

Ludwig, Nicole

From: C S s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

I am opposed to the rezoning of 969 Burrard.

-we are in a housing affordability crisis and another Trump-like tower is obtuse and irresponsible.

-the proposal boasts an addition of 62 market rentals but in actuality is DESTROYING 31 existing ones, making the net addition half of what is bragged about. Misleading and simply not enough.

OPPOSED.

Thank you,
Craig Sorensen

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Olivier Leclerc s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:19 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

I am opposed to the 969 Burrard Rezoning project, as many are. This plan to build yet another unnecessarily luxurious high rise apartment building is an insult to the city of Vancouver. Not only does it violate the West End Community Plan in many areas, which I am positive has already been brought to the corporations attention, and already was known to them when they begun planning, but the arrogance displayed by the developer when he/she spoke and announced that the tower would be even bigger than initially planned perfectly displays the corporations intentions to solely benefit themselves. This is in no way following the guidelines from the City of Vancouver to embrace "Vancouverism", and it is a blunt insult to the residents of the West-end as well as to the city. This tower will, to quickly list the ONLY things it will bring to us: destroy greenspace, increase traffic congestion, not satisfy the need for affordable housing in Vancouver, benefit only the upper class and show to the residents of the West-end that the city does not acknowledge its residents opinions nor care for it. This blatant defiance of so many of our policies and regulations that were put in place to prevent exactly this will be the downfall of our beautiful unique city, and will have deep repercussions in which big money corporations will forever overpower public opinion, and will consequently worsen our valued quality of life.

Sincerely,
Olivier Leclerc

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Monique Mackinnon s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:25 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose 969 Burrard

Subj: Oppose 969 Burrard

Vancouver doesn't need more luxury "trump-like" towering 57-storey condos. We need modest, affordable housing for those that live and work here.

61 new social housing units, that displace 30 units is only 30 net units.

Thank you!

Monique Mackinnon

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Monica M. Vucko s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:31 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed: Development of 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street (57-Storey)

Dear City Council Members,

First off, I would like to thank you for your reviewal of this development proposal and for allowing residents to have their voices be heard on this subject matter. Many difficult decisions are brought-forth to City Council, but I am hoping that the decision you face today will be an easy one.

As a Vancouver resident who is passionate about the health of this city, I am strongly opposed to the proposed development of 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street (57-storey) building for the following reasons:

1. Vancouver is suffering from a major housing-crisis and does not need more luxury condos. To allow for this proposal to move forward (despite the proposed "addition of affordable units") will set a dangerous precedent for other developers who will view this decision as a "green light" for similar proposals.
2. Building more luxury condos is driving out young talent, which Vancouver needs in order to improve the region's economic productivity levels, which is already known to be quite low.
3. Without young-talent and rising real-estate costs, businesses have increasingly less incentive to establish their head-quarters here, which means less employment opportunities for local residents.
4. Young-professionals and families are the heart-beat of a city's vibrant culture, both of which are being replaced by foreign investors who may not have any intention of living-in or renting-out their units.

Is there a place for luxury housing developments? Absolutely, but not during the time of a major housing crisis. City Council Members were appointed by the people for the people – and what the people of Vancouver need now more than ever is an affordable place to live. Thank you in advance for your time to consider this issue and I look forward to this evenings' Public Hearing.

Best,

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Anna Scheri **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:35 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose 969 Burrard

Vancouver doesn't need more luxury "trump-like" towering 57-storey condos. We need modest, affordable housing for those that live and work here.

61 new social housing units, that displace 30 units is only 30 net units.

Thank you!

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Pete Fry s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 3:18 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: OPPOSED Rezoning: 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Re: Rezoning: 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

I'm writing in opposition to the proposed rezoning for this site.

I appreciate some of the proposed Community Amenity Contributions including restoration of the heritage First Baptist Church, modest offering of below market rental housing, and significant cash-in-lieu contributions. However, the opacity of process by which these CACs are being calculated, the questionable pro forma valuation, and the waiving of the standard policy cash-in-lieu payment schedule lead me to oppose the application.

On the whole, I feel the scale and size of the project is too much for the site and it's orientation and lack of setback will negatively impact neighbours in the Patina building on Barclay. Furthermore I feel that a high end luxury tower does not meet the necessary objectives to build housing that is affordable to local working citizens, and will likely contribute to land lift, increased speculation, and geographic rent increases.

But I have two specific and serious concerns about how Community Amenity Contributions are proposed to be calculated and collected on this project (and the opacity of CAC calculations in general).

1. The notion outlined in the staff report under Urban Design (item 14) suggests that the unique design of the towers and open atrium style private amenity spaces are a less efficient use of floorspace and should be valued at 69%. Obviously in an age of micro-suites, empty private amenity space is a premium luxury and should be included in the value of the pro forma calculation.
2. The suggestion that the developer should be allowed to stagger and postpone cash-in-lieu CAC payments. The city should not be vacillating on the existing CAC policy and timing schedule described in 1.3 of that document.*

* <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/community-amenity-contributions-through-rezonings.pdf>

Pete Fry
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Van Duzer, Leslie s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 3:25 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Rezoning Application for 969 Burrard St and 1019-1045 Nelson St - OPPOSED

To whoever it concerns,

I would like to voice my **opposition** to this rezoning proposal. The tower, however handsome, is far too tall for its site. It blocks views and light from countless neighbours, many across Burrard Street, and its impact has not been adequately studied.

I wonder when the city will get around to doing a city-wide plan that fairly distributes density in a humane way.

