

CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-04-06	13:02	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	I am in support of increased density in my area of City Hall. However, I am opposed to ugly big box mid to high rise buildings in my area that will be inconsistent with the style of housing in this area. I would support smaller scale HERITAGE STYLE development, housing 5-7 units. I say NO to this building. Please redesign. If the developer's response is: "I can't make my money out of a smaller development", then my response is: "Too bad. That's your problem. Guess you should have had better foresight."	BOBBY Lee	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-06	13:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	This area should not accommodate buildings taller than six stories. The current infrastructure cannot support the increased population, and the streets are already congested, with insufficient space for two cars to pass simultaneously. High-rise developments would attract a different demographic, disrupting the peaceful nature of the neighborhood. Additionally, they could lead to the proliferation of chain stores, negatively impacting local businesses. Please prioritize the community over gains.	Stephanie Laprise	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-05	16:53	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	This planned structure is not aligned with the historic neighborhood it is in. A development that is clearly about minimizing cost to maximize profits. I want our city planners to be strategic and thoughtful about neighborhoods. I support more rental units but not in the midst of the heritage of Mount Pleasant.	Karen Zygun	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-05	18:06	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	Please limit building housing in residential areas to no more than 6 storeys. The proposed 18 storey building on west 11th is yet another example of how density in some neighbourhoods is destroying the look and feel of our city that was once so beautiful. Please stop the unnecessary density. Even near transit, 20-40+ storeys are not needed.	Sandra Sharples	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-04	15:42	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	This is a small neighborhood street with already very crowded parking and traffic flow. Many cars divert between 12th avenue and Broadway to this residential street, making this small street very busy and sometimes dangerous for families with small children crossing the street. West 11th is not wide enough to accommodate the additional traffic (bikes, pedestrians, vehicles) that the proposed development will generate, and will lead to casualties and accidents (10th is a bike lane with heavy cyclists traffic). There is also not enough street parking existing. Furthermore, how does CoV ensure that the underground sewage infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate this tower? We have already been having overflow issues in recent months.	Mabel Sze	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-04-05	10:11	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	Vancouver residents accept that increased densification and rental housing is needed in our community. However, this needs to be done in a responsible way that respects the history and character of our neighbourhoods. W 11th Ave is a residential community of heritage homes with a mix of single family, multifamily and low rise apartments. There are no business on these side streets. The road is narrow (see attachment) and already cannot accommodate two way traffic as well as parking needs. We also have a lot of bicycles and walkers in our area. This proposal for an 18 storey building with both 165 rental and commercial units is unrealistic in this narrow, strictly residential area. The roads cannot support the additional traffic that would be generated by both the residents as well as customers who would be frequenting the businesses. Large buildings like the one proposed should be situated on main thoroughfares, where both car and foot traffic can be better accommodated. There is already a great deal of development happening on Broadway with several high-rises being built, and likely many more to come. It makes more sense to redevelop the many one and two storey buildings on Broadway, 16th, Cambie and other main roads, rather than placing these super-sized structures in the middle of historic neighbourhoods. These lots could be developed into 6 plexes which would add to housing, but not diminish the nature of this neighbourhood. I would urge Council to consider preserving Vancouver history and the wonderful character that areas like Mount Pleasant bring to the city of Vancouver!	Martin Muller	Mount Pleasant	Attachment 1
2025-04-04	18:42	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	I want to support new building in the city, but I believe that the units will still be expensive and unattainable for the average person. It says that some units would be available below market rent, but market rent right now is outrageously expensive. People should not be expected to pay 2500\$ for a studio apartment just because it is considered the "market" rate. We need more building that will actually help the middle class get into home ownership, not just make the rich richer. It does not make our city any better and just causes gentrification and continual destabilization of our community.	Denise Miller	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-04-03	13:49	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>The area of the proposed development is already facing severe infrastructure strain, and the proposed development will exacerbate existing issues.</p> <p>The local elementary school, with a capacity of just 179 students, is expected to accommodate 483 in the upcoming school year—operating at nearly 180% of its intended capacity. The new school in Olympic Village, which has been delayed for two decades, is not projected to open for another four years, offering no relief. Even when it opens it will absorb existing overcrowding in neighbouring communities, not create new vacancies.</p> <p>Public transit is saturated, with buses regularly overcrowded or completely full during peak hours. Additionally, 12th Avenue is in a state of notable disrepair and is dangerously congested.</p> <p>Current parking availability fails to meet the needs of existing residents, leading to blocked alleys and impassable streets. Introducing additional traffic to already traffic-calmed streets will only worsen these conditions, increasing safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Whilst there is a need for high density housing, it would be better supported and managed in a community that is specifically designed to manage and sustain the capacity, for which this location is not.</p>	Emily Guenette	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-03	19:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am appalled by the audacious effort of developers to totally ruin this very special neighbourhood. Along this section of west 10th and 11th Avenues and adjoining streets are houses dating back to the late 1800s and the streets are lined with beautiful mature trees. This neighbourhood is a cherished testament to the historical and heritage links to the city's past and must be preserved. There are alternative solutions to creating more housing while keeping the integrity of heritage homes intact.</p> <p>This proposal is one of the most bizarre, disruptive and egregious efforts to destroy a part of the city much loved by residents and visitors alike and I strongly urge the City to deny a permit for this application.</p>	ken pattern	Mount Pleasant	

