

PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street - OPPOSE

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
10/08/2021	18:59	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	Vancouver's view and skyline belong to all residents of Vancouver. Allowing such a horrid proposal to proceed forward will only devastate the majority of habitants of West End community. By putting a 40+ story building on Davie St. will neither intrinsically increase beauty value of our community nor enhancing its charm. Adversely sooner or later, we will have to live surrounded by skyscraper barricades. This kind of odd architectural structures does not cherish our authentic history, and sense of belonging; this trend shall not be encouraged, and need to be stopped. Besides, the necessity of buildings like this has been highly questionable. This type of buildings will never resolve our local housing problems by creating more of these so-called habitant units, which can only be seen affordable to the privileged elites, namely wealthy speculators' especially foreign investors. Even mandatory rental units will not be reasonably affordable to the general public while even so' only rich landlords will be beneficiary by further hyping up the local housing market. t will be both appalling and daunting to see if the City of Vancouver permits this horrid application.	Ron To		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
10/08/2021	19:03	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	Vancouver's view and skyline belong to all residents of Vancouver. Allowing such a horrid proposal to proceed forward will only devastate the majority of habitants of West End community. By putting a 40+ story building on Davie St. will neither intrinsically increase beauty value of our community nor enhancing its charm. Adversely sooner or later, we will have to live surrounded by skyscraper barricades. This kind of odd architectural structures does not cherish our authentic history, and sense of belonging; this trend shall not be encouraged, and need to be stopped. Besides, the necessity of buildings like this has been highly questionable. This type of buildings will never resolve our local housing problems by creating more of these so-called habitant units, which can only be seen affordable to the privileged elites, namely wealthy speculators' especially foreign investors. Even mandatory rental units will not be reasonably affordable to the general public while even so' only rich landlords will be beneficiary by further hyping up the local housing market. t will be both appalling and daunting to see if the City of Vancouver permits this horrid application.	Ron To		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
10/10/2021	15:03	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	The building clearly shadows the surrounding buildings depriving them of the natural sun light as it is too tall. This building will destroy the more happening, conventional and classic culture of west end and putting lot of pressure on its already stressed public transportation, traffic, beaches and parks.	Saurabh Agarwal		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
10/10/2021	18:52	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	Against a building that high. Keep same height restrictions	Paige Blaise		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Downtown	No web attachments.
10/11/2021	10:44	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	The existing community garden needs to stay. Another tower at that location is bad for the community. I own a condo in the immediate area & pay property taxes to city of Vancouver. I also lived in the West End for many many years	David Kosowan		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
10/11/2021	22:40	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	I do not support this development and this is why: 1. There is a housing crisis in Vancouver, and I don't see anything about this 289 unit building which will assist the housing crisis - no talk about social housing, or below market value units, nor co-ops. Profits, profits, profits. 2. The traffic on Burrard and Davie is already heavy - filled with too many personal vehicles, much needed public transportation and emergency vehicles. To make this intersection even more attractive for all traffic, the gas station across the street is the only gas station for the entire downtown-west end, and the first gas station from North Vancouver via Lion's Gate Bridge' Your proposal is to add 271 extra personal vehicles at this intersection, is simply ludicrous. 3. The construction of a 47 floor building and 271 parking spots will require the digging of a deep crater, and protracted construction will force both Davie and Burrard to operate at reduced lanes, further impacting the already congested traffic at that intersection. 4. This project is bad for the environment. Not only would you be adding multiple years of construction emissions, digging multiple layers of land for parking spaces and foundation, and adding the emissions of 271 extra vehicles, but you will be destroying the community garden which currently resides on this square of land. As someone who is renting a plot in the community garden, I know it serves the community in the way of affordable fresh produce, and a community gathering place. There is no language in your proposal for providing the community with a new garden. 5. The shade. In Kitsilano the community shot down a much smaller building because it would cast a shadow on the neighbouring houses, a 143m building will have an impact on all surrounding buildings, including residential buildings and businesses. 6. Ultimately, there doesn't seem to be any compelling reason to build such a large building at that intersection other than to provide outsized profits to the developer. A building of that size is not consistent with the neighbourhood, the additional traffic will be disruptive, the community will lose a green space, and there's no discussion in the proposal of the dedication of significant space in the building to social housing. It isn't reasonable to allow certain neighbourhoods to veto buildings over four stories, and to keep the density of those neighbourhoods low by putting a 47 story building in ours. We live in a city with a huge housing and homelessness crisis and I would love to support projects that would bring housing to the members of my community who are currently vulnerable and marginalized. I'm delighted with the project across the street at 1190 Burrard, for example. But this is too much height, too much parking, too much disruption, and you're concentrating too many people in a small section of this city.	Marina Georgieva		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	West End	No web attachments.
10/12/2021	11:44	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	The community garden that currently exists needs to stay. A new 47-storey tower at that location is a very bad for the community. I own a condo in that immediate area and pay property taxes to City of Vancouver.	Tammy Kosowan		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.

PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street - OPPOSE

10/12/2021	12:02	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	I oppose this building as I enjoy the garden and believe it brings a sense of community to the west end.	Gareth Corr		garethcorr@icloud.com	Downtown	No web attachments.
10/12/2021	16:54	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 1157 Burrard Street	Oppose	<p>Many points: For 3 years West End Neighbours has asked the City for an implementation report on the West End Community Plan. Please ask staff when the report will be published so that the public and Council have proper context with which to examine this application. Staff are dragging their feet, a disservice to Council and the public. Ref: https://westendneighbours.wordpress.com/2019/01/16/wen-calls-for-5-year-review-wecp/ - When the City approves a request for additional height and density, this is a highly subjective matter, so we ask our elected officials to scrutinize requests carefully. The Higher Buildings Policy is cited as a justification for height in this application, but the current Council needs to know when this Policy was significantly amended to higher heights it was without adequate public consultation, and in fact faced public opposition. - City staff work closely with developers in applications. Their sense of what is appropriate in terms of building height, density, and shadows is often widely divergent from the values of residents of the community. - The calculation of public benefits and capture of land lift is something Council must scrutinize carefully. Staff do their math and work closely with applicant on details. Prima Properties is benefiting from "cumulative" rezoning from the original gas station (well below 60 feet) up to 47 storeys, rezoned in 2013 under the West End Community Plan to 91.4m (300ft), and now the applicant is seeking 143.0m (469ft.) and increase in FSR from current 6.00 to 13.37. Was the land lift captured by City for public benefit in previous stages of rezoning(s) to greater height. If so, when and how much? The enormous increase in value enabled by rezoning could bring this property value to an order of half a billion dollars. Windfall profits. Is the City extracting enough in return on the public's behalf? No. - These will be expensive condos, not the kind of housing really needed in the West End. Again we need the WECF report to fully judge. - Transparency in taxes saved. A Vancouver Sun story states that the City gave Prima Properties more than \$212,000 in tax abatements in just one year alone (2009) for community garden at this site. For a complete picture, please obtain numbers on the total cumulative abatement enjoyed since the beginning. It could be above \$3 million dollars. The public hearing is a rare opportunity to again shine a light on the developer tax savings with so-called community gardens. In proposed CACs and public benefits, is the public really receiving enough? No. Construction impacts - With this project the City will need a major effort to reduce cumulative construction impacts and protect the quality of life of existing residents during construction. Who can residents speak with regarding negative impacts of construction work, and what are the statistics on reports or complaints? This information should be prominently posted at the construction site.</p>	Randy Helten		(b) (2)(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.