Sincerely,
Leslie Van Duzer

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Joel Sacks s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 3:46 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed: Rezoning 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Mayor Robertson and Council,

I am a resident and owner in the Patina building and I have a few points to add as to why I am opposed to this project:

1. I urge you to please take a look at the traffic situation in the area. Firstly, the lane, which will be used for the parking access to this building, is already extremely congested with cars and pedestrian traffic. People often walk in this lane with their dogs and as there are no sidewalks, they walk in the road. Also, at the top of the lane, at the intersection with Thurlow, cars are parked on both sides, making it single lane access. Now imagine adding hundreds more cars to this!

Many residents from this building will want to head down Nelson in the morning rush hour. Driving out the lane and turning right onto Burrard and left onto Nelson in already congested traffic will be both extremely difficult as well as hazardous. The stretch of Thurlow between Barclay and Nelson is already jam packed in the morning rush hour, so anyone exiting the lane and turning left Thurlow will be left waiting for a very long time, which will cause traffic in the lane to back up even further.

Also, the stretch of Burrard between Smithe and Nelson is completely congested in the end of day rush hour. Now imagine hundreds more cars heading up Smithe, turning left into Burrard and then those same cars clogging up Burrard while waiting to turn right into the lane while pedestrians cross the lane. I know how busy this crossing is as I often make this turn myself.

In addition to the traffic from cars, there will be several more moving trucks, garbage trucks and delivery trucks.

2. The size of this building will also amount to longer construction time, which will cause major disruptions to the traffic for several years, with a highly congested part of Nelson Street either partially or fully blocked off for quite some time.

3. This building does not do much to relieve the rental issue in Vancouver. In essence 32 rentals are being replaced by 61 - In all honesty, this won't have much impact on the current situation.

4. The shadow Analysis shows that from 3pm until sunset, there will be a complete shadow cast over the south facing units of the Patina - on all the floors, leaving the residents unexposed to natural sunlight, which anyone who has lived in Vancouver for a while, knows has a detrimental effect on people's health and well being.

Thank you for listening,
Joel Sacks

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Ashit Dattani s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 3:47 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard 1017-1045 Nelson

The housing crisis is well documented. Everyday we hear about the challenges residents face in trying to find housing that is affordable relative to the income that can be earned in our city. I know this is an important issue for our government leaders as well. However as I walk around this beautiful city of ours I continue to see development applications that profess to bring more supply. I often wonder if this new supply is going to meet the needs of our city or does it simply provide a vehicle for foreigners that live in live in low tax environments to park their money. As I look at what is being developed and the cost of ownership, I feel that it is the latter. In my opinion, the job of the local government in deciding to approve an application should be based on a couple of key questions:

1. Does this application for development address the needs of the local residents today and for the future?
2. Will the average selling price be affordable to local residents? If they are unaffordable to local residents, will it not just add to the inventory of empty homes?
3. Does the application build a stronger community? Does the developer actively market to an international clientele that may not have an intention of living here and building a stronger community?
4. Small business owners in the city have faced a number of challenges - higher property taxes and lack of foot traffic. Will this application hurt or help small businesses?

Clearly there is not enough supply of homes in Vancouver and it's easy to just keep approving applications. However, we will never have enough supply if the projects are unaffordable to the local residents and are just being marketed around the world. Long term the city cannot survive if people do not live here. I urge you not to approve this application.

Sent from my iPhone

Isfeld, Lori

From: Leanna Yee ^{s.22(1) Personal and Confidential}
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: OPPOSE: Rezoning of 969 Burrard Street & 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Dear City Council,

I write today to let you know that I am strongly opposed to the proposed 57-storey luxury building on Nelson Street.

The current plan will be accessible only to a market that is over-served (people whose wealth originates outside of the Vancouver economy) while neglecting the needs of the overwhelming majority of locally-employed Vancouverites. It is of course understandable that the developers would cater to this market. But it is not understandable that city council should do so.

Council has a decision to make about neighbourhood and city priorities. This decision is to be made in the midst of a housing crisis that is pushing away citizens and employers, leaving the potential for our city to become more of a 'recreational' destination, competing with other destination cities, rather than a working, vibrant city.

While I applaud the commitment to social housing via the 7-storey building with 61 rental units - this does not address the dominant issue of only luxury apartments being built. This will do nothing to ease the scarcity of affordable homes for purchase and for rent.

I have lived in the Vancouver for three decades. My partner and I have good-paying, professional jobs. Given the current market dynamics - which are contingent on city policy - we will never be able to buy a home, as long-time residents of Vancouver. We are therefore renters in a market with a scarcity of homes to rent and fierce competition. Vancouver and the West end are in desperate need of not only affordable apartments but especially an increase in the supply of rental buildings - homes that are accessible to the people that live and work in this city. The proposed 57-storeys with 331 units, of which only 61 will be rental units, in a city undergoing an affording housing crisis is contrary to the needs to Vancouverites. We want more buildings catering to the needs (and price-point) of locally-employed Vancouverites. It is this that will produce the vibrant neighborhoods we all want to see.

I therefore strongly urge the city to consider adjusting the plans for the 57 storey tower to something more modest, closer to the original 24 storey plan, and increase the space between this new development and the Patina building so that it meets the 80 foot minimum required distance, as well as the needs to citizens in an affordable housing crisis. Please remember, in your deliberations, the residents of this city who have entrusted you with needs of the citizenry and local economy. I trust that none of us, including council, wants to see Vancouver become a ghost city.

Sincerely,

Leanna Yee

Isfeld, Lori

From: Kamru and Zarine Ebrahim s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 3:16 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Kamrudin Ebrahim
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Mayor Gregor Robertson,
City of Vancouver.