2025-04-07	13:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	We are long term residents in this quaint neighbourhood with a young family. Although we recognize the need for density, we feel a tower in the middle of the neighbourhood will greatly disrupt the neighborhood and feel that there are not enough resources in this community to support this. For example, we often struggle to find a parking spot available on our block due to its proximity to the Canada Line. Our children did not get into the local elementary school due to the wait list., which had 33 children on it. Traffic has already been greatly disrupted by the closure of Yukon Street with cars rapidly driving through Alberta Street, causing a danger to pedestrians and cars. Furthermore, a tower will historic B and I saw in a historic neighbourhood of Vancouver. We feel that compared to most neighbourhoods of Vancouver, ours already has multi units in most buildings and has done a great job thus far of density planning. We feel our neighbourhood could be an inspiration for other neighbourhoods in the city to increase density, but we do not support a tower disrupting the current environment.	Rachel Butler	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-07	14:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	This is a neighborhood made up of old heritage homes. A tower of any size simply would not fit. I can see having a low rise, perhaps 4-5 levels max, but an 18 story tower is absurd and would turn this quiet residential street into complete and utter chaos. As is there is always a fight for street parking; I cannot even imagine what a tower this size would bring to that particular issue. It is also a narrow street with only one direction of cars getting through at a time. It would be a real shame to turn this lovely, vibrant neighborhood into a state of total disarray.	Orly Nash	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-07	18:59	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION FOR 121-129 West 11th Avenue.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 121-129 West 11th Avenue.</p> <p>I am not opposed to change. I am not opposed to building more affordable housing. I am ABSOLUTELY FOR THAT.</p> <p>But I AM 100% against negative change, and change done in a bad and destructive way – which this project, and other projects in the Broadway Plan, are. There is a RIGHT way to do this, and THIS is NOT the right way.</p> <p>This proposal is in an Arts community. It is in a Hospital Community - Mount. St. Joseph's Hospital. The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. The disruption from this kind of construction and negative impact on the hospital and patients being able to access it and life saving care will be HUGE – creating ore congestion and traffic. This kind of project is the LAST thing needed in this area. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDABLE homes in this area (NOT demolish them and displace thousands of residents in place of these ugly, environment destroying – anti Green – luxury towers that only the wealthy can afford to live in), and more social housing – which ABC just voted to reduce even further; absolutely shameful. They clearly do not care one iota for the actual</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	<hr/>

people of Vancouver – who projects like this absolutely do not serve. They only serve the wealthy.

This tower is FAR TOO TALL (AND EXCEEDINGLY UGLY) and will block light and views, and is not in keeping with the neighbourhood and existing buildings and community. THIS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN.

There should be NO towers in residential neighbourhoods. Only towers along main transit routes (Like ON Broadway; this location) Should NOT be any taller than a maximum of 12 storeys. And these should all be at AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRICES (which NONE of these proposals are), and should also include Social Housing – which THE MAJORITY of these proposals are not.

The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDABLE homes in this area (NOT demolish them and displace thousands of residents in place of these ugly, environment destroying – anti Green – luxury towers that only the wealthy can afford to live in), and more social housing – which ABC just voted to reduce even further; absolutely shameful. They clearly do not care one iota for the actual people of Vancouver – who projects like this absolutely do not serve. They only serve the wealthy.

And all of these rezoning proposals that the City are hellbent on forcing though also are not factoring in infrastructure. They are not factoring HUMANITY. They are not factoring the PEOPLE of Vancouver who live here and love here and call this their FOREVER HOMES.

These neighbourhoods are already dense and there are already barely enough streets, park space, schools, health care access and GPs, for people already here.

Now the City wants to build all these super tall towers and bring in 64,000++ + (one of the many high figures I have see on the news and other forms of media) to our ALREADY DENSE communities, with ALREADY STRAINING INFRASTRUCTURES..

...and NONE of these god awful proposals being put forward (and through) are creating more parks.

None will create more green space, more community space, more driving space, more parking space.

None of them will be creating more schools, more libraries, more health care clinics, hospitals, more gyms and community centres.

ALL THESE PROPOSALS WILL:

- DESTROY EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOMES.
- DISPLACE THOUSANDS, SUCH AS “THE POOR” (WHICH INCLUDE):
 - VETERANS
 - SENIORS
 - LOW-INCOME EARNERS AND FAMILIES
 - MID-INCOME EARNERS AND FAMILIES
 - SMALL BUSSINESS OWNERS AND WORKERS

- ARTISTS
- MEDICAL WORKERS WHO NEED TO LIVE IN THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS FOR THEM TO DO THEIR LOCAL HEALTHCARE WORK THERE
- PEOPLE WITH SERIOUS HEALTH CARE NEEDS
• ALL OF THE ABOVE "TYPE" OF HUMANS, ARE OF ZERO INTEREST TO THESE PEOPLE.

• IF YOU FALL UNDER THE ABOVE DESCRIPTIONS, THEN YOU ARE NOTHING TO THESE PEOPLE AND THESE PROPOSALS - TO THEM:

- YOU ARE NOTHING.
- YOU ARE NOT VANCOUVER.
- YOU ARE NOT THE FUTURE OF VANCOUVER.
- YOU ARE USELESS, COLATERAL DAMAGE, AND YOU MUST GO;

SO THAT THE RICH AND THE WEALTHY AND THE HIGHER ("BETTER?") CLASS OF PEOPLE CAN COME IN; AND THEN THEY WILL HAVE THE VANCOUVER, AND THAT IS THE VANCOUVER THAT ALL THESE DEVELOPERS AND PROPOSALS AND THE CITY, IS ENVISIONING.

THIS IS WHAT ALL THIS REALLY IS.
THIS IS INHUMANE.
THIS IS UTTERLY SHAMEFUL

THE VANCOUVER AS WE HAVE ALWAYS KNOWN AND LOVED AND FOUGHT HARD TO PROTECT, WILL BE GONE, GONE ON THIS GREED AND THIS VISION. VANCOUVER WILL BE DEAD
For all this vision of influx of people into these luxury towers, the City and these proposals are also NOT FACTORING in how the life for all the (wealthy only) people that these luxury high rise towers will bring.
No, it's just all about destroying infrastructure and community. Demolishing the incident infrastructure and community (and affordable homes) that we ALREADY have, to be able to put up fancy, ugly, high rise, show-box sized apartments, fire hazard, earthquake hazard, monstrous luxury towers.

If you want to bring in more people – YOU NEED WAYYYY MORE INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY BUILDINGS AND NEEDS!!!
WE NEED:
TO KEEP THE ALREADY AMAZING AND BEAUTIFUL, AND INKEEPING WITH THE OLD CHARACTER NEIGHBOURHOODS AESTHETIC, AND WITH BEING ABLE TO HAVE VISUAL ACCESS TO LOTS OF GLORIOUS LIGHT AND THE AMAZING, MAJESTIC MOUNTAINS OF VANCOUVER. THIS IS WHY WE ARE ALL HERE!! - WE ARE HERE (AND PUT UP WITH ALL THE NONSENSE; FROM CITY HALL, FROM LIFE IN GENERAL) BECAUSE THIS IS VANCOUVER. OUR SUPERNATURAL, BEAUTIFUL, INCREDIBLE VANCOUVER. - BECAUSE OF ITS MOUNTAINS, BEACHES, NATURE.

TAKE THIS AWAY, AND VANCOUVER WILL VERY QUICKLY BECOME JUST BE ANOTHER SHITHOLE CONCRETE JUNGLE CITY, WITH DISGUSTING, NON-GREEN, UGLY, LUXURY HIGHRISE MONSTROSITIES, THAT NOONE WANTS TO VISIT OR LIVE AT.

AND WE NEED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE RIGHT WAY – LOW RISE BUILDINGS, INKEEPING WITH THE BEAUTIFUL, OLD, CHARACTER NEIGHBOURHOODS OF VANCOUVER.

NEED TO BUILD ON UNINHABITED LAND, UNDEVELOPED LAND, ON TOP OF COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

AND WE NEED TO ALL BE DOING EVERYTHING WE CAN TO PROTECT OUR EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BEAUTIFUL, OLD, CHARACTER NEIGHBOURHOODS (OUR PROPER, HISTORICAL, VANCOUVER), PROTECT IT LIKE GOLD -

- NOT ALLOW THE CITY AND THESE TYPES OF DEVELOPERS TO DO WHAT IT WISHES TO DO WITH OUR LAND AND HOMES, AND LIVES:

WHICH IS TO “SCORCH EARTH” IT ALL, FOR WEALTH AND THE WEALTHY.

- THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS HAPPILY DEMOLISHING HISTORICAL, AESTHETICALLY PLEASING, FIRE AND EARTHQUAKE SAFE, LOWRISE BUILDINGS AND HOMES,

- THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS HAPPILY DISPLACING THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE AND

- THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS HAPPILY DESTROYING THOUSANDS OF LIVES,

- THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS HAPPILY DISPLACING MEDICALLY VULNERABLE RESIDENTS WHO HAVE TO LIVE IN THESE HOMES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS TO HAVE ACCESS TO CRITICAL LIFE SUSTAINING MEDICAL CARE...

-

- ALL THIS, TO PUT THESE HIGH RISE LUXURY, SMALL-SCALE SIZES APARTMENTS, THAT ONLY THE WEALTHY WILL BE ABLE TO LIVE IN.

WHO ON EARTH IS THIS NONSENSE FOR????

NOT VANCOUVER AND ITS PEOPLE

Only the developers AND THE WEALTHY

DO NOT BLOCK THE MOUNTAINS. This is the reason why Vancouver is so amazing and people choose to very work hard and call it home Without the mountains, and with these ugly luxury towers, Vancouver will just be another ugly, crappy, urban jungle.

This neighbourhood is NOT a Downtown. It is NOT a City Centre.

It is part of Vancouver's rich history, being one of its oldest; with beautiful, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, low-rise buildings that compliment the natural beauty of the area.

There is no place for luxury towers. These towers will not enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and community. They will destroy it.

It makes ZERO sense to destroy already affordable housing for these monster towers, which will, no matter how much The City continues to claim, NOT be affordable.

If these proposals were actually building the much needed, and more, affordable housing, then people would be absolutely on board – but not in the form of towers.

And these towers are not going to be affordable housing any way.

Even having apartments in these towers at 20% bellow market rate, they are still going be at least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and they will be SIGNIFICANLTY smaller as well.

So we will be asked to lose our beautiful, affordable homes, to be rehoused god knows where and in god knows what conditions, then eventually move into these towers and pay MUCH more and have MUCH LESS space. THIS IS PURE INSANITY.

Do not Scorched-Earth existing, beautiful, affordable, neighbourhoods for new developments. Instead, build on undeveloped land or on top of commercial buildings.

The video on The City website of this tower does not actually show INSIDE the building.

If it did, it would show that the living spaces in these towers are SIGNIFICANTLY smaller than the size of the already affordable housing that The City wants to tear down to build this tower.

A one bedroom in the already existing affordable housing in the beautiful low-rise buildings here average 600 sq ft.

The “small scale units” in these towers will be HALF the size, if not even smaller. That is not a livable space. That is not a home.

