

CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-10-29	15:07	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	Mayor and Council: I am a resident of a nearby property to the site at 1111 Broughton Street. I’ve lived nearby for 32 years. The loss of the previous heritage house at this site to a fire was unfortunate. The current rezoning applicant’s intent to create below market housing units at the site is laudable, but as the form of the building proposed is incompatible with the site’s very small size and the surrounding context, I am opposed to the rezoning as currently formatted. The applicant appears to be relying on the “Rezoning Policy for the West End” as the main basis for their rezoning request. As a participant in the West End Community Plan process, I am aware that the rezoning policy is only part of the policy framework established by the city to regulate change in the West End. Given the time, money, public participation, and community expectations embodied in this planning process, I believe it is important to consider land use changes with respect to all policy components, as well as the specific context of a development application. During discussions on the West End Plan staff noted the need for flexibility in accommodating potential density for existing social housing sites in the neighbourhood, such as the site at 1424 Comox Street which is currently a three-storey social housing building. Massive density increases for tiny lots, as proposed at 1111 Broughton Street, were never discussed during the plan process or as a possible outcome of the implementation of the rezoning policy. West End Plan provisions specifically highlight built form principles that encourage the values of "livability" and "neighbourliness." Neither of these objectives are demonstrated 1111 Broughton Street, with a proposed density of 18.8 FAR. Assurances were provided during the plan process that new development would be evaluated carefully against the city's existing and updated policies, including the West End Tower Form guidelines - identified as setting out the city's expectations for the siting and massing of new residential towers. It is clearly noted in Section 2 that the policy is to be applied for applications being considered under the West End Rezoning Policy and one of the key provisions of the tower form policy is the anticipated minimum site frontage. For the separate rezoning application at 1150 Barclay Street, staff responded recently to a question regarding increased height at that site with the following: “The West End Community Plan does not set out height parameters for this area. The site’s lot width is 90 ft. which could potentially create challenges to construct a taller building. The buildings located along Burrard are larger lots and can therefore [sic] accommodate a taller building. Further, the West End Community Plan supports taller buildings along the Burrard corridor.” If it is staff’s opinion that a building of more than 20 storeys is problematic on a site that is 90 feet in width, it is most certainly problematic on the 66 foot wide site at 1111 Broughton Street. Staff have confirmed that the building form proposed at 1111 Broughton Street does not exist on any other site in the city - and for good reason. Fitting this large building onto this tiny lot has included design responses such as “carving out” the north facade of the building to avoid having residential spaces interact with the overhead powerlines in Jepson-Young Lane. Balconies on the east and west faces of the building are two feet from the property line. Yet staff note that “review by the Urban Design Panel was not required.” For a building type that does not exist anywhere in the city, and perhaps nowhere else in the country, it is puzzling why advice on the project would not be sought from the Urban Design Panel. The project will shade both the existing social housing project at 1424 Comox Street and the Broughton Street West End mini park. As a dense neighbourhood with few public spaces, the shadowing of the mini park should not be permitted. The lack of compliance with the West End Tower Form guidelines means that future development on nearby properties will be severely restricted - this is unfair to adjacent property owners, and could have implications for both future social housing expansion (at 1424 Comox Street) and heritage preservation for the properties to the west and north. To suggest, as the staff report does, that “the proposal is compatible with the surrounding	Michael Hartford	West End	

				urban context” would seem to ignore the existing three-storey buildings to the west, south, and east, and the six-storey building to the north. There is nothing “compatible” about the proposed development. The proposal is in no way, as the staff report notes, “respecting and responding to the neighbourhood character.” The proposal is very clearly a square peg in a round hole - an example of maximizing floor space at the expense of the livability and future development potential of neighbouring properties. The West End is held up as a success story in accommodating a range of housing types and building forms in a highly livable community. Its success is a delicate balance, and the care taken in managing development since the RM-5 zoning was established in the mid-1970's has helped to enhance this success. The fact that a rezoning application such as the one at 1111 Broughton Street "can be" considered does not mean that it “should be.” Please send the applicant back to the drawing board to adjust this proposal in a manner that better reflects its context.			