Dear Mayor Robertson,

My wife and I strongly oppose the rezoning of the above premises for the following seasons:

Few of the remaining old Cyprus trees in the city will be gone and will be replaced by bricks and mortar.

Pedestrians and traffic congestion can hardly be managed as is. The situation will become chaotic then.

Erecting a luxury tower will only benefit the few rich and not the average citizen.

The proposed tower will rob daylight, airflow and create a narrow and claustrophobic situation.

A layman trusts the Council to be fair to all citizenry and not only to the affluent.

The predominant sufferers will be the south facing units of 1028 Barclay St. who will be robbed of quality of life.

The population density in the area will clog the infrastructure.

The need for affordable housing and rentals is more pressing than the luxury apartments.

The proposed building will ruin the West End Community Plan.

Sincerely,

Kamrudin

Isfeld, Lori

From: Ngoc Tran Tran s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 3:19 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose- 969 Burrard rezoning

Hi there,

As a young professional working in this city, I find it very discouraging that the city has made little effort in building affordable housing for the working class here, but instead caters towards the luxury housing clientele. The West End area is already populated with high cookie cutter glass buildings and won't need another tall expensive building that will undoubtedly be bought out by investors and stay empty for the rest of years. I love this city and would love to find some where affordable to stay long-term but would urge the city of Vancouver to decline this zoning application.

Thank you,

Tran Tran

Isfeld, Lori

From: Gilbert Dizon s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 9:00 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

The proposed 57 storey residential tower does not conform to the West End Community Plan and contravenes to the BC Building Code and the City of Vancouver Building By-Laws.

I respectfully urge our City Councillors to demand a counter proposal from the Developers of this project.

Thank you!

Gilbert Dizon

Isfeld, Lori

From: Linda H s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 9:10 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: Graham
Subject: Rezoning Application for 969 Burrard and 1019-1045 Nelson

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We are owners of a unit in the Patina Building at 1028 Barclay Street. We would like to express our opinion on this rezoning issue.

We believe that the proposed 57-storey tower is too close to the existing 42-storey Patina Building. It would be a monstrous proposed tower, disproportionate for the adjacent neighborhood. The proposed tower is too tall and too large for the existing lot and location.

The construction of this tower would bring great noise during and after the construction. The Patina Building is already a heavily occupied/ resided building comprised of homes with families. Is the distance from the proposed tower to Patina adequately safe and within the City of Vancouver's requirements?

The proposed tower will add traffic congestion on an already very congested block, including traffic and pedestrian safety. This includes removal of left turning lane on Nelson Street thereby removing driving area while at the same time increasing car volume.

The proposed tower will reduce the already very little green space in the neighborhood. Removal of green space in favor of an overwhelming mass of concrete building is a negative aspect for a sustainable urban living for the West End Area.

Thank you for your consideration on this issue.

Sincerely,

Linda and Graham Hepper

Isfeld, Lori

From: roni man s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 9:28 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed 969 Burrad St&1019-1045 Nelson St.

Dear Council members,

I would like to tell that that against the new project that will destroy our life in Patina. I bought a flat here 2 years ago and U didn't know then about the new project. We won't let you to kill our lives with more pollution, noise, cars and much more people around here, just for the sake of building a new fancy huge tower.

The alley behind our building is relatively quiet so you want to let many cars moving there in and out for the parking of the new project. I live in floor 4 and my window face the alley. How will I handle the noise and the pollution? - I will have less light too. I won't let you to kill my life and other lives because of this bad project. Let WestBank to look for more income in down town east side and not here.

This plan of yours violates many aspects of the West End community Plan. We won't let you to do it. Move out from this area.

Regards

Roni

Isfeld, Lori

From: Alex Tam s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 10:02 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Please count me among those who will oppose this rezoning at the Tuesday, July 25 hearing.

Regards,

Alex Tam

Isfeld, Lori

From: eric mackinnon s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 10:54 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Hello,

I am against this 57-story luxury tower because it will only exacerbate Vancouver's still mounting affordability crisis.

The people of Vancouver and the West End do NOT need another Trump tower. We need modest affordable housing units that cater to hard-working local Vancouverites.

Thank you kindly,

Eric

Isfeld, Lori

From: Joy J s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 11:39 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to the 969 Burrard Street Rezoning Application

I am opposed to this rezoning because it is a stark contradiction to the needs and values of the local residents. There are numerous other ways in which the benefits could be achieved (and increased) for the church & community WITHOUT an unneeded, unwanted luxury tower that is nothing short of inappropriate given neighbourhood and citizen needs.

Feeding the needs of the elite few is unacceptable when the average person needs to be attended to. Other church projects have been successful without resorting to attaching Trump-style luxuriousness that literally uproots and eclipses the natural beauty of the West End; request that the City deny this rezoning and start from scratch with a process that is, this time, out in the open with transparency and thorough public consultation. Approving this in it's current form is tantamount to dereliction of duty.

Sincerely,
Joy Jensen

Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:21 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to the 969 Burrard Street rezoning.

Dear Sir/Madam.

I wonder what is happening to the concept of the "West End Community Plan" and the trust the citizens can expect from such plans. As for the proposed development on the 969 Burrard Rezoning, it appears as if most common sense is being ignored, if this project goes ahead.

With the housing crisis in Vancouver (especially in the West End) the proposed tower on the First Baptist Church site, will add very little rental spaces (even less) as compared to all the luxury units that the tower will contain.

Then, how about the parking traffic problem that will be created in the lane between the Nelson & Barclay streets. When heading east along that lane, *it's not possible* to turn left (north) onto Burrard street, meaning that all the car traffic would have to head west and emerge (turning left) onto Thurlow street, just some 50 yards away from the **busy** southbound car traffic on Thurlow where (from two lanes) cars make a left turn east unto Nelson street, towards the Cambie bridge.

Then there's the Nelson Park issue, with the sun being blocked from such a high tower, which shouldn't be allowed to interfere with the precious open spaces of the park. As for the availability of spacious Stanley park, well that is not exactly close to Nelson park

and so, the local people should be afforded the extra light and sun, otherwise shadowed by high towers.

Another intense and strong look (with changes) should be forthcoming on this project please, before this development receives a green light.

With best regards. E. Meinertz.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Nadine Diner s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

To Whom It May Concern

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

I am upper middle class and can barely afford a rental in Vancouver. I can't imagine what families with smaller incomes face in trying to find a home.
I'm lucky to currently have a place (which a friend's connections helped me to obtain), but I fear the day I will have to look again...And my current place is way too small for my family's future needs.
Vancouver is entering into a brain-drain phase, where hard-working and intelligent people are opting to leave the city for other parts of the province or elsewhere.
So, this isn't just a housing crisis, it is a community crisis, a knowledge crisis, and an economic crisis... Vancouver families will suffer, but so will Vancouver as capable individuals leave.

Regards, Nadine

Nadine Diner
Director of Industry Initiatives
Industry and Innovation Group



s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Isfeld, Lori

From: Peter Wright s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 8:27 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose - 969 Burrard Street Rezoning

Dear City Council,

I write today to let you know that I am strongly opposed to the proposed 57-storey luxury building on Nelson Street.

The current plan will be accessible only to a market that is over-served (people whose wealth originates outside of the Vancouver economy) while neglecting the needs of the overwhelming majority of locally-employed Vancouverites. It is of course understandable that the developers would cater to this market. But it is not understandable that city council should do so.

Council has a decision to make about neighbourhood and city priorities. This decision is to be made in the midst of a housing crisis that is pushing away citizens and employers, leaving the potential for our city to become more of a 'recreational' destination, competing with other destination cities, rather than a working, vibrant city.

While I applaud the commitment to social housing via the 7-storey building with 61 rental units - this does not address the dominant issue of only luxury apartments being built. This will do nothing to ease the scarcity of affordable homes for purchase and for rent.

I have lived in the Vancouver for two decades, as a renter. I have good-paying job, with access to help from my family for assistance with a down-payment on a home purchase. Given the current market dynamics - which are contingent on city policy - we will never be able to buy a home. We are therefore renters in a market with a scarcity of homes to rent and fierce competition. Vancouver and the West end are in desperate need of not only affordable apartments but especially an increase in the supply of rental buildings - homes that are accessible to the people that live and work in this city.

Another serious problem with the current proposal is the sheer height of the proposed building. Many neighbours will live in perpetual shadow - rarely seeing the sun. Furthermore, the proposed structure does not meet the 80 ft minimum distance from the building across the alleyway - which will create a claustrophobic proximity between residents in the new building as well as nearby buildings.

Having read the submissions of support for this project, I see that support has been focused on the 7 storey building with 61 rental units, and the church upgrades. It is telling that there little support for the 57 storey luxury high rise itself - which is indicative that this is not what the people of Vancouver want or need. We want more buildings catering to the needs (and price-point) of locally-employed Vancouverites. It is this that will produce the vibrant neighborhoods we all want to see.

I therefore strongly urge the city to consider adjusting the plans for the 57 storey tower to something more modest, closer to the original 24 storey plan, and increase the space between this new development and the Patina building so that it meets the 80 foot minimum required distance. Please remember, in your deliberations, the residents of this city who have entrusted you with needs of the citizenry and local economy. I trust that none of us, including council, wants to see Vancouver become a ghost city.

Sincerely,

Peter

Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 8:43 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Dear Respected Mayor and Councillors,

I'm writing to oppose the 969 Burrard Street Development.

I do not live in the area, but I have many close friends and colleagues who live in the west end, downtown, and Chinatown.

My reasons for opposing are listed below:

- Vancouver's citizens don't need a 57 storey luxury tower. Citizens need 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!
- This proposal calls for an overwhelmingly tall building, which will impact neighbours, by blocking sunlight for units (including families and children) and nearby park, block views
- Vancouver needs to be a city for its people. The majority of us are regular people working regular jobs - we cannot afford luxury condos (let alone, regular condos). The basis of living a modest life is having modest shelter.

I urge this council to oppose this development.

With thanks,
Joanna

Sent from my iPhone

Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 9:45 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

To Whom it May Concern,

I am opposed to this rezoning because Vancouver's policy of Vancouverism states that towers will be SLIM and WIDELY SEPARATED BY LOW RISE STRUCTURES.

Thank you,
Amy Sorenson

Isfeld, Lori

From: Kuznetsov Igor s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 10:07 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Dear City Council,

I oppose a proposed development of 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street (57-storey) because it seems egregious to build such a luxurious apartment building at the time when city is suffering from a housing crisis.

If there is a space to build, the city should build housing that is affordable at least for some in the bottom 90% of income distribution. At the moment, it looks like the city cares mostly about 1% and that is why there is an exodus of young and educated people out of the city and the province. I have 2 MA degrees and earn above median income and I cannot imagine myself buying even the smallest and the shabbiest apartment in this Trump-like tower.

The most aggravating part of this deal is the attempt to sweeten this deal with additional 30 units of affordable housing (not 60! there are 30 units in place right now). For an economist, it sounds like a band aid on a bone cancer. What is the plan than? To squeeze all young professionals into "affordable housing" so that the rich could have service they need and enjoy the views of Vancouver area while sheltering their foreign assets of unknown origin at the same time?

If the City Council cares about the human capital and future growth and prosperity of the city, then it should work day and night to solve this housing crisis using every opportunity to build houses, condos and apartments that are within the reach of those whom this city needs the most, i.e. us, young professionals.

Sincerely,

Igor Kuzetsov

Research Analyst

Isfeld, Lori

From: SIGRID SINGLETON s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 10:25 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrard Street and 1019 - 1045 Nelson Street

Dear Mayor and Council Members

There are some aspects of this application that I fully agree with. However, I am very opposed to the height of the main tower. Last time submissions and public hearings were held, we were opposed to the height in that we wanted it reduced. Now I see that the height has actually increased. Again, this is the highest point of the city, and at the edge of the west end where the buildings are much lower. I strongly object to the building height and that it is not suitable for this location. I wouldn't want to see more than 30 stories maximum.

This plan also violate many aspect of the West End Community Plan - ensuring tall slim towers are widely separated by low-rises. It needs to provide daylight, airflow, privacy and exposure to the outdoors. There is ample space to create a new plan that demonstrates respect for everyone's quality of life and avoids these extreme and negative impacts.

Why are there only 61 affordable housing units being built to replace 32 existing ones, not more hyper luxury towers that are unaffordable.

Traffic congestion to the max. With all the extra cars from the lane access and removing the left turning lane on Nelson St. increases volume significantly.

There are too many towers planned for this area!!!

Regards
Sigrid Singleton and Biren Shah

Isfeld, Lori

From: Gary Averbach s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 10:32 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

To City Council Members:

I have lived in the Downtown Burrard area for just over three years now. 28 months in the Wall Centre and now have a residence in the Trump Tower. I do love living downtown and enjoy the ability to walk most places. However I almost daily find some need to cross one of the bridges to get to the area South of False Creek - occasionally as far as Richmond.

When I was in the Wall Centre I actually had very little problem with driving from there to the Granville Street Bridge going south. But all that changed when I moved to the Trump Tower. Most days, at least between 3:30 and 6PM I could actually walk to the Wall Centre faster than the drive down Thurlow to Nelson and down Nelson to Howe and thereon to the bridge. Thurlow can be a nightmare, especially at the intersections with Georgia, Alberni and Robson but the worst part is the three blocks of Nelson between Thurlow and Howe. The massive jams sometimes take ten minutes to navigate.

Given that, I shudder to think of the additional burden the proposed structure will put on the traffic situation. Furthermore the elimination of vehicle traffic lanes on the Burrard bridge means that there will be little if any relief in that direction.

It's all very well to encourage the use of bicycles as an alternative to cars but in the vast majority of cases it is neither practical nor desirable to use a bicycle when travelling from downtown to other areas of Metro Vancouver.

I implore the Council to take this into consideration when examining the rezoning noted above.

I
Partner

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 10:44 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to the 969 Burrard Rezoning

I am opposed to the 969 Burrard rezoning because the tower is far too large for that space- it feels completely out of place for the west end. Further and more importantly, it imparts too much undue harm by destroying quality of life for neighbouring residents by blocking them in entirely with a huge wall. This is not what Vancouver is about or known for.

Thank you,
Linda Lasell

Isfeld, Lori

From: David Low s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 11:05 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Hello Council,

I am an owner and resident in the Patina building which is adjacent the proposed project. I am opposed to the current 969 Burrard rezoning proposal at its current state and would like to raise the following concerns/suggestions:

- The proposed tower is not in accordance to standard planning practices by staggering towers to provide daylight, airflow and privacy. **Swapping the location of the proposed social housing and tower would achieve this.** Not only do you give both towers additional space and privacy but you do not have a 57 storey tower so close to a heritage church.
- This tower will be a luxury tower. I predict pre-sales at \$1,500 to \$1,600 per sq.ft. if not higher. Imagine how high the market rents will be.
- 32 existing rentals will be destroyed to build 61. That's an addition of only 29 new units. How does this prioritize affordable housing?
- Please listen to the people that live and work in the area.

Thank you for your time.

David Low
Resident of Patina

Isfeld, Lori

From: Lily Wong s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 11:16 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Dear Vancouver City Council,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the rezoning of 969 Burrard. I'm a resident of the West End community and live right beside the property of 969 Burrard.

I believe the plan violates many aspects of the West End Community Plan and is opposite to City of Vancouver's values in creating a city that is livable and not a concrete jungle -- in other words, ensuring that Vancouver's tall skyscrapers are widely separated by low-rises, having enough greenspace, and a high quality of life where housing and community resources benefits all citizens, instead of the elite few.

I am extremely concerned about the plan violating the practice of staggering towers, providing daylight, airflow, privacy and exposure to the outdoors. As this tower would be built immediately in-front of my condo, our family will be severely affected as no daylight would reach our windows, due to the close proximity of the tower plans. Our quality of life will be severely impacted, including that of my newborn child, whose room is directly facing the new tower. I'm also very concerned about our privacy due to the proximity of the tower, am I to have my blinds closed all the time in addition to having no daylight? In addition, the concrete plaza proposed would eliminate the established trees thereby destroying the greenspace that we have -- which is enjoyed by not only our family but neighbourhood family and pets.

In addition, currently our block is already over-congested with traffic due to one-way traffic on Thurlow and one-way traffic on Nelson. Nelson is regularly congested as it is a main thoroughfare for those exiting downtown trying to get onto the Cambie Street or Granville Street bridge. Many times it is bumper-to-bumper traffic starting at 9am all the way to 8pm. Adding another tower would severely congest an already congested area not only for vehicles but for foot traffic as well. Many times, those stuck in traffic or simply lost due to the one-way street and try to make illegal u-turns in front of our condo -- causing gridlock and endangering pedestrian safety. I myself have had a number of close calls with drivers who were not vigilant while making illegal u-turns in front of our parking lot driveway.

Finally, I am an advocate of affordable housing and rentals in Vancouver. Building this tower would destroy 32 existing rentals, with only 61 being built. Given the lot size and the need for affordable and rental housing, the priority should not be allowing a luxury tower to be built benefiting the elite while displacing those whom rely on rental units.

I have been a citizen of Vancouver ever since I was 4 years old via immigration. I love our city and think it is the best-in-class, and most progressive cities in the world. Please keep Vancouver a world-class city with a high quality of life and don't turn it into a concrete jungle. Many aspects such as sunlight, greenery, airflow cannot be replaced once the tower is built.

Sincerely,
Lily

A concerned Vancouver citizen

Isfeld, Lori

From: Grace Leung s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose 969 Burrard

Subj: Oppose 969 Burrard

Vancouver doesn't need more luxury "trump-like" towering 57-storey condos. We need modest, affordable housing for those that live and work here.

61 new social housing units, that displace 30 units is only 30 net units.

Thank you!

Yeelui leung

Isfeld, Lori

From: langzg s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 12:18 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose 969 Burrard

Vancouver doesn't need more luxury "trump-like" towering 57-storey condos. We need modest, affordable housing for those that live and work here.

61 new social housing units, that displace 30 units is only 30 net units.

Thank you!

lang zeng guang

Isfeld, Lori

From: Walter s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 12:39 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to rezoning of 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Dear Mayor Robertson and Vancouver City Council,

I am a resident and owner at the Patina building and I am *strongly opposed* to the proposed project as it currently is. Here are just some of the many reasons:

1. The size of the tower is completely disproportional for the area and it will loom over all other buildings.
2. The area is already extremely congested, especially during the rush hours. Nelson is usually packed from Thurlow to Burrard and it's even more packed from Burrard down, with cars often left waiting in the middle of the intersection. It cannot handle hundreds more cars added to this.
3. The lane, which will be used for entrance to this building's parking lot, has a lot of pedestrian traffic as well, with people walking their dogs to the Nelson dog park too. Adding more cars and trucks to this lane will impact the lives of the residents of the area.
4. The entire south side of the Patina will in virtual darkness from 3pm, due to the shadow cast from this building.

Thank you for your consideration.

Walter Apai

Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential on behalf of Po On Yeung s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 12:46 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oppose 969 Burrard

Dear City Council,

I strongly oppose this new development of a 57 storey luxury tower.

It's Trump tower 2.0.

Vancouver needs more affordable housing options for the people that live and work here. Not another luxury condo that is out of reach for the vast majority of the local population. Not another development that will likely stay empty downtown.

There are aspects that sound great on paper - like the introduction of 61 social housing units. However, the net gain, after tearing down 30 existing units, is not very much.

I believe that we have a supply issue of the right type of housing in Vancouver. The modest, affordable housing that Vancouver residents want and need, such as the original approved plan (that is similar to St. Andrews church across the street, and their adjacent housing unit).

There needs to be a better development proposal that makes sense for the West End community, to keep the neighborhood vibrant, and to serve the needs of the majority, not just a select few.

Thank you,

Po On

Isfeld, Lori

From: Veronica Dubak s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 12:49 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: danagolden@gmail.com; Lori Isfeld; Po On Yeung
Subject: Re: Request for speaker substitution

Hi Lori,

Thank you for the clarification. I'm disappointed to hear that I cannot assign Dana to take my place. I would definitely like my speaking notes to be distributed to the Mayor and Council if the hearing concludes today. If the hearing is extended and will continue on another day, I would like the opportunity to speak.

Here are my speaking notes:

Thank you to the Mayor and Council for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Veronica Dubak and I am here to oppose the development of 969 Burrard Street and 1017 – 1045 Nelson Street.

As a resident of the adjacent strata tower, Patina, I am deeply concerned about the impact of this new development.

The proposal includes a 57 story condo tower on a high point in downtown, not only obscuring the views for Patina residents, but of those residing in surrounding buildings who may not even be aware of the project and the impact it will have on their views of downtown and English Bay.

The proposed development's proximity to Patina is especially of concern. The residential towers will not have adequate distance from one another, creating privacy issues for residents of both towers alike. Giant towers in downtown Vancouver should be staggered more appropriately and not be built side by side with barely 80 feet of distance. **The proposed development appears to have a mission of constructing the largest residential tower possible on the small parcel of land it has available, disregarding the ill effects it will have on surrounding buildings, residents, and the Vancouver skyline.** The building height is simply inappropriate for the center of downtown.

The proposal suggests 32 existing social housing units be replaced by 61 social housing units – a positive idea, but merely a deflection of the real problem - the 331 market strata units. Will these new units help with the affordable housing crisis, or will they simply add to the proliferation of luxury condos accessible to only a select few in Vancouver? This development is using a small contribution to the social housing crisis as a smokescreen for the 57 story monstrosity that will yet again house the wealthy.

In order to access underground parking, residents of the new development will be utilizing a narrow alleyway situated between Barclay and Nelson Street. Residents and visitors approaching from northbound Burrard will be turning left across a bike lane, and two lanes of heavy southbound Burrard traffic, just to access the alley. The other access point is from Thurlow, a one-way street, creating a challenge just to access the alley in itself. The 540 proposed parking spots and the vehicular traffic that will come with it will make this narrow roadway especially dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, while increasing congestion, pollution, and noise.