AND WHY CAN'T THE CITY GIVE ESSENTIAL INFORMATION CLEARLY? WHY HIDE THE ACTUAL LIVING SPACE MEASUREMENTS IN THIS FLOOR SPACE RATIO 5.8 GOBBEDLDYGOOK? WHY CAN'T YOU JUST SIMPLY SAY HOW MANY SQUARE FEET AN APARTMENT AND A ROOM IS???? WHY SO DECEPTIVE?

The proposal states that 20% of the apartments in this tower will be at below-market value.

BUT BELOW-MARKET RENT IS STILL UNAFFORDABLE. THIS IS NOT

AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

My rent is \$1200. Others pay just \$1000, or even less. And we pay this for beautiful one-bedroom apartments that are 600 sq ft or larger.

These apartments this luxury tower will offer are significantly smaller than this.

So, we are being asked to give up our ALREADY AFFORDABLE, beautiful, healthy sized, homes for tower apartments that are much smaller and will cost much more.

THIS IS NOT LIKE-FOR-LIKE.

THIS IS NOT HELPING THE HOUSING CRISIS, BUT INSTEAD ADDING TO IT.

And taking living space away from people with ALSO ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS.

Towers completely go against the concept of providing affordable housing and Vancouver being the greenest and most beautiful city.

And this tower is UTTELRY HIDEOUS.

These towers will not be for residents of the community. They will be for the wealthy.

They will block the natural light that is so important to all aspects of health and wellbeing.

You deprive people of space and light, this will ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS, as well as ADDING TO THE HOUSING CRISIS.

The City claims there are excellent Tenant Relocation and Protection Policies.

This is pure fantasy, and an insult.

Where will The City put all these Vancouver residents who are made homeless when their affordable homes are destroyed for these luxury towers to be built go? – it most certainly will not be in the same neighbourhoods.

It does not say where these displaced tenants will go for the years that it takes to tear down their homes and build these towers.

And that the tenants who are forced out of their beautiful, affordable homes

for these towers will be able to move back in to them at below-market value.

As I have already said, this will STILL BE HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS MORE than the rent they are paying in their already affordable homes, and the space will be much, much smaller too.

People live here because they love it and because it is ALREADY AFFORDABLE. People with low to middle income, healthcare workers, seniors, people with disabilities and essential healthcare needs.

Do we all need to apply under with The Registry for Social Housing? So that we are not forced out of our neighbourhoods by these unaffordable towers? So, is it a case of, Register for Social Housing or be homeless? Also, many people live here because THEY HAVE TO - I am just one of those people. And there are thousands more here like me. And if I cannot afford to live here, because of losing my affordable housing to these luxury unaffordable towers, I'm completely SCREWED.

Rezoning projects like this force residents out of their homes and communities; taking them away from the essential, life-sustaining, healthcare that they need to have access to.

And forcing people who live here because they also work here is going to result in them all having to driving in to the area (as they will be forced to live in the Suburbs and there is no transit infrastructure to here from most suburban areas – another reason why I am such a proponent of building OUT – NOT UP - and creating proper infrastructure there and between there and the city); so more cars, more traffic, and more pollution.

Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.

I refer you to the GRENFELL TOWER FIRE IN LONDON IN 2017.

This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.

But the fact remains that BECAUSE IT WAS A TOWER IT WAS A SIGNIFICANT RISK FACTOR; as people were not able to get out in time due to limited stairwell space and access, and seniors and people with disabilities being unable to use or get down the stairs in time.

TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.

This was a 24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured. There have been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.

THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.

I live in a 3-STOREY LOW-RISE APARTMENT. We had a FIRE alarm just before Christmas.

Everyone was OUT OF THE BUILDING WITHIN JUST 30 SECONDS. Think about this...

The City wants towers that height and even higher; up to 50 story's, 50, now 60.

More floors in a tower =/+ more people in the tower = the more extreme risk to get everyone out safety in the event of a fire; and the more the chance of safety and survival goes down – more deaths.

There is a formula used in building risk assessment mathematics that says if you go above 6 floors, each story adds another 5 % risk (or 5% less chance of surviving a fire), and another 5% for the floor above, and so on – so each added floor adds 5% further increased risk of death in case of a fire in these towers.