2025-10-29	21:07	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	Council Statement – Opposition to 1111 Broughton Street Good evening Mayor and Councillors, My name is Steven, and I’ve lived in the West End for over ten years. I’m an artist, and I chose this neighbourhood because of its creativity, diversity, and strong sense of community, values that the West End Community Plan was created to protect. I want to be clear that I fully support social housing, but not when it destroys the livability and integrity of the very community it’s supposed to serve. The proposal at 1111 Broughton Street does exactly that. The City keeps saying this project fits within the West End Plan, but it doesn’t. That plan was built with the people who live here, and it was meant to keep the center of the neighbourhood low to mid-rise to preserve sunlight, open space, and the character that makes the West End unique. In recent years, the City has introduced a series of amendments, changes to view cones, setbacks, lot sizes, parking rules, sunlight access, and open space protections. This proposal has taken maximum advantage of every single one of those changes, overriding the protections that were meant to safeguard this community, simply because it is being presented as a social housing project. The result is a tower completely out of scale with its surroundings and fundamentally at odds with the intent of the plan. The City has already surrounded this corridor with high-rises, and now it is trying to fill in the middle where the plan promised breathing room. This process feels like a predetermined outcome. The City hasn’t met its social housing targets, and now it is forcing through a tower on one of the smallest lots in the West End, driven by spreadsheets and political pressure rather than good planning. That is not responsible city-building; it is a violation of public trust. Prominent architects who have reviewed this project have said it is completely out of line with responsible development. Nearly every resident I have spoken with just shakes their head at this proposal, but most will not speak up because people are exhausted. They have watched too many of these decisions pushed through and no longer believe the City is acting with genuine public due diligence. To make matters worse, this building proposes zero off-street parking in one of the most congested areas in the city. There is no underground transit here, and we already face a parking crisis. Just where do you think those cars will go? It is completely unrealistic, and it is our daily lives that will bear the cost. If every rule in the plan can be bent, amended, or overridden, then the West End Plan means nothing. The years of community collaboration mean nothing. I urge every Councillor to walk this site and see the scale for yourselves. It is completely out of proportion and entirely inappropriate for this location. Please reject this proposal. Do not sacrifice a community’s livability for a rushed political checkbox. Social housing deserves better planning than this, and the West End community deserves to be heard. Thank you.	Steven Pollock	West End	

CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-10-29	21:24	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	The project is problematic on so many levels—its height, its lack of parking, its complete disregard for anyone living around it and in it—and feels designed by someone who does not intend to live in the neighbourhood. It goes against a well-researched plan for the West End neighbourhood, which is designed to protect the livability of this already high-density neighbourhood by containing tall buildings to established development corridors, and protecting low to mid-rises. Those of us who live here respect love the livable density we have here—but expect the City to also respect the plans put in place to keep the neighbourhood a desirable, well designed place to live. A six-storey max building would be better suited to this site (with set-backs, as well designed buildings should have), with at least some modicum of parking. Please don't destroy this beloved neighbourhood without consideration.	Anicka Quin	West End	
2025-10-29	22:27	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	Firstly, this should be a West End Permit parking zone (20 or more spots at least) for all West End parking permit holders since there is a serious lack of permit parking zones in the West End. In my opinion, a tall high-rise of that stature should not be built at all in the heart of our beautiful West End, especially on this block. It will over-shadow our beautiful heritage building (the Gainsborough) from all the natural sunlight and overtake all the other smaller buildings on this block. It will kill the vibe of our neighborhood, enough has been built already, go build those in Coal Harbour please. Plus I heard it would have no underground parking. Are you kidding me? Not to mention the chaos, disruption and noise pollution it will create on Broughton St and surrounding area for years. I am flabbergasted and deeply upset by such a project proposed by the City.	Yves Bernadet	West End	
2025-10-29	22:34	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	I am opposed to the new building due to concerns of overcrowding in this area. Many people in our building who can see a tree, the ocean or nature would now have their views blocked and instead of looking at nature they will be looking at concrete. This is obviously not good for anyone's mental health. The building we live in is a heritage building and will now be next to a second tower. A second tower is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings, ours being a heritage, the buildings across the street are 3 or 4 story buildings. The lot where this proposed building will go is extremely small. Currently there is street parking on both sides of the proposed building. As it is the parking here in the west end is unbelievably difficult. If I come home after 8 pm I have to drive around circling my home to find a parking place within 5 or so blocks of my home. The proposed building has no parking which is ridiculous. There is no way that out of that many people none of the residents will have cars. What about people with disabilities, what will they do? And what about the folks in our building with disabilities? For them to walk 5 or more blocks to park is challenging but to walk further than that will be impossible. We need to think about all in our community not just the money that's going to be made for the developers of this outrageous proposed building. And what about green space for all these people? Are we not a city that cares at all about green space? We need to think about the well being of people and I don't think this new building is considering that at all. I am 100% opposed to the proposed building and would hope you will seriously consider what you are thinking giving permission to build this monstrosity in an already densely populated area. Please do not ruin this city any further.	Gwen Bevan	West End	

2025-10-29	22:37	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	This is a terrible idea. I live next door to this proposed project. Not only it will take away our view and our privacy , there is no parking left! I work in film and have to drive to different locations every day, I come back late most of the time and can't find street parking even tho I pay for a street parking permit. It's really stressful already to drive around and around for up to 45 minutes when I have to get up really early. I don't understand how you think it would work? Also the lot is ridiculously small for such a high building. This is not the right place to build this.	No Name No Name	West End	
2025-10-30	06:40	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	I am concerned about the lack of parking in this large new development. This will make the challenge of street parking in this part of the West End worse. I would prefer that this development include parking for their residents/staff/trades, and also include parking for rent to people in the neighbourhood. While I support Mobi, Lime and transit, for some residents these are not viable options for commuting to work and having a car is necessary. Most older buildings do not provide parking for their residents (mine has no parkade) and so street parking is the only option. It is extremely difficult to find street parking in this part of the West End. I welcome more people to the West End and higher density building but the pressure it is putting on parking needs to be considered more fully.	Andrea Seale	West End	
2025-10-30	07:32	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	Too large of a building on a small lot. Will negatively impact neighbourhood. Is not in context with the neighborhood. Can the City study the West End and encourage buildings that are in keeping with the existing? People tend to stay longer in these types of buildings and become part of the neighborhood. I feel the towers are eroding a unique and vibrant area. It's a village in a big city. Not an opportunity for developers to capitalize on, without thought to the heart and character.	Marilou Rudakewich	West End	
2025-10-30	12:58	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	I am in favour of building social housing at 1111 Broughton Street but am strongly opposed to rezoning the height restriction. The site previously contained a house, the lot is designed for a smaller footprint than 25 stories. The block will be negatively impacted by noise and light pollution, increased traffic congestion, increased demand on street parking, poor and illegal decision making about parking and driving. It will negatively impact the local bird population. It will put a strain on local schools, community centre and public transportation, all of which are beyond capacity. There is already been multiple successful rezoning applications for higher heights for housing developments in Nelson St, Thurlow St, Robson and Alberni. The City of Vancouver does not appear to be tracking these prior approvals in a judicious or thoughtful way. These decisions have major impact to the fabric of the community and yet are made casually by local government. Social housing is a critical need but social housing shouldn't mean small, cramped layout that's poorly designed. This housing should offer more diversity of living space for different needs; single, couple, families to add to the fabric of the community. Please consider pausing this change to the rezoning and focusing on housing developments that bring value and vibrancy to our neighbourhood and city.	Sarah Gordon	West End	
2025-10-30	13:38	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	The building form does not align with the west end planning. It has never been any policy to allow such tall building in such a small lot. For boardway plan, the frontage has to be at least 99 ft for a tall building.	Olive Yu	South Cambie	
2025-10-30	14:24	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	This proposed rezoning and tower would have completely negative impacts on the neighbourood, especially the residents in a 3-block radius. Say NO!	Greg Helten	West End	
2025-10-30	14:44	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	Mayor and Council: I live at [REDACTED] a property close to the site at 1111 Broughton Street for 20 years. The loss of the previous heritage house at this site to a fire was unfortunate. The current rezoning applicant's intent to create below market housing units at the site is laudable, but as the form of the building proposed is incompatible with the site's very small size.	Diana Matrick	West End	

			I am opposed to the rezoning as currently formatted. The applicant appears to be relying on the “Rezoning Policy for the West End” as the main basis for their rezoning request. As a participant in the West End Community Plan process, I am aware that the rezoning policy is only part of the policy framework established by the city to regulate change in the West End. Given the time, money, public participation, and community expectations embodied in this planning process, I believe it is important to consider land use changes with respect to all policy components, as well as the specific context of a development application. During discussions on the West End Plan staff noted the need for flexibility in accommodating potential density for existing social housing sites in the neighbourhood, such as the site at 1424 Comox Street which is currently a three-storey social housing building. Massive density increases for tiny lots, as proposed at 1111 Broughton Street, were never discussed during the plan process or as a possible outcome of the implementation of the rezoning policy. West End Plan provisions specifically highlight built form principles that encourage the values of "livability" and "neighbourliness." Neither of these objectives are demonstrated 1111 Broughton Street, with a proposed density of 18.8 FAR. Assurances were provided during the planning process that new development would be evaluated carefully against the city's existing and updated policies, including the West End Tower Form guidelines - identified as setting out the city's expectations for the siting and massing of new residential towers. It is clearly noted in Section 2 that the policy is to be applied for applications being considered under the West End Rezoning Policy and one of the key provisions of the tower form policy is the anticipated minimum site frontage. For the separate rezoning application at 1150 Barclay Street, staff responded recently to a question regarding increased height at that site with the following: “The West End Community Plan does not set out height parameters for this area. The site’s lot width is 90 ft. which could potentially create challenges to construct a taller building. The buildings located along Burrard are larger lots and can therefore [sic] accommodate a taller building. Further, the West End Community Plan supports taller buildings along the Burrard corridor.” If it is staff’s opinion that a building of more than 20 storeys is problematic on a site that is 90 feet in width, it is most certainly problematic on the 66 foot wide site at 1111 Broughton Street. Staff have confirmed that the building form proposed at 1111 Broughton Street does not exist on any other site in the city - and for good reason. Fitting this large building onto this tiny lot has included design responses such as “carving out” the north facade of the building to avoid having residential spaces interact with the overhead powerlines in Jepson-Young Lane. Balconies on the east and west faces of the building are two feet from the property line. Yet staff note that “review by the Urban Design Panel was not required.” For a building type that does not exist anywhere in the city, and perhaps nowhere else in the country, it is puzzling why advice on the project would not be sought from the Urban Design Panel. The project will shade both the existing social housing project at 1424 Comox Street and the Broughton Street West End mini park. As a dense neighbourhood with few public spaces, the shadowing of the mini park should not be permitted. The lack of compliance with the West End Tower Form guidelines means that future development on nearby properties will be severely restricted - this is unfair to adjacent property owners, and could have implications for both future social housing expansion (at 1424 Comox Street) and heritage preservation for the properties to the west and north. To suggest, as the staff report does, that “the proposal is compatible with the surrounding urban context” would seem to ignore the existing three-storey buildings to the west, south, and east, and the six-storey building to the north. There is nothing “compatible” about the proposed development. The proposal is in no way, as the staff report notes, “respecting and responding to the neighbourhood character.” The proposal is very clearly a square peg in a round hole - an example of maximizing floor space at the expense of the livability and future development potential of neighbouring properties. The West End is held up as a success story in accommodating a range of housing types and building forms in a highly livable community. Its success is a delicate balance, and the care		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				taken in managing development since the RM-5 zoning was established in the mid-1970's has helped to enhance this success. The fact that a rezoning application such as the one at 1111 Broughton Street "can be" considered does not mean that it "should be." Please send the applicant back to the drawing board to adjust this proposal in a manner that better reflects its context. Thank you very much, Diana Matrick			
2025-10-30	15:20	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	I oppose the rezoning because the area is just too small to support the proposed changes without damaging the close-knit, walkable community we have. This neighbourhood is special because we can easily walk to local shops, parks, and visit each other. If larger developments are introduced, it would overcrowd the space and risk destroying the sense of connection and safety that makes this place feel like home. I believe keeping the area as it is is the best way to preserve the character and livability of the neighbourhood.	Dan Seo		
2025-10-30	15:22	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	This is way too small to be building what they are proposing, the street is already crowded enough this will become an even bigger safety risk.	Ammaar Muz	Downtown	
2025-10-30	15:30	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	The lote is very small to build an SRO	Daniel Bedoya		
2025-10-30	15:49	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	I'm a resident of the West End and my home is directly along the south property line of 1111 Broughton, the site of this proposed rezoning and development. The West End has been a special place for my entire life. My grandparents have lived here for over forty years and still do. I've lived here for nearly ten, and just over two years ago, my partner and I made the decision to invest in the community and purchase our first home at the corner of Pendrell and Broughton. The West End is truly one of Vancouver's most unique and livable neighbourhoods, a rare mix of charm, greenery, walkability, and community in the middle of a busy city. I am strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning and development at 1111 Broughton. First, the proposed building would have no setbacks. This means a 26-storey tower would be built directly against the walls of my home, with virtually no buffer. The scale and massing are completely out of character for this block. It would create significant loss of privacy, sunlight, and airflow for neighbouring homes. In our case, the south-facing windows of this new building would look directly into our bedroom skylights, creating serious privacy and safety concerns. (Reference 1 in document attached for visual) The plans submitted by Arcadis also contain factual errors, including the height of the existing building next door which is listed as three storeys when it's actually four. This error suggesting a lack of awareness or accuracy in how this development interacts with the surrounding properties. (Reference 2 in document attached for visual) Then there are the construction impacts, which are being completely overlooked. Large concrete towers of this scale take three or more years to complete. What is the plan to protect the structural integrity of neighbouring buildings during excavation? How will noise, dust, and heavy machinery be mitigated for residents living only a few feet away? How will residents safely access their homes when the construction site shares a property line? These are not small inconveniences, they are major disruptions that would make it nearly impossible to live safely and comfortably next door for years. Beyond my immediate property, there are broader concerns that affect the whole community. Traffic and parking: The proposal eliminates street parking for new loading zones but offers no on-site loading area. The Bloom Group's existing property on Nelson Street is a daily	Rachel Trummler	West End	Attachment 1

				example of this issue. There are taxis and service vehicles constantly idling out front, blocking lanes. This will worsen congestion on an already narrow street. Public safety: The West End’s crime rate has risen dramatically in recent months. My car and building were both broken into within the past month. What is the plan for ensuring community safety and maintaining quality of life if this high-impact project proceeds? Neighbourhood character: The West End has a long history of inclusive density done right through thoughtful mid-rise design, mature trees, and public spaces. A 26-storey tower with no setbacks and a high institutional use does not align with that legacy. This sets a new standard of what is acceptable in the area and opens the door for move developments like this to be considered. Infrastructure strain: Local utilities, parking availability, and emergency access are already under pressure. Adding a high-density building without proportional infrastructure upgrades will push these systems past capacity. If a project like this is approved, it risks eroding the very fabric that makes the West End special. The West End is a close-knit, livable, human-scale community where people know their neighbours and choose to stay for decades. I urge the City to reject this rezoning and prioritize developments that protect the West End’s integrity, projects that fit the neighbourhood, not overpower it. A 26-storey tower built without setbacks or consideration for its neighbours is not progress; it’s a step toward losing the very community that makes this area worth living in.			
2025-10-30	16:22	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	As a concerned West End resident living next to 1111 Broughton Street, I urge you to reject or substantially reduce the proposed 25-storey, 88 m tower with FSR 18.8. While I support affordable housing in principle, this project’s height and density far exceed the intent of the West End Community Plan (WECP) and would set a damaging precedent for growth across the West End. 1. Height, Density & Policy Conflicts The WECP calls for: “Gradual height transitions, human-scale streetscapes, and preservation of sunlight and open space.” This proposal violates all three: ● At 25 storeys on a very small lot (~20m × 20m), it creates an abrupt, jarring scale shift in a neighbourhood of 3–4 storey mid-rises. ● Tower Form, Siting & Setbacks Guidelines require towers to transition height to surrounding buildings, minimize shadowing on parks and streets, and preserve livability through setbacks and massing controls. ● While the floor plate (~325 m²) may meet technical slenderness criteria, the overall height and density overwhelm context, erode sky views, and fail the spirit of these policies. Recent view cone relaxations in 2024 should not be used to justify abandoning other WECP safeguards for sunlight, livability, and neighbourhood character.	Callum Davies	West End	

			2. Livability & Infrastructure Impacts ● Sunlight loss: City materials confirm afternoon shadows on the Broughton Mini-Park and neighbouring homes. ● School capacity: Lord Roberts Elementary (111%) and King George Secondary (159%) are already over capacity, with no education or transit investments proposed alongside this density. ● Parking pressure: With only one additional parking spot provided, the project risks overburdening permit zones; a parking impact study should be required before approval. ● Neighbourhood character: The West End’s unique mix of mid-rises, green streets, and human-scale density would be irreversibly altered. 3. Public Benefits vs Private Uplift If Council grants extraordinary height, density, and DCL/CAC exemptions, public benefits must be equally extraordinary. Instead: ● Only 30% of units are secured at BC Housing’s HIL levels; the other 70% lack defined rent or income limits. ● Just ~6% of units are family-sized, compared to 58% at 488 Broughton Street, which also delivered childcare, a school, and long-term affordability agreements at much lower scale. ● No public realm improvements, amenities, or infrastructure investments are committed despite fee waivers and massive density increases. This project offers far less public benefit for far more height and density than past precedents. 4. Precedent & Community Opposition Approving 25 storeys here would open the door to oversized towers across the West End, undermining the WECP’s balanced growth strategy. Over 222 public submissions have already raised concerns about height, shadowing, infrastructure strain, and neighbourhood character. I join them in urging the Council to protect the livability and scale the WECP promised residents. 5. Requested Outcome I respectfully ask Council to: ● Reject this rezoning as proposed, or ● Substantially reduce height, density, and massing before any approval, ensuring compliance with WECP height transition, sunlight access, and livability objectives. Any version moving forward must include: ● Enforceable affordability commitments for all units, not just the 30% at HIL levels, ● Expanded family housing, childcare, and public realm improvements matching or exceeding 488 Broughton ● Infrastructure upgrades addressing schools, transit, and public spaces before adding this		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				level of density ● Full shadow, sunlight, and livability studies released publicly before Council approval. Conclusion This project is simply too tall, too dense, and too out of scale with the West End Community Plan. Please listen to the many residents raising these concerns and protect the livability, sunlight, and character of our neighbourhood. Thank you for including this letter in the public record before Tuesday’s Public Hearing. Yours sincerely, Callum			
2025-10-30	16:38	CD-1 Rezoning: 1111 Broughton Street	Oppose	Dear Council, My name is Peter Tivy, and I live at [REDACTED], directly beside the proposed development at 1111 Broughton. I am writing to express my strong opposition to this proposal. The submission demonstrates a complete disregard for neighbouring residents, an inaccurate representation of site conditions, and a failure to align with the City’s own West End Community Plan objectives. 1. Total Lack of Consultation or Community Engagement Neither I nor our strata were ever consulted about this development. Multiple attempts were made to contact The Blume Group, yet no effort was made to respond or engage. This absence of outreach shows a clear disregard for community impact and an unwillingness to address legitimate resident concerns. Such behavior from a developer seeking approval in a dense residential area should be unacceptable to the City. Consultation is not a courtesy — it’s a responsibility when proposing a structure that directly affects light, privacy, and livability for neighbouring homes. 2. Overdevelopment and Permanent Impact on Adjoining Lots The proposed structure maximizes density with virtually zero setback, rising directly against our property line. It is disproportionate to the small lot and overwhelms both the heritage home next door and our four-storey strata at 1401–1411 Pendrell. Because the neighbouring lot contains a heritage-designated home, this proposal would eliminate any future densification potential for our property. Once constructed, our building would be trapped between the heritage site and a full-scale wall, effectively rendering our lot a “dead lot” for redevelopment. The City should instead view this block holistically under the West End Plan. A rational approach would involve lot consolidation, preserving the heritage home while creating a more appropriate, balanced development form that respects both heritage and density goals with proper setbacks. 3. Severe Privacy and Livability Violations The developer’s plans misrepresent our building as three storeys, when in fact my unit — 1407 Pendrell — is on the fourth floor and includes a rooftop patio and chimney. The proposed new building would sit directly adjacent to this space, blocking sunlight, removing	Peter Tivy	West End	Attachment 1

			open-sky exposure, and allowing full visual intrusion into my patio and bedroom skylights. This level of encroachment is unacceptable and contradicts the City’s own design guidelines on livability, shadowing, and privacy protection between adjacent residential uses. Conclusion and Requested Action Given the above, I request that the City: • Reject the current proposal in its present form; • Require The Blume Group to engage directly with neighbouring property owners before resubmission; • Reassess the block’s zoning context in alignment with the West End Plan, prioritizing heritage preservation and balanced density through potential lot consolidation; and • Ensure any resubmitted design includes realistic height and shadow studies that accurately model our four-storey elevation and rooftop conditions. This proposal, as submitted, is careless, inaccurate, and damaging to the character and future potential of the neighbourhood. I urge the City to take a firm stance against this kind of disregard for community and context. Sincerely, Peter Tivy Resident, [REDACTED]			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--