

CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-05-15	16:23	CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue	Oppose	<p>If not for longstanding plans to be out of province on May 20/25, I would appear in person and look each councillor in the eyes as I challenge you to respect and honour the legitimate concerns of homeowners and renters who live in the neighbourhood and are opposed to the rezoning proposal as presented.</p> <p>Unable to do so in person, I challenge you in writing to do the right thing by approving construction of a building not to exceed 14 stories rather than the 24 stories indicated in the revised proposal.</p> <p>Destruction of neighbourhood character: Have a good look at the renderings and all details for the proposed building, and assess whether you would support construction of such a building adjacent to or near your own home. I challenge you to treat this proposal through that lens.</p> <p>Market demand: Please review market realities and assess whether approving the proposal as submitted and recommended by City staff will exceed market demand.</p> <p>I ask whether you have taken the time to stand in front of the current building at 1770 West 12th Avenue, and if you’ve walked the narrow lane behind the property. Do you have any care or concern for the voters who live in the neighbouring homes the proposed building would dwarf?</p> <p>Traffic congestion and safety: Have you taken notice of the already heavy traffic around Burrard Street and 12th Avenue? Consider the inherent traffic congestion in a lane and on neighbouring streets that were designed for three-storey condos and residential homes. The lane and surrounding streets are not suitable for accommodating a 24-storey tower with 264 cramped residential units and commercial space, and the increased traffic associated with parking spaces for 171 vehicles and 477 bikes.</p> <p>Accountability: This Council’s actions, and conversations with some City staff members with whom we’ve spoken, give the impression people making recommendations and decisions are going through motions with no regard for the character of our city, its neighbourhoods and people. There seems to be an absence of acknowledgement that you are accountable to your communities of voters and taxpayers. Please prove me wrong.</p> <p>Please do what’s right for the community, rather than for developers: I ask that you do what’s right for the people who will be adversely impacted by this development proposal, even though a review of this Council’s track record suggests you will approve all or most of what’s proposed.</p> <p>I ask to you consider the following, and to reject the proposal as presented; please identify and require revisions reflecting the following. I ask you to consider your actions from the perspective of people who elect our Councillors to serve us, rather than voting in a manner</p>	Shelagh Donnelly	Fairview	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3

			<p>that could be perceived as reflecting being in developers’ pockets.</p> <p>1. OPPOSITION TO EXCESSIVE HEIGHT AND DENSITY, AND CONCERNS RE ADVERSE IMPACTS TO NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER: The proposed height of 76.6 m/251 feet to the top of a residential parapet before accounting for additional height for rooftop amenity space is ridiculously out of place. Look at the renderings and ask if you would want such a building in your neighbourhood.</p> <p>2. LANE CONGESTION AND SAFETY: The existing lane behind 1770 West 12th Avenue is inadequate for the increased vehicle and bike traffic the building would generate. I note the proposed inclusion of 171 vehicles spaces and 477 bicycle spaces, all to be accessed from the rear lane. This would only exacerbate traffic and safety issues. The provision of speed bumps as noted in item 2. (g) within Appendix B of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report would not address traffic, air quality and safety concerns.</p> <p>3. CONGESTION AND SAFETY ON FIR and BURRARD STREETS: The traffic the proposed building would generate must, by necessity, head to either Fir Street (which is already packed with parked cars lining the street, with only a single lane available for drivers) or Burrard Street. Again, please walk the site of the proposed building and the adjacent block. The proposed density is impractical for the scale of the neighbourhood, the lane and the surrounding streets.