If we maintain the format of building low rise buildings that we have already existing in our beautiful neighborhoods here, then we would not have to worry ourselves with these statistics; with this rate that each floor that you build higher, the higher the risk people dying in a fire is.

If we keep with the low rise buildings, this would not have to be even a remote concern. As I said, my building had a fire alarm in early December 2024; it's a three level story, and even myself with a disability, we were all able to get out onto the street in less than 30 seconds. THIS LEVEL OF SAFETY SIMPLY CANNOT BE ACHIEVED IN TOWERS.

AND I REFER YOU FURTEHR STILL TO YET ANOTHER TERRIBEL EVEN THAT JUST HAPPENED, THAT IS ANOTHER CLEAR EXAMPLE AND REASON WHY NOT TO BUILD HIGHRISES –

THE MYANMAR/THAILAND EARTHQUAKE.

DOZENS OF PEOPLE IN THOSE TOWERS HAVE DIED, DOZENS MORE ARE IN HOSPOITAL AND FIGHTING FOR THEIR LIVES (AND QAULITY OF LIFE – A NUMBER HAVE SERIOUS HEAD TRAMUAS).

AND AS OF RIGHT NOW (12:29 PST MONDAY APRIL 7, 2025) 137 PEOPLE REMAIN TRAPPED IN THE DEBRIS FROM THE HIGHRISE TOWERS. EVEN MORE REASON TO STOP AND PROPR THINK ABOUT THE (NON)SAFTERY OF TOWERS.

We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT

			<p>DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOURHOODS. We do not have the SPACE in what is already a dense, very congested area to add these towers and the amount of people that come with them.</p> <p>Also, this location is close to VGH and its helicopter landing pad and towers compromise the flight paths of emergency helicopters. And more people mean more cars and more traffic, compromising ambulance and public access to the hospital and urgent medical centres.</p> <p>AND, local businesses will NOT survive if these towers and their mainstream retail outlets are built.</p> <p>Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• STOP destroying Vancouver neighbourhoods.• STOP destroying Vancouver communities.• STOP destroying Vancouver residents’ LIVES.• STOP destroying our beautiful Vancouver. <p>* STOP making it even harder and harder for people with disabilities to be able to remain in the Hospital Zone area for their healthcare and life support needs.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Very concerned and very proud Fairview resident,</p> <p>Fiona O’Connell</p> <p><small>§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p> <p><small>§ 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-04-07	21:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	I was previously living in 121 w 11th but felt forced to move after receiving notice that the building could be redeveloped. My landlord offered very little clarity or information throughout the entire process. This redevelopment will lead to the loss of affordable housing. These buildings are currently occupied by long term tenants paying affordable and livable rates. The payment plan in place for displaced tenants did not apply to me as I had not lived there long enough to qualify. I was a tenant there for 2 years, 2023-2025, and I had made the place my home. It is sad to know that the building replacing these lots is projected to have such a small amount of units below market rate. Also, what does that imply? What qualifies as "below market rate"? And will this be a rate that adheres to our current or future market? Rent will continue to rise, and I imagine this will influence the future rental prices. I am a young recent university graduate and the redevelopment of these types of properties is terrifying. This is the only type of rental I can afford, but now it's being replaced by a large luxury building. These decisions will continue to push students and low income individuals out of the city, and that is disgraceful.	Nico McGiffin	Kitsilano	
2025-04-08	19:18	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	Dear Vancouver Mayor Ken Sim and Vancouver City Council: I am writing to oppose the rezoning application for 121-129 West 11th Ave. The current zoning is RT-6 (Residential). The RT-6 zoning is appropriate and correct for this Mount Pleasant neighborhood. 11th and 10th Avenues between Main Street and Cambie Street is a family neighborhood with primarily beautiful historic homes. The neighborhood is quiet and safe, with long-term renters and affordable rents. A decision to approve this rezoning application will have irreversible negative impacts on the neighborhood. 165 units with the corresponding cars and parking demands will overrun the quiet neighbourhood with traffic. 18 stories exceed the height limits for the area, breaching the protected sight lines from Queen Elizabeth Park that once lost cannot be returned. In a city known for its natural beauty, the city has a duty to preserve site lines for all Vancouverites and future generations to enjoy. Further, a guarantee that 20% of residential floor area will be below market means that 80% of units will be at or above market value. It is well documented that market rate housing is not affordable for the majority of renters living in Vancouver. A decision to approve this rezoning request is not in the best interest of the neighborhood, current and/or future renters, or the preservation of our beautiful sight lines in Vancouver. A decision to approve this rezoning request benefits property developers, and signals the true values held by this Mayor and City Counsel. Please do not approve this rezoning application. There are options other than building towers to increase density in Vancouver neighbourhoods.	Ian MacLeod	Mount Pleasant	
2025-04-08	12:23	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the proposed rezoning for this development as it is far too tall for the area and unsuitable for the character of the neighbourhood.	Allan English	Mount Pleasant	

Report date range from: 2/4/2025 12:00:01 AM to: 4/15/2025 11:00:00 AM

2025-04-11	12:26	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>For the past 30 years Mt Pleasant has operated under the program of increased density in exchange for heritage preservation. This program has been very successful in creating missing middle housing in a walkable, affordable family oriented neighbourhood. At the same time Mt Pleasant absorbed 12,000 people (the population of Pt Grey) and is the 4th highest density in the city with out the need for towers.</p> <p>To drop a 20+ story tower in the middle of a residential block with commercial space on the ground floor will create shadowing remove green space and crowd the sidewalk.</p> <p>Finally Mt Pleasant has the second highest density of people per hectare of park in the city 2,700 per hectare even higher than downtown at 2,200 per hectare. To increase to the level of density that is created by towers without any increase in park space is against planning norms, especially since people in towers need access to green space.</p>	Andrew Nichols	Mount Pleasant	
2025-02-26	17:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>The proposition that 18 storeys is financially feasible while 14 is not is rich - considering the below-market financing available from CMHC for rental projects which only requires interest-only payments until the project is completed. We should not be giving up our public goods for private profit. Approve 14 storeys only.</p>	Mark Trischuk	Mount Pleasant	

2025-03-18	16:39	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	Ruining the fabric of distinct communities. We can do better to respect our environment and those that live there, while respecting traditional lands.	Allan Prazsky	Kitsilano	
2025-03-31	15:29	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>There seem to be some consequential irregularities in the staff report entitled Strata Title Conversion of 4288 Yew Street: Excerpt: "A total of 170 strata lots are proposed in this "Block B – South" building of this mixed-use development." Staff assert that "The Owner always intended for ASP 2 to be strata titled upon completion of construction" The staff report refers to the Development Permit that approved the building. But staff fail to mention that the Development Permit staff report at the time clearly said that this for "a seven storey, mixed use building containing 170 residential rental dwellings." At the very least, City Council should put this strata-titling process on hold until Council receives a comprehensive report that provides information on:</p> <p>exactly what the rezoning report for this site said what was said by applicant, staff, and City Council at the public hearing for the rezoning, and a legal opinion on whether Council is legally obliged to approve this strata-titling. (Noting that other municipalities have moratoriums on strata-titling of occupied buildings.)</p>	Rice Tart	West Point Grey	
2025-03-31	16:33	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	Totally inappropriate development for 18 stories in this existing low rise area. If this was on a major thoroughfare, it could be acceptable. But on a quiet side street that is already quite densely populated. This makes no sense whatsoever. Six stories might be acceptable, but not 18 - this is not the West End where high-rise is typical. Please don't destroy 30 years of intricate city planning by allowing this to happen.	Laurel Clarke	Mount Pleasant	

CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-04-14	13:41	CD-1 Rezoning: 121-129 West 11th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I oppose the current proposal because of two elements. Firstly, the inclusion of a podium and commercial space, which while important on a commercial street such as Broadway, on 11th it increases the mass and visual intrusion at the lower levels, making the proposal much more intrusive than it needs to be within the immediate vicinity, and reduces the opportunity to setback the property from the edges and soften the building into its environment with landscaping.</p> <p>Secondly, the site is connected to a lane dedication that currently is unused and overgrown, why is this not being used to provide access to the parking. The arrangement from the street, again is a visual intrusion and reduces space for treatments to help integrate the proposal into the neighborhood.</p>	Ian Sproul	Mount Pleasant	