. The proposal is for 55 stories, but the HBP allows for a 425' tower on this site. Vancouver House has had extensive expert, media and public [criticism](#); an even taller tower will too.

2. Neither the proposal nor the development review have addressed **impacts on/interactions with other major City initiatives in the area**, including housing and infrastructure projects such as the [Granville Bridge Connector](#), [Granville loops development](#), [Richards Bike Lane](#), [Drake bike lane](#) & bike network connections, and the [South False Creek Redevelopment](#) directly across from the site.

3. **Neighbourhood impacts: Liveability** - 601 Beach is counter to planning guidelines intended to ensure False Creek North is home to sustainable, diverse and complete communities.

{False Creek North ODP 1990, Beach CD-1 Guidelines 2002, CD-1 (366) 500 Pacific Street.} Development been "too much, too fast", with rapid densification having cumulative negative impacts on transportation, infrastructure, schools, quality of life (congestion, pollution, shading), and the loss of diversity of incomes and housing types. 601 Beach proposes 455 parking spaces, and doesn't conform with [Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines](#) (2002), which specify 10 – 38 storeys buildings that step down to the water.



601 Beach proposes 455 parking spaces, and doesn't conform with [Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines](#) (2002), which specify 10 – 38 storeys buildings that step down to the water.

Schools - 601 Beach would add 455 units to the hundreds of high-rise condos under construction in V6Z area, yet Elsie Roy Elementary, the only school, operates at capacity (410 students and a long wait list). New schools planned for Roberts Annex and Coal Harbour are 5-10 years away and not walkable from 601 Beach.

4. **Impacts on surrounding neighbourhoods** are not but should be considered, given the location, scale and extreme height of the project. All False Creek North projects significantly affect residents and visitors who live, work, play, shop or commute in/on the Seawall, False Creek North and South, Fairview Slopes, South Granville and Kitsilano. The City should better link False Creek North planning and development [all those neighbourhoods](#).
5. **The Social housing component is flawed**, offering an unacceptable quality of life for residents, in stark contrast to the luxury condo component. The design, with tower market condos above the bridge deck and podium social housing below is a **striking and embarrassing metaphor for social inequity in the City**. Separate entrances, lobbies and elevators clearly reinforce this. The [Urban Design Panel report](#) was critical of the podium social housing fronting the bridge deck, citing lack of light/shading, lack of privacy, air pollution, and traffic noise. These issues remain in the redesign, which shows an outdoor children's play area on level 3, at bridge deck level, and 1/3 of the units with windows facing the bridge. The amount and quality of social housing is far from what was envisioned under current plans and zoning. The proposal has 152 units; we estimate current zoning would allow about 50% more. The City's definition of "social housing" vis-à-vis true affordability has been [controversial](#), and this project would exacerbate public and expert [doubt and concern](#), especially when associated with highly visible luxury condo tower.