</p> <p>4. REQUIRE DEVELOPER TO MAINTAIN AND PROTECT THE MATURE, HEALTHY LANE TREES THAT ARE HOME TO BIRDLIFE WHILE ALSO PROVIDING OXYGEN AND NATURE FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD: Page nine (9) of the April 1, 2025 “Referral Report”, includes a reference to “Natural Assets”. That section reads, in part, “The Protection of Trees By-law aims to maintain a healthy urban forest by requiring permission be sought to remove trees that meet certain conditions. The intent is to retain and protect as many healthy, viable trees as possible, while still meeting the challenges of development. This is in keeping with City goals to achieve resilient and healthy natural systems in our urban areas. There are 8 on-site trees and 10 city trees that are proposed for removal. The final number of new trees will be determined through the development permit process.”</p> <p>a) The Referral Report fails to note that the trees to be removed include a magnificent stand of mature trees spanning the lane behind the 1700 block of West 12th Avenue. These trees reach higher than the three-storey buildings on the block.</p> <p>b) These trees lining the lane are home to birds, and they provide oxygen as well as greatly needed green space and nature for the community.</p> <p>c) How does Council determine which is given priority, “the challenges of development” or the maintenance of healthy and beautiful, mature trees that are part of the character of the neighbourhood?</p> <p>d) Please see the attached pictures of the trees for reference.</p> <p>e) It is our understanding, following communications with City staff, that the developer and City staff support chopping down all these lane trees. This is shameful. We’ve been given to understand “replacement” trees would be planted. How are such trees to grow and flourish in the shadow of the proposed monolith of a building?</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>5. ADVERSE SHADOWING OF NEIGHBOURING HOMES/VOTERS’ RESIDENCES; INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE CITY TO FOCUS ON IMPACTS SOLELY ON PUBLIC PROPERTIES: Page six (6) of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report references “Shadowing” and states, “The proposal presents no shadow impacts on public open spaces, parks or schools.” It is both remarkable and frustrating that the referral report ignores the substantial shadow impacts on neighbouring private properties.</p> <p>a) It’s only because the property is surrounded by private properties that there are no public open spaces, parks or schools that might be impacted by shadowing.</p> <p>b) Many residents/voters – homeowners and renters alike – who live in the immediate vicinity of the building, in private properties, will be adversely impacted by shadowing.</p> <p>c) When this redevelopment was proposed and I contacted City staff with concerns about the proposed building’s impact on neighbours, I was told the City considers impacts solely on public properties. This seems bizarre and inappropriate.</p> <p>6. RECOMMENDED SETBACK WILL ADVERSELY IMPACT NEIGHBOURS: Page seven of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report references “Public Realm and Interface”. There’s a statement that, “Staff have prepared a condition to increase the setback along Burrard Street to support ‘spill over’ retail activities, landscaping and urban elements such as seating, signage, and bike racks.” Such a setback will have adverse impacts on neighbours/voters to the rear of the proposed building, in terms of shadows, noise and further loss of privacy.</p> <p>7. THE THREE SEPARATE OUTDOOR AMENITY SPACES WILL ADVERSELY IMPACT NEIGHBOURS/VOTERS: Page seven (7) of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report references “Private Amenity Space”. It states, “The development offers on-site common indoor and outdoor amenities for the residents at the podium and tower rooftop. An additional common outdoor amenity is located at ground level in a south courtyard facing the lane.”</p> <p>a) The proposed podium, the rooftop amenity space and the additional common outdoor amenity in a south courtyard facing the lane would all create noise issues for neighbours. It is disappointing and mind boggling that the City apparently ignores impacts on private properties and the voters who live in such properties.</p> <p>8. 24 STORIES ON A SIX-STOREY PLATFORM WILL NOT BE GOOD FOR THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD, AND SUPPLY WILL LIKELY EXCEED DEMAND: Page six (6) of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report references “Form of Development”. It states, “The Plan supports a residential tower up to 20 storeys on a four-storey podium. However, the Plan acknowledges that increases in building height, generally up to six additional storeys, can be considered in circumstances where additional building height helps achieve better urban design outcomes. The proposal includes 24 storeys on a six-storey podium ... These changes are minor, do not unduly impact the adjacent context, and keep within the Plan’s urban design objectives.”</p> <p>a) How on earth can one believe, as stated in April 1, 2025 Referral Report, that “These changes are minor, do not unduly impact the adjacent context ...”