

## Kennett, Bonnie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Friday, July 03, 2015 10:45 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: 1754-1772 Pendrell Street Rezoning Hearing

---

**From:** Matthew Goguen [mailto:<sup>s.22(1) Personal and Confidential</sup>],  
**Sent:** Friday, July 03, 2015 10:32 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** 1754-1772 Pendrell Street Rezoning Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am the owner of <sup>s.22(1) Personal and Confidential</sup>, and am writing to voice my opposition to the rezoning from 6 stories to 21 stories of the 1754-1772 Pendrell Street project.

The summer light my living room receives will be sorely diminished if the existing 3 story structures are replaced with a 21 story building. Would you want the same for your home?

I know density is the current goal of council, but doubling the existing height to 6 floors would achieve a density increase of 100%! One must remember that the West End is already very high density, and there must be limits to density, or we will lose the West End we know and love. I will look elsewhere to live if the character of the West End changes too much.

Thank you for reading, and your service to the city.

Regards, Matt Goguen

## Kennett, Bonnie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2015 3:12 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: 1754-1722 Pendrell Street rezoning application

**From:** patty burn [mailto:s.22(1) Personal and Confidential]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2015 2:38 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** 1754-1722 Pendrell Street rezoning application

The following should be considered when reviewing this application:

### 1) TRAFFIC

The proposal includes 3 underground levels of parking with a minimum of 80 proposed parking spaces.

Nearby Denman Street is bumper to bumper traffic in rush hour and on summer weekends. We don't need more cars in the West End, especially not in such an already busy locale.

Note also all the events that take place in or pass through the West End and result in street closures (Denman, Davie, Robson and/or Beach)

- \* Sun Run
- \* Marathon
- \* Pride Parade
- \* Fireworks
- \* Etc.

### 2) HEIGHT

Are we going to have a forest of taller buildings at the foot of Denman Street? There is already one recently erected building at the corner of Bidwell and Davie and another application is for a 22-storey tower kitty-corner to that one at 1188 Bidwell Street.

### 3) DENSITY

Many areas of the city are underpopulated. Several schools are slated for closure in East Vancouver. We don't even know how many condos and houses bought by investors sit empty.

As a West End resident I know the value of this location--the Beach, Stanley Park and downtown within walking distance--but also the disadvantages--noise, crowding, small variety of businesses due to high rents, lack of green space: Stanley Park is great but it is used by the whole city as well as the many tourists who come here. If we leave aside Stanley Park, the West End has fewer amenities than Yaletown.

To my mind, Kitsilano is an even more attractive area. Where are all the applications to build high towers there? A walk down 2nd or 3rd Avenue between Vine and Burrard shows many older low-rise buildings that could be replaced by towers. For nearly a year I used to get off my bus from UBC and walk through that area over the Burrard Bridge and never saw a development application sign. Strange--must be sacred ground.

#### 4) INCLUSION OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL UNITS

HA HA HA HA HA HA HA!

#### 5) PROFITABILITY

The investors will no doubt argue that they need to put up such a tall building in order to break even. The site in question, or at least part of it, has sat vacant for years, and this is not the first development sign to go up. Only the owners of the site know why they waited so long to put forward the current proposal, but the average man in the street would guess they were waiting to maximize profitability. As a resident of the area, I am more interested in maximizing livability.

Yours sincerely

Patricia Burn (homeowner)

## Kennett, Bonnie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2015 3:17 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: On the proposal for a 21 story building at 1754-1772 Pendrell  
**Attachments:** Pendrell Street proposal.docx

---

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** William Ellis [mailto:[william.ellis@cityofvancouver.ca](mailto:william.ellis@cityofvancouver.ca)]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2015 3:14 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** On the proposal for a 21 story building at 1754-1772 Pendrell

July 6, 2015

To: The Mayor and Council Members of the City of Vancouver

Re: the proposal to build a 21 story building on 1754-1772 Pendrell.

Dear Mr. Mayor and Council Members-

I urge the city to reject the proposal to build a 21-story building on 1754-1772 Pendrell. There should be no further buildings approaching this height in the West End, where my wife and I reside.

Since moving to Vancouver two years ago, we have found that the quality of urbanization practiced in Vancouver is usually poor. I have lived in a number of cities as large or larger than Vancouver - Boston, Montreal, Toulouse, Phnom Penh, Kunming, and Chengdu - and I have visited many more. Vancouver occupies one of the world's most splendid natural sites. Unfortunately, its built environment is often unworthy of it.

Buildings here tend to be either too high or too low. Buildings of one or two stories sometimes have historical value. When they do they should be preserved, but when they do not, there is no need to persist in maintaining the very low profile that many buildings have along major commercial arteries in the West End such as Denman, Robson, and Davie.

There are no excuses for further tall buildings in the West End. First of all, tall buildings push housing costs upward, never downward, and Vancouver, which is the Canadian city that is the tallest (for its size) and the most expensive (regardless of size) illustrates this principle. Second, once a certain height is reached - 10 stories say - it is virtually impossible to maintain the human scale of a building.

To give an example: I live in an 11 story tower on the corner of Gilford and Nelson. It is perfectly functional, yet sterile. The building occupies only about 40% of the total lot space. At least half of that is occupied by an open-face parking lot. A wider building of five stories that occupied the entire lot, in which all parking was underground, would have been a much more urbane solution to the site.

That is the solution that the city of Vancouver should be promoting: low-rise and high-density construction.

Here are comparative statistics that further illustrate my point: the downtown of Vancouver, the West End,

and Stanley Park, occupy about 10 square kilometers (of which 4 belong to Stanley Park), with a population of 99, 000. In Montreal, the quarter of Le-Plateau-Montreal (parks included) occupies about 8.1 sq. kilometers with a population of 100, 000. If we don't count the parks, the size of both urban areas remains about the same, since some of the largest Montreal parks are in the Plateau and there are many parks. (These figures come from Wikipedia and the website of the Plateau).

Yet in the Plateau-Montreal, (which is where I lived for over 20 years) there are very few buildings that are either very tall or very low, and the area as a whole is a much more successful piece of urbanization than the West End and Downtown Vancouver. Some might disagree with this last point, and I don't want to press the comparison very far: of course the Plateau is not part of the downtown of Montreal.

But the comparison does show that it possible to build an esthetically pleasing high-density environment without tall buildings, such as the 21 story tower proposed for Pendrell street, in a neighborhood already very dense and overbuilt with tall buildings.

Respectfully,

Dr. William Ellis

ps. I should add that I am a semi-retired university professor currently teaching Art History in the Liberal Arts Program at Simon Fraser University's downtown Harbor-front campus.

## Kennett, Bonnie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:22 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: rezoning 1754-1772, pendrell St., Vancouver

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** ray alexander Eyton [mailto:[redacted](#)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:10 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** rezoning 1754-1772, pendrell st., vancouver

Please vote no. If you stop approving towers the predicted one million people will not be moving to Vancouver. Then we would not have to raise the ten billion for transportation infrastructure . There are lots of areas in Canada that needs people.

If you vote yes you will be creating more Donald Trumps, adding to the overpopulated West End, blocking view corridors, and lowering the quality of life in general.

Personally, the loss of the English Bay view will devalue my apartment by about \$75,000.00. The total loss for the other affected suites in our building will be about 3.5 million. Keep in mind that is just one building.

A six storey building would be acceptable for most people.

R.A.Eyton

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential