

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Jarrod McKenna s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2017 2:56 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: "Opposed to Rezoning: 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street"

I live near this and I am totally against this monstrosity in our neighbourhood.

Jarrod McKenna

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Norma s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 8:09 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

As a resident of the West End I object to this project.

This project violates the West End Community plan on spacing towers, height, air flow, privacy, exposure to nature's elements especially daylight. It will eliminate established trees which can not be replaced. Traffic congestion would be hugely impacted in the area, especially on Nelson.

Seriously consider each of these factors in the WECP in connection with this proposal.

Norma Dechene

Music is Life's way of celebrating the spirit and rewarding the soul!🎵

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Brandon Chapman s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, July 23, 2017 10:45 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: SUBJ: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Vancouver doesn't need a 57 storey luxury tower, it needs modest, affordable housing (as per the current zoning for a 24 storey building)
32 existing rental units will be destroyed, and 61 rebuilt - Vancouver needs more rental units

Cheers!

Brandon

Sent from my BlackBerry - the most secure mobile device - via the Koodo Network

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Martin Leclerc s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, July 23, 2017 11:15 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Hi,

I oppose this rezoning project based on the multiple negative effects this will create in the neighbourhood. The size of this project is unwarranted for such a dense area and will not enhance the quality of life of our downtown.

Regards,

M. L. Leclerc

Sent from my iPad

Ludwig, Nicole

From: DANA GOLDEN s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Saturday, July 22, 2017 12:09 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

To the City Councillors asking questions to myself on July 18, 2017:

When Councillor Stevenson asked me how high I thought the tower to be built on this site should be, I was not as definitive in my answer as I feel I should have been. I feel that probably this tower should adhere to what the previous zoning and area plan was, which was 24 floors. It was supposed to be a mirror image of the tower directly across Nelson St., beside St. Andrew's Wesley Church. Given that Nelson Street is only 2 lanes wide here, it seems ridiculous to contemplate anything larger.

Yours truly,
Dana Golden

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Nicky Ellis s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 9:37 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: OPPOSED to 969 Burrard rezoning

To Whom it May Concern,

I'm writing to opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning

The monstrous 57 story proposed tower plan is not well planned to consider surrounding neighboring building. Not staggered. There's not enough green space around and the proposal to eliminate established 100 year old trees is outrageous!

Sarah
Concerned Vancouver citizen

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Ellis Ellisellis s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 9:38 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: OPPOSED Rezoning Application for 969 Burrard & 1019-1045 Nelson Street

To whom it may concern,

I am an owner/resident at Patina building, 1028 Barclay. I'm writing to opposed the rezoning application for 969 Burrard & 1019-1045 Nelson Street for the following reasons:

- Removal of green space in favor of overwhelming mass of concrete
- the distance from proposed tower to 1028 Barclay is within the 80-foot distance requirement
- proposed tower violates City mandates in West End Community Plan, exceeding various WECP guidelines
- proposed tower height of 57 stories is disproportionate for the lot and location, more than double of previous proposal of 24 stories height.

Ellis Cotter
Patina resident

Ludwig, Nicole

From: 3LLiS s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 9:30 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

To Whom it May Concern,

I'm writing to opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning as the proposed tower violates standard staggering towers planning that is negatively affect surrounding buildings access to daylight, airflow, privacy, and exposure to outdoors.

I STRONGLY OPPOSED to the plan to remove tall trees on Nelson St. These trees provide much needed green space and crucial for the little wild life that we have in downtown Vancouver.

A. Lee
Concerned Vancouver citizen
Patina Building

July 19, 2017

To Vancouver City Councilors:

Yesterday, I attended the public hearing and intended to speak in opposition to the zoning application for the development of 969 Burrard St. and the building proposal of the First Baptist Church. I am Cynthia Owen, a west-end community resident, owner and member of our strata's council. I have received emails and verbal comments from several other owners and wanted to share those with you. We are an owner-occupied building and we are self-managed. About 50% of the building has lived there for more than 20 years. We are 100% occupied.

I went into the meeting ready to tell you about the impact this development will have on me and my neighbours. Those impacts being about: our space having reduced or eliminated sunlight; street level views of the sky from the sidewalks being significantly reduced or eliminated; and the need for sky and sun for our health, internal well-being. I also wanted to also comment about the impact of the congestion on a street that is already experiencing significant traffic issues; raising issues of safety for the school children, people on the way to dog park, other pedestrians, elderly and disabled people. There are also the air quality issues from increased traffic. We will be the one's breathing in the fumes from the increased traffic. I also wanted to implore the councilors to consider the impact of the

increased garbage truck traffic. On any given day, there are 4 to 6 different waste-management trucks that travels up and down my alley between Nelson and Comox. I cannot grow herbs on my balcony because the levels of dust created by the alley traffic, hard concrete surfaces and no buffer zones in the alley. Also, the expected increase volume of waste will increase the incidence of wildlife like skunks, racoons, rats in our garbage. Although, we all have locked containers etc., garbage is dumped in our alleys. See some recent photos. These are the several serious impacts on my quality of life if this building proposal goes forward.

After hearing the applicant's presentation, I left feeling deeply that this proposal is all wrong for our city on several fronts. Where are the applicant's comments about the policies you, our council was voted into power to put in place? The two most important to me are: greenest city in the world and zero-waste. The most important policy I heard the applicant speak to was that the building must be architecturally interesting from a point in Queen Elizabeth Park. Really? That is the only development policy the City of Vancouver has? There is a huge disconnect between that policy of a view from Queen Elizabeth Park and my everyday life, in the West End of Vancouver. It seems there are some big holes in the City's building development policies.

To me, the most important questions the applicant for this development and all applicants need to answer is:

- How does this development contribute to Vancouver becoming the greenest city in the world?
- How does it reach the zero-waste policy? and
- How does it address the urgent and critical need for affordable housing downtown?

The 250 luxury condos and 41 affordable properties proposed for this development seems backwards to me. How about have 250 affordable properties and 40 luxury condos. When I look west bound from my balcony, I see a condo building with less than 20% of the lights on in the evening. Will the current policy change the absentee owner issue? Time will tell, but my sense is that it will not. Therefore, if you approve this development, you approve the same story to be repeated over again. It is very difficult for Vancouverites to buy into the luxury condo market when we are competing with investors from countries that pay little to no taxes; may have earned their resources through corrupt methods and have no need to actually live in Vancouver. So, I wonder who this development is really for and what are they really asking the council to approve?

I would like to propose a you take a new approach to decision-making process for this type of development. Look at criteria such as meeting the zero-waste target; impact on greening the city; what green initiatives are

they undertaking; what new green trades will be developed as a result of this application? Impact on air quality, sunlight. How are the community artists, designers and architects being employed? Or does the applicant demonstrate that someone else, someplace else are better than our local knowledge and abilities. It is an opportunity for you to direct the hours, energy and financial resources of many involved in developing these plans and applications into achieving the policy goals you were elected to implement.

These are difficult leadership positions and directions to take. I thank you for your willingness to accept these responsibilities. I ask you simply about the vision you hold for our city. What is the Vancouver you want to be creating? Something green, something new and exciting or same old, same old?

Cynthia Owen

Ludwig, Nicole

From: 柏緯 陳 s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 11:52 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: Opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning

Hi,

I am writing this e-mail to oppose the project on 969 Burrard rezoning.
The traffic in downtown is already so packed all the time.

If this project approved, the traffic is going to be the nightmare for a long time.

Our building is a heavily-occupied building of individuals, couples, and families with children,

NOBODY should be needlessly enshrouded in near total darkness!!!!

sincerely,

Po Wei Chen

Public Hearing <PublicHearing@vancouver.ca> 於 2017年7月24日 上午10:26 寫道 :

Good morning,

Thank you for your letter. Please note that the Procedure By-law requires that correspondence for Public Hearings have a name on it.

If you wish to have your letter circulated to Council, please resend it with a name on it.

Thank you,

Nicole

From: ?? ? s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, July 23, 2017 11:51 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning

Hi,

I am writing this e-mail to oppose the project on 969 Burrard rezoning.

The traffic in downtown is already so packed all the time.

If this project approved, the traffic is going to be the nightmare for a long time.

Our building is a heavily-occupied building of individuals, couples, and families with children,

Ludwig, Nicole

From: David Mahjour s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 12:07 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrard

Dear City council

I would like to express my displeasure with the density and design for 969 Burrard street. The height is absurd given the neighbourhood as is the design around all these older buildings and does not fit in with the design and make of the older buildings. Once again this development does not tackle the issue of affordability as most in the neighbourhood or even who have grown up in Vancouver will be able to afford it.

At minimum I ask the city to reduce the height to not more than 40 stories, 57 is an insane amount and blocks the view of a majority of the residents and the area.

Thanks for reading this email

David

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Karen Charlesworth s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 12:22 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Fwd: Opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Karen Charlesworth s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Date: July 24, 2017 at 12:19:32 PM PDT
To: publichearing@vancouver.ca
Subject: **Opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning**

Hi

I am a long time Vancouver resident and am very concerned about the rezoning application for 969 Burrard.

On so many levels this proposed building concerns me

-height

-distance to neighbor buildings

-31 rentals removed to replace with 61 unites at I am sure a much higher rental rate.

- construction impact on traffic on Nelson for at least 2 years

I listened to the mayor last night on the Global news informing Vancouver that council will be focusing on developing housing with a direct connection to income levels.

This proposed tower is in complete contrast to affordable housing and if approved will make a significant statement to the voters of Vancouver.

Sincerely

Karen Charlesworth

Sent from my iPad