? Such proposed changes are substantial, rather than minor.</p> <p>b) These changes do impact neighbouring properties and voters (are we voters the “adjacent context?”), and we strongly oppose the proposed increase to a six-storey podium as well as</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>the proposed 24 stories, rather than 20 stories. We understand a new building will be a reality and, as above, support up to 14 stories in height, with a four-storey podium. Anything more will be an eyesore and it's likely the building will have vacancies that may result in proposals to sell units.</p> <p>9. A CHALLENGE TO THE STATEMENT THAT THIS PROJECT'S SCALE IS MODEST AND NEED NOT UNDERGO URBAN DESIGN PANEL REVIEW: Page seven (7) of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report contains a remarkable statement in association with the heading, "Urban Design Panel". It was with disappointment that I read the statement, "A review by the Urban Design Panel was not required due to the project's modest scale and general consistency with the Plan's expectations." How on earth is a 24-storey mixed-use rental building consisting of 264 units, soaring 76.6 m/251 feet in the air a project of "modest scale"?</p> <p>10. INSUFFICIENT LOCAL SCHOOL SPACES: Page four (4) of the appropriately dated April 1, 2025 "Referral Report" references "Local School Capacity" and states, "The site is located within the catchment of Shaughnessy Elementary School and Kitsilano Secondary School." Please do have a look at a map. Shaughnessy Elementary School is situated more than two kilometres (2.3 km) from the proposed building.</p> <p>a) First of all, look at the proposed building and unit sizes; ask if you would raise children in such tight spaces.</p> <p>b) If people with children are to live in the building, that 2.3 km commute to school would require parents to have cars and drive their children over to Granville Street and head south toward King Edward before making a left turn off King Edward to reach the school. Not many parents living in such a building would have the luxury of driving their children to and from school.</p> <p>c) The other option for children living in the proposed building to attend Shaughnessy Elementary School would involve young children walking or biking (with no bike lanes) south on busy Burrard Street, across 16th Avenue and through the meandering streets of Shaughnessy before crossing another busy street, King Edward Avenue, to reach school. How realistic is this?</p> <p>d) The Referral Report understandably refrains from mentioning the closer elementary school, which is Lord Tennyson Elementary/Ecole Lord Tennyson. This is unsurprising, as this French immersion school is incredibly popular and demand exceeds spaces.</p> <p>11. OPPOSITION TO LIVE/WORK UNITS FACING THE LANE: Please see Appendix "B" ("PAGE 4 of 15") of the April 1, 2025 Referral Report references "Economic Development". The item reads, "1.15 Recommend alignment of live/work units to the alley". Why would staff or Council recommend aligning business-related units to face the lane and neighbours/voters, rather than facing 12th Avenue and its transit offerings?</p> <p>12. PROPOSE A REQUIREMENT THAT CURRENT LANE UTILITIES BE MOVED UNDERGROUND: If the proposed development is to be of any benefit to the neighbourhood, why not include a requirement that the utilities in the lane be moved underground?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2025-05-15	17:00	CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION FOR 1770 W. 12th Avenue</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 1770 W. 12th 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 chance 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 residential, family, neighbourhood community. It is a Hospital and Health Care Community – VGH, the Medical Mile, all the clinics and facilities here that thousands of people access daily, and thousands of people live here because of working here, or needing to have direct access to the life saving care from here.</p> <p>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 more congestion and traffic. This kind of project is the LAST thing needed in this area. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDBALE 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The last thing this area needs, and can accommodate, is a project such as this. What IS needed is protecting the ALREADY AFFORDBALE 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>...and NONE of these god awful proposals being put forward (and through) are creating more</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview
------------	-------	--------------------------------------	--------	--	----------------	----------

			<p>parks.</p> <p>None will create more green space, more community space, more driving space, more parking space.</p> <p>None of them will be creating more schools, more libraries, more health care clinics, hospitals, more gyms and community centres.</p> <p>ALL THESE PROPOSALS WILL: DESTROY EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOMES. DISPLACE THOUSANDS, SUCH AS “THE POOR” (WHICH INCLUDE):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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 AFFORDABEL HOUSING IN THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS FOR THEM TO DO THEIR LOCAL HEALTHCARE WORK THERE- PEOPLE WITH SERIOUS HEALTH CARE NEEDS <p>ALL OF THE ABOVE “TYPE” OF HUMANS, ARE OF ZERO INTEREST TO THESE PEOPLE.</p> <p>IF YOU FALL UNDER THE ABOVE DESCRIPTIONS, THEN YOU ARE NOTHING TO THESE PEOPLE AND THESE PROPSOALS - TO THEM:</p> <p>YOU ARE NOTHING. YOU ARE NOT VANCOUVER. YOU ARE NOT THE FUTURE OF VANCOUVER. YOU ARE USELESS, COLATERAL DAMAGE, AND YOU MUST GO;</p> <p>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 PROPSOALS AND THE CITY, IS ENVISIONING.</p> <p>THIS IS WHAT ALL THIS REALLY IS. THIS IS INHUMANE. THIS IS UTTERLY SHAMEFUL</p> <p>THE VANCOUVER AS WE HAVE ALWAYS KNOWN AND LOVED AND FOUGHT HARD TO PROTECT, WILL BE GONE, GONE OT THIS GREED AND THIS VISION. VANCOUVER WILL BE DEAD</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If you want to bring in more people – YOU NEED WAYYYY MORE INFRASTRUCURE AND COMMUNITY BUILDINGS AND NEEDS!!!</p> <p>WE NEED: TO KEEP THE ALREADY AMAZING AND BEAUTIFUL, AND INKEEPING WITH THE OLD CHARATER NEIGHBOURHODDS AESTHITC, AND WITH BEING ABLE TO HAVE VISUAL ACCESS TO LOTS OF GLORIOUS LIGHT AND THE AMAZING, MAJESTIC MOUNTAINS OF VANCOUVER.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>THIS IS WHY WE ARE ALL HERE!! - WE ARE HERE (AND PUT UP WITH ALL THE NONSENSE; FROM CITY HALL, FROM LIFE IN GEENRAL) BECAUSE THIS IS VANCOUVER. OUR SUPERNATURAL, BEAUTIFUL, INCREDIBLE VANCOUCVER. - BECAUSE OF ITS MOUNTAINS, BEACHES, NATURE.</p> <p>TAKE THIS AWAY, AND VANCOUVER WILL VERY QUICKLY BECOME JUST BE ANOTHER SH! THOLE CONCRETE JUNGLE CITY, WITH DISGUSTING, NON-GREEN, UGLY, LUXURY HIGHRISE MONSTROISTIES, THAT NOONE WANTS TO VISIT OR LIVE AT.</p> <p>AND WE NEED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE RIGHT WAY – LOW RISE BUILDINGS, INKEEPING WITH THE BEAUFITUL, OLD, CHARACTER NEIGHBOURHOODS OF VANCOUVER. NEED TO BUILD ON UNINHABITED LAND, UNDEVELOPED LAND, ONTOP OF COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.</p> <p>AND WE NEED TO ALL BE DOING EVERYTHING WE CAN TO PROTECT OUR EXISITING AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BEAUFITUL, OLD, CHARACTER NEIGHBHOURHOODS (OUR PROPER, HISTORICAL, VANCOUVER), PROTECT IT LIKE GOLD -</p> <p>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 WEATHLY. THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS HAPPILY DEMOLISHING HISTRORICAL, AESTHETICALLY PLEASING, FIRE AND EARTHQUARE SAFE, LOWRISE BUILDINGS AND HOMES, THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS HAPPILY DISPLACING THOUSHANDS 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 NEIGHBHOURHOODS TO HAVE ACCESS TO CRITIAL LIFE SUSTAINING MEDICAL CARE...</p> <p>ALL THIS, TO PUT THESE HIGH RISE LUXURY, SMALL-SCALE SIZES APPERTMENTS, THAT ONLY THE WEATHLY WILL BE ABLE TO LIVE IN.</p> <p>WHO ON EARTH IS THIS NONSENSE FOR????? NOT VANCOUVER AND IT’S PEOPLE Only the developers AND THE WEALTHY</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>THIS IS A HOSPITAL ZONE.</p> <p>There is no place for luxury towers. These towers will not enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood and community. They will destroy it.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>And these towers are not going to be affordable housing any way.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Do not Scorched-Earth existing, beautiful, affordable, neighbourhoods for new developments. Instead, build on undeveloped land or on top of commercial buildings.</p> <p>The video on The City website of this tower does not actually show INSIDE the building.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A one bedroom in the already existing affordable housing in the beautiful low-rise buildings here average 600 sq ft.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>AND WHY CAN’T THE CITY GIVE ESSENTIAL INFORMATION CLEARLY? WHY HIDE THE ACTUAL LIVING SPACE MEASUREMENTS IN THIS FLOOR SPACE RATIO 6.8 GOBBEDLDYGOOK? WHY CAN’T YOU JUST SIMPLY SAY HOW MANY SQUARE FEET AN APARTMENT AND A ROOM IS???? WHY SO DECEPTIVE?</p> <p>The proposal states that 20% of the apartments in this tower will be at below-market value.</p> <p>BUT BELOW-MARKET RENT IS STILL UNAFFORDABLE. THIS IS NOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>These apartments this luxury tower will offer are significantly smaller than this.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>THIS IS NOT LIKE-FOR-LIKE.</p> <p>THIS IS NOT HELPING THE HOUSING CRISIS, BUT INSTEAD ADDING TO IT.</p> <p>And taking living space away from people with ALSO ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS.</p> <p>Towers completely go against the concept of providing affordable housing and Vancouver being the greenest and most beautiful city.</p> <p>And this tower is UTTELRY HIDEOUS.</p> <p>These towers will not be for residents of the community. They will be for the wealthy.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>They will block the natural light that is so important to all aspects of health and wellbeing.</p> <p>You deprive people of space and light, this will ADD TO THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS, as well as ADDING TO THE HOUSING CRISIS.</p> <p>The City claims there are excellent Tenant Relocation and Protection Policies.</p> <p>This is pure fantasy, and an insult.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Something else that needs to be considered is Fire Safety.</p> <p>I refer you to the GRENFELL TOWER FIRE IN LONDON IN 2017.</p> <p>This was even more so tragic because of the material used on the outside of the building acted as an accelerant for the fire.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>TOWERS ARE A SIGNIFICANT FIRE RISK.</p> <p>This was a 24-storey tower. 72 people died, 2 later in hospital, 73 more injured. There have</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>been many similar tragedies throughout the world in such towers.</p> <p>THEY DO NOT BUILD TOWERS IN LONDON ANYMORE SINCE THIS.</p> <p>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...</p> <p>The City wants towers that height and even higher; up to 50 story's, 50, now 60.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>And i refer you further still to yet another terrible even that just happened, that is another clear example and reason why not to build high-rises –</p> <p>The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.</p> <p>Hundreds of people died both in those towers and died by being trapped in the debris of those towers - even more reason to stop and proper think about the (non)safety of towers. We should building OUT, not UP! We should be working with other municipalities and putting in proper infrastructure to support this. NOT DESTROYING EXISTING, ALREADY AFFORDABLE, BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBOUHOODS. 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.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<div><div>• STOP destroying our beautiful Vancouver.</div><div>* 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.</div><div>Yours sincerely,</div><div>Very concerned and very proud Fairview, Vancouver resident,</div><div>Fiona O’Connell</div></div>			
2025-05-15	18:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue	Oppose	<div><div>Ethically, I disagree with the amount of affordable housing being offered at actually affordable rents in this project. This part of the city needs homes for minimum wage workers! 20% below market is not affordable for apartments.</div><div>These towers are also being built in a location that completely interferes with the stunning, iconic experience of John Hendry Park. Why wouldn't that be cherished and preserved as part of our heritage? There are so many places to build massive towers that do not reek havoc with the long term health of our city. And by health, I mean preserving our green spaces and views that keep us in touch with the natural wonder of the beauty of this part of our Province, country and world.</div></div>	Sherry Lukits	Grandview-Woodland	
2025-05-16	07:33	CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue	Oppose	<div><div>I live at 1777 West 13th, a condo building across the lane from 1770 West 12th. I agree we need more density in Vancouver, more affordable rentals, but I am very strongly opposed to several aspects of this new rental building. I am opposed to (1) the height and size (2) cutting down of trees along the alley (3) the cost and size of the rental units (4) the outdoor children's play area and the dog off-leash area. (5) parking and loading</div><div>(1) Size. NO to 25 storeys, NO to 20 storeys. Yes to 12 or 14 storeys. The initial proposal was a 4 storey podium with a tower of 20 (or 21?) storeys, and I objected to this when the CoV was accepting comments. Suddenly the latest proposal increases the podium height by 50% to 6 storeys, and the tower to a total height of 24 storeys. And the comments by the developer are 'these changes are minor and do not unduly impact the adjacent context'. I am NOT an 'adjacent context'. I am a homeowner in this neighbourhood for 31 years, and my life here will be extremely negatively affected by this enormous structure. It does