

CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-11-06	10:34	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>OPPOSITION FOR 1125 W. 10th Avenue.</p> <p>I am a very proud, long-term Fairview, Vancouver resident and I am in absolute OPPOSITION of the rezoning proposal of 1125 W. 10th 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 ugly 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 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 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.</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 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.</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.</p>	Fiona OConnell	Fairview	

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 business 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, collateral 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 to 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 way more infrastructure and community buildings and needs!!!

We need:
 To keep the already amazing and beautiful, and in keeping 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 sh!thole concrete jungle city, with disgusting, non-green, ugly, luxury high-rise monstrosities, that no one wants to visit or live at.

And we need to build affordable housing in the right way – low rise buildings, in keeping 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, low-rise 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 it’s 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.

THIS IS A HOSPITAL ZONE.

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% below market rate, they are still going to be at least \$500 a month more than what people who live in the affordable housing here is, and they will be SIGNIFICANTLY 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 Scorch-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 9.06 gobbledegook? 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 UTTERLY 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 further still to yet another terrible even that just happened, that is another clear example and reason why not to build high-rises –

The Myanmar/Thailand earthquake.

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.

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.

AND, local businesses will NOT survive if these towers and their mainstream retail outlets are built.

Thus, I am voicing my absolute opposition.

- STOP destroying Vancouver neighbourhoods.
- STOP destroying Vancouver communities.
- STOP destroying Vancouver residents' LIVES.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, Vancouver resident,</p> <p>Fiona O'Connell <small>S. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</small></p>			
2026-01-11	13:50	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I oppose this mid-block rezoning for ground floor commercial. I suggest starting this paradigm shift rezoning at the corners where the inevitable increase in traffic can be more reasonably managed with short term parking provisions. This mid-block rezoning on a relatively narrow designated bikeway will cause unnecessary congestion and hazards, and set a bad precedent. going forward. Recall the already frequent emergency traffic from the firehall and hospital.</p>	Duane Elverum	Fairview	
2026-01-11	16:09	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Dear All,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the rezoning application for 1125 West 10th Avenue. As a long time resident who cares deeply for our city I reject this application for various reasons and have outlined several below.</p> <p>I believe it is fundamentally mismatched with the direct local landscape where it is applying. While high rise buildings are appropriate for some locations, this particular application is not suited to this property.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this rezoning application in favour of a design that respects the community character, design, and scale.</p> <p>This could include allowing the building to remain as it is for the time being, given that it already fulfills important housing needs for Vancouver, with citizens who cherish this place as their home and have deep roots in the community including employment.</p> <p>Scale and Zoning Concerns</p> <p>The proposed height significantly exceeds the capacity of this location. To maintain the integrity of the neighbourhood, this site should be zoned as low-rise, with a maximum allowance of occasional modest mid-rise structures more broadly over various blocks. Furthermore, I advocate for this site to remain strictly residential to preserve the character of the avenue. Given the high rate of commercial vacancy in desperate need of filling and revitalizing on Broadway, (and elsewhere throughout the city), adding more commercial space here would unnecessarily alter the neighbourhood and risk further dereliction in an area already struggling with commercial occupancy.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Safety</p> <p>West 10th Avenue is a critical designated bike route (with city responsibilities for protecting the safety and flow of these designated routes), it is narrow in this location, and Spruce</p>	Kimberly Gillett	Fairview	

				<p>Street is an exceptionally cramped corridor. These streets already serve as vital routes for many pedestrians and cyclists, along with local traffic. Increasing density to this degree would lead to hazardous vehicle-pedestrian conflicts and overwhelm existing infrastructure that was never designed for high-density transit.</p> <p>Environment and Well-Being</p> <p>Our community thrives because of its relatively calm, healthy environment and access to nature. The reduced noise pollution (compared to high-rise heavy traffic areas) lowers stress, and the pedestrian centric lifestyle encourages good health and meaningful interactions, fostering a sense of belonging, collective responsibility, and enhanced social and emotional well-being among neighbours. Close-knit communities where neighbours know each other tend to have a stronger sense of security and are more vigilant about unusual activity, contributing to a safer living environment. There are well established gardens, hedges, and trees that are home year round to small birds, bees, and butterflies. The view of the open sky and the natural wildlife present are essential to the local ecosystem; here, pollinators and residents alike find respite from the heavy traffic and buildings of the Broadway corridor. A high-rise would irreparably diminish this microclimate and the social cohesion of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>A building like the one proposed would be welcome in some locations but it is incompatible with 1125 West 10th Avenue and should be halted.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, care, and consideration.</p> <p>With much appreciation and best wishes, Kimberly</p>			
2026-01-13	18:30	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	The City is moving too fast approving multiple oversized towers for this neighbourhood without testing the impact of increased density on the already overused community amenities. The increased traffic coupled with insufficient underground parking for the multiple new nearby giant towers alone will make the neighbourhood unliveable, certainly undesirable. I urge city hall to slow down and test out this density intensification.	Karen Campbell	Fairview	
2026-01-14	15:19	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to this proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This proposal and the Broadway Plan is contributing to making the neighborhood unaffordable with higher costs for renting. 2) This will increase density, noise and pressure on this quiet neighbourhood. 3) Priority should be given to green spaces, gardens and making the city more resilient in the face of climate change, and increasing habitat for birds, insects and wildlife. 4) There are already a lot of rezoning applications in the neighborhood, and the disturbance created by construction would be unbearable. 	Rémi Torrenta	Fairview	
2026-01-14	15:53	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	This rezoning area is at residential street (west 10 ave) where houses or buildings are below six floors. A comprehensive high building on this location will not only disrupt the scenery but the commercial stores also attract unnecessary traffic on this narrow avenue and the Spruce St. s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential The unfinished and suspensive buliding on 2511 Spruce St has already blocked my view and sun light. Thus I do not want another tall building take away the remaining sky and light that I can see from my living room.	Yuntong Liang	Fairview	Attachment 1
2026-01-15	14:02	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I'm writing as a neighbour living close to this site, and I want to be very clear about something: this application is not consistent with what the Broadway Plan actually says.</p> <p>The Broadway Plan repeatedly tells residents that added density must come with livability, not at the expense of it. This proposal does the opposite.</p>	Kate Wilson	Kitsilano	

1. Density — The Plan says “up to 6.5 FSR.” This proposal wants 9.1 FSR.

Section 9.9.1 of the Broadway Plan says the expected density in this area is:

“up to 6.5 FSR.”

This application is asking for 9.1 FSR — which is a 40% increase over what the Plan anticipates.

There’s nothing in the Plan that says a site can exceed that because the lot is too small or because the economics don’t work.

2. Livability — The Plan is unambiguous about this.

Section 11.1 (Urban Design) states:

“The intent is to provide a high level of livability for all residents... ensuring that new development is respectful of the scale and character of the existing neighbourhood.”

A 21-storey tower squeezed onto a 100-foot lot with 5-metre side setbacks is not “respectful of the scale.”

And it definitely doesn’t provide a “high level of livability” for the people living next door who now get a tower basically pressed up against them.

3. Tower Separation — The Plan calls this a core requirement.

Section 11.3.1 (Tower Placement) says tower separation exists to:

“minimize shadowing, maintain privacy, and maximize views to the sky.”

With 5 m on each side, if the neighbour redevelops one day, the towers would sit 10 metres apart.

That is less than half of what the Plan normally requires for tower separation. It doesn’t “maintain privacy.” It destroys it. Is the applicant not technically stealing air space from neighbouring owners? How can that be considered equitable?

4. Shadow Impacts — The Plan tells developers to limit them.

Section 11.4.1 (Solar Access):

“New development should be designed to limit shadowing on existing residential buildings.”

The only reason there’s more shadow is because the applicant is pushing the density way above the Plan’s expectations.

A building that stuck to 6.5 FSR would be narrower and would cast noticeably less shadow. The extra shadow is avoidable, and it’s entirely caused by the extra density.

5. “Viability” is not a Broadway Plan policy.

The Plan does not say:

“add more density if the site is too small,” or

“reduce setbacks if the pro-forma doesn’t work.”

				<p>Yet that’s exactly what’s happening.</p> <p>If the site is too narrow to meet the Plan’s setbacks and tower-separation rules, then it’s not an appropriate tower site.</p> <p>We shouldn’t be bending the rules to make a problematic land purchase “work.”</p> <p>Bottom line</p> <p>This application asks Council to ignore the Broadway Plan’s own words on:</p> <p>density (“up to 6.5 FSR”),</p> <p>livability (“high level of livability for all residents”),</p> <p>privacy and sky access (“maintain privacy” and “maximize views to the sky”), and</p> <p>shadowing (“limit shadowing on existing residential buildings”).</p> <p>All of these impacts are happening because the applicant wants more floor area than the Plan anticipates for this location.</p> <p>If the Broadway Plan is supposed to mean anything, this is not the kind of application Council should be approving.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>			
2026-01-16	12:40	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Where is the childcare? Every new tower should have built in childcare.</p> <p>20% below market rental is not enough to support a vibrant community.</p> <p>I cycle as my primary mode of transport with my young child. Residents of this building will be clogging 10th Ave as it is mid-block and there are not enough parking spaces underground. This is a serious safety concern.</p>	Caroline Liu	Fairview	
2026-01-19	16:35	CD-1 Rezoning: 1125 West 10th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Grossly non-compliant with the Broadway Plan, which itself was non-democratically forced onto neighbourhoods as well, is economically not viable from a cost perspective, let alone livability. Please actually engage with the neighbourhood, talk to citizens who don't want to live in a building lacking character, walk the streets and see the low quality of living legacy you are building.</p>	Brett Macfarlane	Kitsilano	