After reading the letters of support, it appears that many of the supporters of the development are either members of the First Baptist Church congregation itself, or are affiliated with the Church in some other way. These supporters will directly benefit from the church upgrades and expanded program space, but are a very small subgroup of the downtown community and while vocal, do not necessarily represent the views of the entire community.

The First Baptist Church proposed seismic upgrades and expanded church programs are really not the issue. Nor is the proposed 61 units of social housing in its separate 7 storey building. The issue is the 57 story tower that will stick out like a sore thumb without any foreseeable benefit to the downtown community.

I urge the Mayor and Council to consider a more reasonable alternative to this proposed development. Perhaps combining the market strata and social housing into a single 20 story tower? Or at the very least, reducing the height of the 57 story residential tower by half so that it doesn't dwarf its neighbours and create a host of problems that goes along with the kind of population density that is being proposed.

The impact of this proposed development is significant and will create a ripple effect downtown by increasing traffic and congestion with overcrowding, will obscure the views of residents residing in countless properties spanning the core, and will barely make a dent in the affordable housing crisis while creating a 57 storey blemish on the stunning downtown Vancouver skyline.

Thank you for your time.

Veronica Dubak

On Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 12:42 PM, Public Hearing <PublicHearing@vancouver.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon,

As per the City's Procedure By-law, a speaker must be present at the Public Hearing in order to speak, there is no allowance for representative speakers unless Section 18.20 copied below is met. If you miss your turn to speak, as an alternative you can email your speaking notes prior the close of public comments and they will be distributed to Mayor and Council prior to decision on the application. If Dana wishes to speak on her own behalf, she is welcome to register and would be slotted in at the end of the list.

Feel free to give me a call if you need clarification.

Representative speaker

18.20 A speaker may only speak on behalf of other persons or organizations if:

(a) the speaker represents three or more other persons, three or more other organizations, or three or more other persons and organizations; and

(b) those represented are also present at the public hearing, either in person or by a representative of each corporation or organization represented by the speaker.

Link to the full Procedure By-law is <http://bylaws.vancouver.ca/9756c.PDF> .

Thank you,

Lori Isfeld

Lori Isfeld | Meeting Coordinator

CITY OF VANCOUVER | City Clerk's Office

[604.871.6355](tel:604.871.6355) | lori.isfeld@vancouver.ca

From: Veronica Dubak **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 5:14 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**; Isfeld, Lori; Lori Isfeld; **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**
Subject: Request for speaker substitution

Hello,

I am unable to attend the public hearing on July 25, regarding the rezoning application for 969 Burrard Street and 1017-1045 Nelson Street.

I was scheduled to be speaker #14 at the first public hearing and would like to request that Dana Golden (cc'd here) read my speech at the council meeting tomorrow.

If you have any questions, please email me.

Thank you,

Veronica Dubak

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Meghan Armstrong s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 1:28 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to rezoning application at 969 Burrard Street

I would like to express my concern and opposition to the rezoning application at 969 Burrard Street.

This does not allow for sustainable Urban design including air flow and access to light and is not scaled to be a part of the community.

Sincerely,
Meghan Armstrong

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Kohlmann, Lou s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:00 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard rezoning

Hello

I forgot to mention in my earlier comments opposing the said rezoning that not only the size of the proposed development (57 storeys) is too large for the narrow plot of land, but also that the tower should be staggered or offset from its nearest neighbour, the Patina high rise. They would be, as proposed, almost in alignment, which would cut off the direct sunlight for 17 units in the Patina for much of the day.

As well, south-facing residents of the Patina and north-facing residents of the new proposed high rise will be looking into each others units; the distance being only about 80 feet apart. There is land available to move any said development to the east, toward Nelson Park, so the two high rises aren't in direct alignment.

There are four towers of about 24 storeys (three south of Nelson and one north of Barclay across from the Patina). All are offset from each other. Also, in looking at the almost 60-storey structures at West Georgia and Alberni, both have ample space (a combination of roadways and lower buildings) surrounding said buildings.

I'm also worried about the congestion and gridlock any new development in the immediate area would bring. Besides this proposed development, the Mole Hill high rise and any future St. Paul's Hospital development will bring even more people and cars into the area. They're not doubling the roadways, and expanding Nelson Park, for example. And the proposed development at 969 Burrard plans on cutting down mature trees, and fails to replace them with much-needed green space. Thurlow and Nelson streets are very busy now with cars at off-peak hours and jammed at rush hour. Can you imagine how busy they would be with the addition of the cars that a 57-storey high rise to the area would bring?

The 969 Burrard development seeks to use every square inch of land and space to generate as much revenue as possible without taking into account its neighbours and the community at large. Let's develop our city, but in a sustainable, "good-neighbour" way; much like a "good-neighbour fence" does.

The land is originally zoned for 24 storeys. A compromise needs to happen here.

How do you put a price on quality of life?

Lou Kohlmann

Ludwig, Nicole

From: jay steinman s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:12 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposed to 969 Burrard Rezoning

Greetings,

I wish to add my voice to the opposition of the rezoning of 969 Burrard.

I am reminded of the old adage: 'there oughta be a law.'

In this particular case, there oughta be a law against constructing a new high-rise building so close to an existing one. Those of us at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential just bought in recent years and many considered new buildings coming in the future, but not just across the alley in the back. My partner and I never thought of this scenario in this proximity; further up Nelson or farther afield in any direction but not this close. Isn't there a law against this? The obstacle this new building will present to natural light and sunshine will be near total. Are there not laws that keep new tower construction from the near total blockage of sunlight for another building as will be the case in this matter?

There oughta be a law protecting the privacy of residents and not just ignore those laws to the benefit of the developers. Looking out the south side of s.22(1) Personal and Confidential one sees an apartment building on the other side of Nelson in the 1000 block. Residents in both buildings cannot help but notice the other and be aware of the privacy concerns of just being at home and walking around comfortably in your own home. It is literally quite hard, if not impossible, to imagine a new building going up in between the two of us. Never mind 'a stone's throw away'. This seems like 'spitting distance', the two building will be on each other's doorstep. And, looking in each other's windows will be a constant nuisance for all. Are there not laws that protect residents in this situation?

There oughta be a law that focuses on the congestion that comes with all these towers. Every new tower is another huge parking lot downtown - albeit underground. All these underground parking lots might not be seen but they will surely be felt in the coming years. Have you seen the traffic along Nelson Street? After about 7am, traffic is lined along the full block for most of the day and until 7pm.

Like so much of modern life, most of the benefits that come from 'development' go into the hands of frightfully few people - and the general trend of the haves and the have nots continues unabated. The cynicism that results with this unchecked development is the poison that corrupts modern life and contributes to the general decline of trust in our institutions.

There oughta be a law!

Thank you and please consider the future.

James Steinman
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Bob Golden s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Tuesday, July 25, 2017 2:08 PM
Public Hearing
Subject: Opposition to 969 Burrard Street & 1017-1045 Nelson Street

I am totally opposed to this 57 Story Tower being built and will speak tonight – Here is my presentation to council – I believe that we need to go back to the drawing board & do what is RIGHT for the area - Church upgrade & Affordable Housing!

NOT A 57 Story Skyscraper with a 30' Appenditure!

Good evening Mr. Mayor, council members and everyone here today.

My name is Bob Golden & I have lived in the West End Community for 5 years.

My family, for three generations, & I have invested in this Community for over 50 years.

Most Recently - you heard from my wife Dana that the Golden Family is funding a revitalized Children's Playground at the Roberts Creek Annex School - and the First stage almost completed.

Westbank is a Multi Country Developer home-based in our Dynamic Multi-Cultural CITY...it is our good luck that in our city they have built and I have no doubt will continue to build us beautiful and iconic buildings...and I also have no doubt that the building we are concerned with today will be in itself beautiful and iconic - IF BUILT IN THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME.

But I am not feeling lucky or fortunate today I am feeling very sad today I am feeling a loss today, not a gain today we are here deciding to convert a neighborhood a community..... a special, enduring, multicultural, warm and friendly, chatty and caring community..... a community even more iconic than Mr. Gillespie's vision....why would we want to convert OUR COMMUNITY ... My neighbors and I are at a loss to understand why.

So – HELP US UNDERSTAND THE WHY, HOW, WHO AND WHAT

HELP US UNDERSTAND WHY you would agree to a 57 story Skyscraper – concrete, glass and steel – that families can ill afford – yet you talk all the time about providing places in the West End where families can live.

HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW this building deepens affordability for West End residents when meeting the needs of a growing Community is the Priority.

HELP US TO UNDERSTAND WHO you think are actually going to live, work & play here? Will they be here to support our local businesses?

HELP US UNDERSTAND WHY taking out a left-hand turn lane on Nelson that will help the continued traffic congestion and safety issues for Cars, Pedestrians and Bikers alike. And then Driving new traffic through an already congested laneway! Do you have the Police Reports of Traffic & Pedestrian Incidence! I BELIEVE THIS TRAFFIC PROPOSAL IS RIDICULOUS AND SHORTSIGHTED

HELP US UNDERSTAND WHY you are relying on a Traffic Study almost 2 years old when traffic density will continue to grow dramatically over the next 5 years -this building has planned for 497 parking spaces!

HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW this project got an FSR of 11.27 from 2.87 in the West End Community Plan when then advertised to the public as 10.83 FSR. Plus a 30' Appentiture on top of all that!

HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW a WESTEND COMMUNITY PLAN pushed all these SKYSCRAPERS to Burrard, Thurlow & Barclay? No one locally, that we talked to, had input - turns out this was done at the Community Centre on Denman! Possibly a NIMBY factor.

HELP US UNDERSTAND WHAT "Social Housing" means by your definition –BTW - it's now our understanding that this has been reduced to 40 from 66

HELP US UNDERSTAND YOUR DEFINITION of Market Rentals –

HELP US UNDERSTAND WHY we are being told this Project is and was a "slam dunk" a done DEAL!

We are not here today debating Westbank and their International owners We support the Community and welcome Rentals & Social Housing and meeting the needs of the Baptist Church even though their membership is aged and shrinking!

We are here today concerned with the where of such buildings-SKYSCRAPERS - and whether we are collectively prepared to convert over a 100 years of community in favor of more towers in the sky where empty boxes – potential Piggy Banks for Foreign Investors - replace a warm way of life. Money from the outside (Foreign Money) has turned what should be middle Income Properties into High End Properties!

I know AND WE ALL KNOW that this building will in no time at all be joined by other such buildings until there is nothing left but empty boxes in the sky and our communities being devastated. Where do the families go? Do we want to be a Skyscraping Manhattan if so, we all need to say SO BECAUSE THAT MY FRIENDS IS WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE TODAY.

As Stewards of our land I would HOPE YOU DO THE RIGHT THING and turn this PROJECT DOWN!

Thank you for your time.

Robert (Bob) Golden