

## Kennett, Bonnie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 09, 2015 9:19 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: rezoning 1754-1772 Pendrell Street

---

**From:** Marion s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 09, 2015 6:25 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** re: rezoning 1754-1772 Pendrell Street

I was involved as I could be in the West End Community Plan and it was my understanding that there would be no buildings between Davie and Robson that would be over 6 stories. This proposal exceeds that. I understand that this development was approved before the WECP was in place but I believed that the plan would be adhered to. How many more times will I need to watch to see that the city planning department disregards the desires and hard work of the residents in working on this plan. The development proposal at Davie and Bute also seems to contravene the plan. We believed that the West End Community Plan would be adhered to. Are we going to be betrayed?

Marion Smith

## Kennett, Bonnie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2015 4:13 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: 1754-1772 Pendrell Street Rezoning

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Pearce s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 12:52 PM  
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
Subject: 1754-1772 Pendrell Street Rezoning

I am writing in opposition to the rezoning at 1754-1772 Pendrell Street. I live nearby this proposed development with my wife and two small kids in a one bedroom apartment. While I will support higher densities in the West End such as this, I think the overall public benefits for west end residents are inadequate.

Higher densities and smaller units sizes in urban areas are only supportable, in my view and especially for families with high quality newer amenities with programming within walking distance, including playing fields and neighbourhood playgrounds which can be used during the day, high quality public schools with capacity for student enrolment, new childcare centers.

What I would like to see is more of an assessment of the impacts on:

- \* active playing fields in the westend including number of persons/hectare.
- \* existing programming and capacities at the WECC and Gordon neighborhood house.
- \* existing daycare centres.
- \* existing public schools including French immersion.
- \* existing indoor swimming pools
- \* existing splash parks and wading pools.
- \* existing neighborhood playgrounds which can be used during the day.

I think council needs to refocus its priorities on high quality amenities for families in the west end. In addition, many families of modest incomes would like to stay and invest in the west end and continue the walkable lifestyle, but the supply of 3 bedrooms units (and even 2 bedrooms with a den) available for purchase is so limited it really is not feasible for most families.

Tom Pearce  
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2015 9:59 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Notice of Public Hearing- 1754-1772 Pendrell Street

---

**From:** William Brown s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 12, 2015 10:20 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Robertson, Gregor; Stevenson, Tim  
**Subject:** Notice of Public Hearing- 1754-1772 Pendrell Street

His Worship Mayor Gregor Robertson and Vancouver City Council,

I am writing to council in regard to the proposed zoning and development by-law amendment for 1745-1772 Pendrell Street. Specifically the change from an RM-5A district development to a CD-1 district development, according to my notice this would permit the construction of a 21 storey building.

As a resident of the West End I am writing to asking council to vote down this amendment for the benefit of the current residents and for the future of the West End.

The West End of Vancouver is historically a bustling and dense neighbourhood. Although many Canadian cities can make this claim, only the West End has a distinct water border and an iconic city park constituting its main boundaries. Shops, tourism, annual parades and long time residents provide the neighbourhood with its unique identity. These factors also substantiate the West End's reputation for density, traffic and the feeling of truly living downtown.

The proposal of a 178 housing unit situated near a traffic choke point will no doubt add to the urban congestion we residents already enjoy.

The addition of such a large structure, at that particular address, will not enhance the quality of life in this part of Vancouver. Furthermore, I am not aware that this council has any plans to change the infrastructure to accommodate this type of ambitious request. Is the building going to have underground parking? Will residents be required to deal with more vehicles and see increased competition for highly coveted parking spots?

On a temporary level the construction of a building of this size, in such a compressed space, will not only be stressful on residents in the vicinity but on the neighbourhood as a whole. Large scale construction is not a clean, noise free or green endeavour.

I'm quite certain that the developer will argue that the short term discomfort will provide a long term gain for the city and the West End. My concern as a citizen, and of course a resident, is that this council will be approached by other developers if this by-law amendment is passed. Perhaps we will see higher structures in the future? Maybe a large demolition project to make way for a building bigger than the one proposed?

Is the long term gain for the West End a Coal Harbour like neighbourhood next to English Bay? The West Does not need skyscrapers and we shouldn't open the door to projects where, quite frankly, they appear to be unsuited for certain sections of an already saturated part of the city.

For the record I am not against renewal or development. I have watched a few buildings be constructed in my short time living in the West End. But this particular project is not a suitable choice for the West End and council must look at its distinct location and the impact it will have.

Finally, I must reiterate my previous concern: Approval could possibly signal that buildings of this size can be constructed anywhere in the West End.

This is likely my biggest concern.

It is the responsibility of this council to oversee proper development and implement decisions that best serve this community. One of the greatest tools at the disposal of this council is restraint.

For the above concerns and as a resident of the West End I ask council to deny the proposed amendment.

Thank you for reading my correspondence.

Sincerely,

William Brown

cc: Mayor Gregor Robertson

cc: Councillor Tim Stevenson

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Chris Lambert s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2015 10:28 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Public Hearing  
**Cc:** robertson@vancouver.ca  
**Subject:** Notice of Public Hearing- 1754-1772 Pendrell Street

His Worship Mayor Gregor Robertson and Vancouver City Council,

I am writing to council in regard to the proposed zoning and development by-law amendment for 1745-1772 Pendrell Street. Specifically the change from an RM-5A district development to a CD-1 district development, according to my notice this would permit the construction of a 21 storey building.

As a long time resident of the West End I am writing to asking council to vote down this amendment for the benefit of the current residents and for the future of the West End.

I understand the developers desire to add rental units and shops (and to make lots of money) but what cost will the west end bear if this monstrous tower is to go up? We will see traffic increase, parking decrease and noise, dust and bother go up. The location is also an issue because of its proximity to our beach, are we looking to transform the iconic west end into another Yaletown or Coal Harbor? I very much enjoy the green spaces and views the west end provides now, raising a huge tower right on Denman street not only blocks views for others further inland but it also adds a blight to our shoreline if not done tastefully. I'd hate to see another concrete monolith go up like sunset towers. Will this building usher a new frenzy of construction in the west end resulting in apartments above what current tenants can afford? I enjoy the zoning as it is now and truly believe that changing it is opening the doors to something bad that will be out of our control as residents.

For the record I am not against renewal or development. I have watched a few buildings be constructed in my short time living in the West End. But this particular project is not a suitable choice for the West End and council must look at its distinct location and the impact it will have. It's just too big and too tall.

For the record, my biggest concern: Approval could possibly signal that buildings of this size can be constructed anywhere in the West End.

It is the responsibility of this council to oversee proper development and implement decisions that best serve this community. One of the greatest tools at the disposal of this council is restraint.

For the above concerns and as a resident of the West End I ask council to DENY the proposed amendment.

Thank you for reading my correspondence.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Lambert

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** CityHallWatch (MetroVanWatch) s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2015 3:37 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Public Hearing 13-Jul-2015, 1754-1772 Pendrell. Complaint and query about Urban Design Panel "in camera" 8-Apr-2015

Dear Mayor and Council,

We are writing to bring your attention to what may have been an irregularity regarding the process leading up to this Public Hearing for 1754-1772 Pendrell Street, a rezoning for a 21-storey tower.

This is a specific request for City Council to clear up the facts, for the public record.

On behalf of CityHallWatch, I attended the Urban Design Panel meeting, regarding this application, on April 8, 2015.

The scheduled start of the meeting was 3 pm. But shortly after 3 pm, the Chair of the UPD asked members of the public to leave the room for about ten to fifteen minutes. No reason was provided. When the public was called back in, the meeting resumed with a presentation by the applicant team. Mysteriously (to me), although the UDP had nearly unanimously rejected an application due to urban design concerns (including excessive density) at the same site in 2010, this time the UDP supported the application unanimously even though the revised application had even greater density than in 2010.

As far as I was concerned, the meeting went "in camera" at the start of the meeting, and the extreme difference in the UDP's conclusions in 2010 versus 2015 led me to wonder about the content of the portion of the meeting that was abruptly closed to the public.

It appeared to me that the UDP went in camera, in violation of the Vancouver Charter, which requires in Section 165.3: "*Before holding a meeting or part of a meeting that is to be closed to the public, the Council [or body] must state, by resolution passed in a public meeting: (a) the fact that the meeting or part is to be closed, and (b) the basis under the applicable subsection of section 165.2 on which the meeting or part is to be closed.*"

The Minutes of the April 8 UDP meeting state this: "*Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. There was a brief business meeting and then the Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.*" (Note, I believe the correct time was 3:10 pm)

A reasonable member of the public has no way to judge whether the content of that closed meeting justified having the public sent out, so to any objective observer, it went in camera.

I believe this is a matter that requires oversight from above, meaning City Council.

The Public Hearing today, July 13, is for a 21-storey tower application in the West End at 1754-1772 Pendrell, by a developer and architect who have received a large number of project approvals over the past decade. One might be reasonable to assume that they have considerable connections and influence at City Hall.

Exactly for these reasons, in the interest of maintaining public trust in all the bodies of Vancouver municipal government, I hope that you will independently confirm the exact nature and content of this closed meeting of the UDP on April 8, 2015.

If the Vancouver Charter was violated, I hope you will have the matter rectified. And even if the Charter was not violated, perhaps Council could take some steps to remind all the City's advisory bodies of best practices to ensure that not even a glimmer of doubt can arise regarding transparency and respect of due process by all advisory bodies, relating to closed meetings.

Sincerely,  
Randy Helten  
CityHallWatch Media Foundation

--

\*\*\*\*\*

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

*CityHallWatch.ca. Tools for engagement in Vancouver City decisions. Creating our future.*

*MetroVanWatch.ca. Our dream: A socially, environmentally, agriculturally sustainable Metro Vancouver region.*

*BC Election Campaign Finance Reform Network: Get the big money out of civic and provincial politics.*

\*\*\*\*\*