

Isfeld, Lori

From: sara ganjaei s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 2:21 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: about 969 Burrard rezoning

Hi,

This is regarding the rezoning application for 969 Burrard St. Both Nelson and Burrard streets (like many other places in the West End) are already under a lot of pressure from increasing traffic load. By erecting yest another highrise in this area the problem is only going to get worse. Does anyone in the planning office actually think about the limitations of the area's infrastructure before giving out more and more development permits? Or is it all about just building more without any long term planning? Or maybe the City is thinking of making the entire West-End area car-free eventually? It is already difficult to get to many places with a car, and it is such an inconvenience for people with limited walking capability like myself. I would like to see that the City taking the quality of the life the people in the area into consideration, before packing more and more people into the neighbourhood.

Thanks,,

Sara

Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 4:12 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: Re: 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street, Vancouver

I am writing on behalf of my wife and myself to express our concerns regarding the above mentioned project. A 57 storey tower in this location will dwarf the other surrounding structures. It will have an impact on the view corridors, traffic congestion etc.

We are not opposed to the project and for the admirable services it will provide. The height of the tower is our main concern. **We oppose the proposed project as it stands.**

Dr. Akbar V. Lalani, MD FRCP(C) and Ms. Shamin Lalani, LLB, LLM

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Isfeld, Lori

From: roni man s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 7:25 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrad St&1019-1045 Nelson St.

Hi to the council remembers:

I live in s.22(1) Personal and Confidential I have my own suite in the 4 floor. My plan was to live in a low floor and not in the high tower. I don't like towers and it is wrong to build them in the West End. Even Patina was a wrong project so please don't keep to the same and let another tower that even higher to be build near by.

This area us busy enough with people and cars and there is no room for more. Don't keep push more and more people here with all the services that re needed. You are killing the little quality of life that left for us. You are killing our future here, our health, joy and the benefits that we used to have in the West End.

The main issue is to use the back alley between Barcaly and Nelson (behind Patina building) for the entrance for the new tower and other buildings parking. This alley is still not so busy with cars and you will kill it too. My window view is the alley and with the huge traffic because of the new tower and the other parts of the project you will create lots of noise and pollution to me and other. You can't just damage our quality of life. At least change the entrance to the parking of the new project to Nelson St. Nelosn is busy and the cars there can wait when cars will come in and out from the new tower.

Please don't kill our life

Thank you

Roni Rachmani

Isfeld, Lori

From: Sean Smith s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 11:40 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: Public Hearing Notification - 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street

Hello,

I won't be able to attend the public hearing regarding **969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street**, however I would like to register my opposition to the proposal as it stands. It is entirely too monstrous in height. The Wall Centre across the street is already 48 floors high, this proposal (at 57 floors) will dwarf it.

I am OK with perhaps one or two "landmark" buildings that are this sort of size, such as the existing Wall Centre, or Shangri-La, but we don't need any more. I strongly disagree with the City's plan to surround the West End with monstrously tall buildings that will overshadow us and cut off views to the skyline.

It also brings in far more people, most of whom will still have cars, and puts even more stress on the roadways, transit, storm, sewer, and water utilities. None of those are being up-sized to carry this extra capacity. This kind of massive development should be promoted in other areas such as Kingsway, Marpole, or other satellite "urban centres".

It is also very likely that the people who will move into these big new towers won't necessarily also work downtown - offices are already migrating outwards from the downtown core because of high rents, and the difficulties in commuting downtown (by any form), and difficulty in retaining employees, so the residential developments should be following the out-migration of the employment centres.

This kind of development also seems aimed at the real estate speculator, and continues to encourage the housing problems we have today.

regards

Sean S. Smith
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

On Wed, Jul 5, 2017 at 11:07 AM, Planning Info <planninginfo@vancouver.ca> wrote:

You are in receipt of this email as a person who has expressed interest in the Rezoning Application for 969 Burrard Street and 1019-1045 Nelson Street. Please find below information regarding the upcoming Public Hearing.

Public Hearing:

Tuesday, July 18, 2017, at 6 pm

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Carol Whitehead s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2017 2:34 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Proposed Rezoning of 969 Burrard St. and 1019-1045 Nelson St.

Vancouver City Council,

I am strongly disturbed about the proposed development on this site. Under no circumstances is a 57 storey tower an acceptable addition to the West End neighbourhood. Regardless of the West End Community Plan and Rezoning Policy, that arguably was implemented without the support of the community, this tower is in no way in keeping with the heights of surrounding towers. As you are well aware, it is twice the height of all others in close proximity to it.

As attractive as the proposed inclusion of 61 units of social housing, restoration of the First Baptist Church, and new church ancillary spaces, the social housing proposed is being called rental accommodations when in fact it is not rental housing but Social Housing. There is a difference and it is one that Council has recognized in the past. The West End has the largest population of renters in Metro Vancouver. Renters who have been forced to pay exorbitant rents as a result of lack of supply and the non-existence of a Rent Control Policy. City Council directing its' attention towards the implementation a Rent Control Policy would be a better use of its' time and would have a far greater impact on all of the residents of Metro Vancouver.

