

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-05-12	17:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue	Other	<p>I own a condo in the building directly across the alley from 1770 West 12th, and I have lived in this condo for more than 30 years. My address is 1777 West 13th. I welcome families with their children, and people of all ages and incomes to my neighbourhood. I support many aspects of the Broadway plan but I am not in favour of some of the plans for 1770 West 12th. I would like to offer my observations and suggestions.</p> <p>1. the original development application was for 20 storeys, and now the request is for 25 storeys. The reason given is to allow a 'rooftop amenity' which seems to consist simply of outdoor seating. I strongly oppose this. In my opinion, this very very tall building will destroy any chance of sunlight in my suite. I wish the maximum height to be 20 storeys, and truthfully, only 14 storeys.</p> <p>2. Loading bays: there need to be big loading bays to accommodate the very large tractor-trailer moving trucks, delivery trucks, etc. I cannot count the number of times I was unable to enter or leave my underground parking because a large truck was obstructing the entrance/exit ramp, or blocking the alley. And this has been the case despite all 4 stratas in this block being 3 storeys with 40-48 suites per building. I imagine it will be MUCH worse with almost 250 rental units - people will be moving in and out all the time, as renters are more transient. Last point, emergency vehicles such as fire trucks and ambulances need to have full access to all buildings from the alley, in case of any emergency. Please, put large loading bays into the plan, in lieu of the dog area and play area.</p> <p>3. visitor parking, 15 minute parking, drop-off areas. As to my comments above about big trucks blocking the alley, there are many "I'm just.." or "I'll only be..." people who park their cars, their ubers, their door-dash, etc in the alley or in my visitor's parking and when asked to move, say "I'm just waiting for my sister" or "I'll just be a minute, I'm just dropping off this parcel...there is no parking on 12th..." This will be greatly increased when more than 250 rental units are built and there is a retail space on the first floor. Please ensure there is visitor parking, 15 minute parking etc. Thank you.</p> <p>4. Trees. People want to live in this neighbourhood for many reasons: safety, walk- and bike-friendly streets, good schools, shops nearby. And the huge leafy trees which provide shade, privacy and oxygen. I am distressed that the trees will be cut down along the alley, and I beg of you to please ensure BIG trees are planted again.</p> <p>5. Podium height: was originally 4 floors, which I can live with. The new design is for 6. floors, and this will again block the view of the sky, will block the sunlight, and is not necessary in my opinion. Please, return to the original 4 storey podium.</p> <p>My last comment reflects statements in the development plan that this new building will complement the neighbourhood and fit in well. I strongly disagree. To put a 20-25 storey monolith in the middle of a well established residential area of 3 to 14 storey tall buildings is not in any way, by any stretch of any imagination, fitting in with my neighbourhood. Thank you for listening.</p>	Cyril Tranter	Fairview	
2025-05-12	18:14	CD-1 Rezoning: 1770 West 12th Avenue	Other	<p>I live across 12th from 1770 West 12th - my building is a strata, and I bought my condo in the early 90s, so I'm a long-term resident of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I'll admit to being confused about the results of the first consultation. If I'm reading the documents correctly, then there were a great many responses, and they shared my worries, the first time around - that the podium was too massive and the tower too tall, and that it appeared we would lose some trees.</p> <p>And yet, the revised proposal has an even more massive building - a 6-storey podium, and an even taller tower, with added height for rooftop amenities. It is also clear that the mature trees will be sacrificed.</p>	Sian Echard	Fairview	

I'll repeat what I said the last time. I WANT densification. I have no problem with a significant alteration to that site. However, it is important to break up the masses and to make at least some effort to fit into the existing neighbourhood, even as it is imagined that this will evolve over time.

When the Broadway Plan was launched, it talked about a mix of building types and heights, but all the boards in my neighbourhood are proposing the same massive towers; it's not very imaginative, and in some cases the juxtapositions are completely incongruous (I'm thinking of the places where these towers are going up right next to Spanish revival buildings, or rows of craftsmen, for example).

Now, you may think that 12th and Burrard isn't a neighbourhood, and it's true it's the intersection of two busy streets, but at the moment, it does have trees, grass, and medium density, and a lot of people who've lived here a long time. We're a real place, not a drive-through. The current proposal for 1770 West 12th explains the offset of the tower by noting a future plan for a mirror tower down the block, and you can actually see its outlines in the renderings.

So, it looks as though 12th is going to become a glass-and-steel wall, without trees. That's not healthy - many city planners are concerned with how the Broadway Plan is developing, and this kind of wall is one of the reasons.

I would be supportive of a three- or four-storey podium on the existing footprint, with a slender 20-storey tower, on the corner if that's what you think makes the most sense (though that tower will plunge my own unit into darkness a lot of the day, but them's the breaks, I guess). I quite like that tall slim tower that's going up on the corner of Broadway and Granville, for example. I wouldn't live in a tower myself, but they can be aesthetically pleasing, and they don't have to block all the "solar access," as the proposal charmingly calls it.

But this behemoth is really too much. If the developer won't back down on the tower's added height, could you at least get the podium back to three storeys? That would mean that a chunk of the building would align with the current neighbourhood, and there'd still be lots of extra units, both because the units in the podium will be smaller than they currently are, and there would be a tower as well. That's adding a lot - enough, I think.

I chose a walkable, transit-accessible neighbourhood, and I applaud the city for trying to make those opportunities available for more people. But you shouldn't do it by throwing up walls and cutting down trees - light needs to get through, and trees are more important than ever, to counteract the heat-island effect of giant glass buildings like these. If anywhere is going to need tree canopy for cooling, it's this intersection.

Of course I know why the revised proposal actually makes the building even more massive - it's because the developer says that level of density is necessary to make the building financially viable. And here's my final concern. Developers vary, and I am not one who blindly thinks they are all evil, but you must know that Greystar has a particularly awful reputation. I see that concerns have been raised about the company in the first consultation, and the answer has been a cut-and-paste comment about provincial and city regulations and protections.

But there are such regulations in many of the places that Greystar operates; indeed, I know of its record in part because of the many places that have pursued action against it. Those haven't stopped the company from behaving badly. And this isn't an historical problem: in January of this year, the FTC was considering a lawsuit against Greystar for misleading and deceptive pricing practices. Just a week ago, a new class action law suit was proposed in California.

			<p>The company also has been the subject of lawsuits concerning unsafe construction practices. They were, for example, found guilty of negligence in securing a crane during work in Dallas, resulting in the death of a person living in one of the buildings onto which the crane collapsed. The death was in 2019, and in 2023 a jury awarded 860 million in damages for gross negligence.</p> <p>Finally, Greystar partners with AirBnB to rent out many of its apartments. I know Vancouver has short-term rental rules, but again, there’s nothing about Greystar’s track record that gives me any confidence in their willingness to adhere to local rules.</p> <p>In short, Greystar is the very worst kind of developer and apartment management company. They cannot be trusted even to adhere to the plan as proposed, and they certainly will not administer the resulting building in the way that will add value for people who live in this neighbourhood.</p> <p>TLDR: Please, we need trees; we need some sunshine; and we really don’t need a rapacious American developer to build our desperately-needed housing. Why in the world would the city let an American company in, at this time of all times?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--