not in any way, by any stretch of the imagination, fit this neighbourhood. It will shade the entire north side of my building, my home, and will destroy the character of this neighbourhood. People want to live here because of the quiet tree-lined streets, the bike routes, parks, and its walkability. Instead: I support a 3 storey podium with a tower having a maximum height of 12 storeys or even as high as 14 storeys (note: not 14 on TOP of the podium...14 including the podium). This neighbourhood already supports many 12 or 14 storey buildings, they are of varying design, and DO fit into the character of this part of the city. I DO support 12-14 storeys. I will still have access to sunlight and the sky, which is essential to my quality of life. (2) the alley has lovely mature trees which are taller than the current 3 storey condo building. Walking along our alley is like walking on a country lane. The breeze in the trees causes a beautiful sound. Many birds live in these trees. The trees provide privacy, oxygen, and shade on hot summer days. I beg of you: please do NOT remove these trees. There are also beautiful mature trees facing Burrard street. Please please do not destroy these trees. You may say "but we can't build the new 12 or 14 storey building unless we remove them". This is not true. There is a 14 storey rental building at 14th and Burrard, recently completed, which has several mature Redwoods along Burrard street. The building was completed without removing or damaging those trees in any way. (3) the size of these rental units is extremely small. I cannot imagine how 3 bedrooms, at least 1 bathroom, maybe 2, a living</div></div>	Kathleen Collin	Fairview	

			<p>room and kitchen will fit into 891 to 1018 square feet. Who can live in this? The below market rents are very expensive: \$2819 for 3 bedrooms? What average family can afford that? And at market rent, that would start at \$3382 per month. People can't save to buy their own home at this high rent. Instead: build a smaller building (12 storeys) and make the rents more affordable. (4) outdoor dog area: no. Simply: no. There is a brand new dog park just 400 m from this proposed rental building. I do not want to hear dogs barking, howling, maybe fighting, all day long. The comment may be "oh, that won't happen, people will be supervising their dogs". It will happen. The building at 1750 West 13th is a pet-friendly rental building and for years, for decades, dogs bark all day long. Every time a dog comes out for a walk: bark bark bark. Some owners are leaving their dogs on their balconies for hours at a time - barking, and howling when they hear a siren. NO dog area. The same comments for the children's play area: no. An alley, with car and truck traffic all day long is NOT a safe place for children to play. The new building will have 171 parking stalls and 8 visitor stalls. The 3 condo buildings have between 50-60 parking stalls. Each condo building has gardening trucks, garbage and recycling trucks, delivery trucks at least once per week. The rental building with 264 units will probably require garbage pickup daily? Recycling pickup daily? There will be renters moving in and out constantly, I'm sure at least once per month and probably more often. It is NOT a safe place for children to play, with vehicle traffic and exhaust all day long. (5) parking. At this time, our garage entrance is often blocked by moving trucks or large delivery trucks, because there is at this time, no loading area for any of the 4 building that have land access. The new rental building will increase traffic exponentially in the alley. Of particular concern is the large moving trucks, the semi-trailers. They are huge and block access to the garage entrances/exits, prevent our garbage collection and other service vehicles from accessing the alley, and potentially prevent emergency vehicle access too. The comment might be "there will not be any 18-wheelers, any tractor-trailer semi trucks used in moving or delivery." Not so. This already happens. I have family members who work for the large moving companies like Allied Vanlines. What happens is: the truck will be loaded with 2 or 3 contracts, and will unload one contract at a time. So it does happen, and will continue to happen, that large trucks will block our alley. So instead of a useless tiny dog off-leash area and a dangerous children's play area: replace these with a LARGE loading bay that will accommodate the inevitable 18-wheeler moving trucks. In conclusion: a maximum of 14 storeys, leave the existing trees in place and protect them during construction, no children's play area, no dog area, add a very large loading bay, and make the apartments BIGGER and liveable, and more affordable. Thank you for listening. Sincerely Kathleen Collin</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--