Who do you and the developers think your're fooling by suggesting that a 57 floor strata residential building provides affordable family housing to the community? We are all well aware of the market value of strata suites and how their prices continue to rise as the real estate market moves away from unaffordable detached home purchases. Yaletown and it's rapid and continued development of strata units has resulted in outrageous costs per square footage and many empty suites. In fact, it is a community of upper middle income earners rather than a mix of singles, families and "empty nesters". It is not one providing affordable housing that is accessible to all demographics.

Under no circumstances would I approve a 57 storey tower; a tower that one might expect to regrettably find in the downtown area. However I would give more consideration to this development if it at least truly offered a significant proportion of market rental housing. City Councillors, I urge you to do what's right and representative of the majority of West End residents. Do not approve this development as proposed! Please address its' considerable and significant deficiencies by demanding that they come back with a proposal that is more in keeping with our neighbourhood's values as well as our Mayor's apparent commitment to truly providing more social and affordable rental housing to our city's residents.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Carol Whitehead

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Kohlmann, Lou s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 6:19 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: CD-1 (445) (Comprehensive Development) District By-law No. 9204

Hello

I wish to comment on this rezoning because I live right across from where the development would be built, s.22(1) Personal and Confidential at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential in a small condo with a balcony facing the alley and the future development.

I, and others in my building facing the alley, would lose much of the light we now receive, and I fear it would be like living in a cave, if the development, as proposed in the rezoning, goes ahead. It's not about the view, I have none now, just the church, some trees, a parking lot, an alley and some older, low-rise buildings. And I'm not against what the advantages of the development would bring.

It's about quality of life. It's about having light and air. It's about packing in as many human beings in a small space as possible. The issue I have with the development is its scale. It's too large for that site. You can see this by how the developer has tried to move the proposed high-rise as far away from the Patina as possible, unsuccessfully, I might add. It still looks too close.

I understand why this is being done. Why they're trying to pound a square peg in a round hole — to get as much money as possible per square foot. But, please, don't take away my light, my quality of life.

Thanks for the chance to comment.

Lou Kohlmann

Ludwig, Nicole

From: James Millar s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 4:38 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrard and 1019-1045 Nelson St

This monstrous development will have an overall negative effect on the neighbourhood where I live. It could only be approved by a city hall that is development crazy and is too influenced by the development industry.

This building and others like it proposed for the immediate area will change the character of the downtown forever. Why is this kind of development necessary? Why do we need to build a huge tower which will feature unaffordable condos for the rich? how many of them will be purchased by foreign owners?

The traffic downtown and particularly on Nelson St is already past carrying capacity much of the day. This any other developments will only make it worse. Our mayor's attempt to get everyone on bicycles is just plain silly.

I sympathize with the church's need to raise money, but they should find another way to do it without selling out the neighbourhood. This development needs to be re-thought and reduced in size considerably.

J. Millar

Ludwig, Nicole

From: DANA GOLDEN s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 1:43 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Rezoning of the Baptist Church site by Westbank

To whom it may concern:

It seems that this Westbank that is being proposed has received approval before due process has been completed. There has not been a confirmation that the Patina tower and the proposed tower are indeed 80 feet apart. The height and scale of the proposed tower is so incongruous with everything else for blocks around it that it borders on ridiculous. How has the zoning gone up from 24 storeys (it seems the new building on this Baptist Church site was supposed to be a mirror image of the tower across the street that is

beside the Unitarian Church!) to 57 storeys? Will the proposed densification of the area be an asset or a hindrance to neighbourliness, green space, pedestrian, cycling and car traffic, affordability for people living and working downtown, view cones, and light in existing premises? As a person who has lived in this ground zero for the past 5 years, I will tell you it is a hindrance on EVERY account. As I expressed a couple of years ago at the first public outing of this project, there is no shame in going back to the drawing board, only shame if you don't. This decision will affect all Vancouverites now and in the future. Please consider the negative impact of this proposal before approving it-- you will still get the social housing, the public art, the church upgrades, etc. from any developer here.... but it must contribute to our livability in the area, not detract. The tower must be smaller in scale in every sense.

Yours truly,
Dana Golden

Ludwig, Nicole

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 3:58 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 1019-1045 Nelson St. Baptist Church site

I am writing in regards to the proposed 969 Burrard and 1019-1045 Nelson St. Baptist Church site.

I live down Smithe St at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential the Rosedale Garden Building. Last night while watching the sunset with my neighbors, we realized that this new 57 storey tower will fill the ONLY sliver of airspace where we can see the sunset from our homes.

This building site is sitting at the highest point of our city and this monstrous building will be towering over the city skyline taking away so much city airspace and view access for many residents. Its proximity to the Patina Building beside it is not allowing for enough airspace in between the towers (not to mention the density and traffic this will create)... We are 9 blocks away and we can sense the damaging affects this building will have for us – I can't imagine the residents who are living in the immediate area!

I understand the need for more housing and infrastructure in this city, but 57 storeys of luxury apartments at our city core is not the answer, and not what I voted for with our new Government. It is just a replication of the same problem the city puts on its residents.

On behalf of the Vancouver locals living east, downhill from the Baptist Church site, we urge the city to reconsider the building proposal for this site and decrease the size of this luxury apartment tower.

Thank you for your consideration.

Emilyn Golden

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Stuart Derdeyn 5.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 2:48 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 969 Burrard Street/1019 - 1045 Nelson Street Proposal

Looking over the amendments considered to the CD-1 (445) District By-Law No. 9204 proposal, I am concerned about the nature of the 57-storey tower.

1. What is the status of this structure? More owned condominiums? Market rentals? Mixed?
2. How much parking is included with this massive tower as there is already a serious problem with space in the surrounding area and this represents a huge increase in driving population.
3. What is being done to improve/deal with the huge challenges this construction will place upon already difficult traffic flows through the area?
4. Does the City of Vancouver treat the services and housing owned and operated by a church as part of its affordable housing strategy for the West End?
It would seem quite unfair to both the church with its specific religious agenda and the secular public taxpayer to not get actual social services and housing additions because of a privately owned facility and development plan which, presumably, can be changed at any time.

Stuart Derdeyn

Sent from iCloud

Isfeld, Lori

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 2:47 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 1019-1045 Nelson St. The Baptist Church site - OPPOSE

Hi there,

I am writing in regards to the proposed 969 Burrard and 1019-1045 Nelson St. Baptist Church site. I live down Smithe St at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential Last night while watching the sunset with my neighbors, we realized that this new 57 storey tower will fill the ONLY sliver of airspace where we can see the sunset from our homes.

This building site is sitting at the highest point of our city and this monstrous building will be towering over the city skyline taking away so much city airspace and view access for many residents. Its proximity to the Patina Building beside it is not allowing for enough airspace in between the towers. Not to mention the density and traffic this will create... We are 9 blocks away and we can sense the damaging affects this building will have for us – I can't imagine the residents who are living in the immediate area! The poor West Enders that will be in its shadow...

I understand the need for more housing and infrastructure in this city, but 57 storeys of luxury apartments at our city core is not the answer, it is just a replication of the same problem the city puts on its residents.

On behalf of the Vancouver locals living east, downhill from the Baptist Church site, we urge the city to reconsider the building proposal for this site and decrease the size of this luxury apartment tower.

Emilyn Edwards

Isfeld, Lori

From: Ichi Chen s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 4:16 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Residence from Patina on Barclay street

Hi,
I am a residence at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential and living in the block and I am sending this email to show my concerns of the upcoming developemnt.

Thanks.

Ichi

Isfeld, Lori

From: Margarita Bruehler s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 5:55 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Proposed tower on Nelson and Burrard

The
Following are some of the negative aspects of erecting an exceedingly high tower, within 80 feet of of an investment that I have put my life savings into. I am 79 years old.

- 1) 1)Traffic in the lane will be very dense, given the high volume of residents and cars that will be added to this small area.
- 2)The noise and pollution will be high, especially for the lower south facing units. I am on the fourth floor. This noise and pollution will be trapped in the narrow space of the lane.
- 3)Any sun or view will be obliterated.
- 4)there will be no greenery to replace the tall row of cedar trees now adjacent to Nelson St.
- 5)The majority of units are high end, not affordable housing. The rental section is too dense and directly opposite the lower Patina units. Traffic will be dangerous for old people and children.
- 6)The skyline will be distorted. The building is totally out of place in the West End Sent from my iPad

Isfeld, Lori

From: Jessie Chun s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 7:31 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Proposals on the 969 Burrard Street (District by Law No. 9204) Development

Regarding the proposal on the 969 Burrard Street (District by Law No. 9204) development, I would like to share my comments with the respectable members of the City Council:

1. Proposal on restoration of First Baptist Church – I welcome this proposal. This church is a historical site that should be preserved and maintained properly by the residents and the city.
2. Proposal on a New Church Ancillary spaces – Unnecessary as YMCA is located within 100 meters of the church and offers all the facilities (Day care, counselling center, gymnasium, etc) that this ancillary plans to offer.
3. Proposal on a new seven storey social housing building – West-end is notorious for break-ins, petty crimes, and panhandlers. The possible increase of these problems should be considered, if the social housing building will be built in the middle of the West-end.
4. Proposal on a New 57 Storey tower – Opposed by the “Environmental” reasons:
 - 1) Increased Traffic – which means more emission gas into the beautiful West-end area. City Council should consider the traffic increase, not only by the residents of this new 57 storey building, but also the visitors to the new building,
 - 2) Shadow Effect – The building will block the daylight from the existing buildings that are surrounding the Site. This will seriously impact the living environment of the residents in the neighborhood, also will create a headache for the city due to the constant complaints from the neighborhood.
 - 3) The closeness – The Site is very condensed, surrounded by high and low rise buildings. It may not meet the requirement of minimum 80 feet. Even when it meet the requirement, it will still block daylight from the other buildings, which, as mentioned above, will impact the human living environment in the neighborhoods.

I understand how serious the lack of the living space is in the City. However, the increase of living space should be created without violating the living environment of the existing residents.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Best Regards,

Jessie Chun

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential