

Hello my name is Drew Smith, I live at 2151 Blackwater Road. Back in September I was nominated by our community to be the representative to speak on their behalf against the original Drewlo application regarding the subject lands in our community. Over the past 6 months I and a couple other residents have been part of a committee that have been representing our community in discussions with Drewlo seeking a compromise that all parties can be happy with. Before I get into any points on this latest application let me begin by just stating a few things regarding the direction given by PEC at the September meeting to Drewlo and how our community feels about how that progress has been.

Back in September PEC stated that Drewlo's application was to "BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration for consultation with the developer and the community on issues related to, but not limited to, height, density and setbacks." Of these areas

- Setbacks - never came into question as Drewlo never considered doing any other structures than apartment buildings, even though some were suggested by our committee, and these apartments have not moved any closer to any houses, they have always been the furthest away from housing they could be.
- Density - The original application was pushing the absolute limit of medium density, the lower end of high density, at 75 u/ha with a total of 314 units for all 3 buildings. Drewlo has not done any compromise regarding density for any of the proposals they have had over the past 6 months when the proposal is considered in its entirety for all 3 blocks. With this latest application Drewlo is still at a total of 314 units. Our community was willing to accept a moderate increase in the density from the current zoning of 35 u/ha had Drewlo been willing to reduce the density in their proposals. When Drewlo in their proposal A1.9, the one prior to this application, reduced the density and height of buildings 1 and 2 to 62 u/ha we told Drewlo we would accept these changes, we would be willing to compromise on the density for those two buildings being lower however Drewlo never reduced the density planned for all of these subject lands as a whole, they just shifted the number of units from one set of buildings to another so building 3 became denser and higher. Feedback from our community has been extreme disappointment that the overall density was never reduced nor considered by Drewlo during our months of working together. We have mentioned to Drewlo that if the density was reduced the height of their buildings would have been lower or other buildings

could have been considered which would lower their costs and we would have had an approval on this much sooner.

- Traffic - although not specifically stated as a point to work with the community on it was a major area of concern to our community back in September. Traffic flow is primarily geared by the density, the more density the more traffic. In this latest application access for building 3 is off of Adelaide only, there is no longer any access to Garibaldi Avenue. Although Drewlo approached the city traffic about doing this it was not a compromise given by Drewlo as such access could only be given by City traffic or council
- Height – There has been a change to the heights on all 3 buildings from the original design. Originally all buildings were 5 storeys – 18 m, 6 storeys on the walkout sides. With this latest proposal buildings 1 and 2 are down to 4 storeys – 12 m, 5 storeys on the walkout side which does meet the current zoning height restriction. However all Drewlo did was to move the lost floors over to building 3, you do not see it here but the plan prior to this application A1.9 had building 3 at 8 storeys – 23m, 9 storeys on the walkout side, a 3 storey increase from the original 5/6 storey apartments. This was no compromise but a movement from one area to another and has led to the 98 u/ha and OPA or bonus zoning set forth on this current application. Drewlo did add underground parking but this was to accommodate the additional units in the building. With this latest application Drewlo had made the building L-shaped which brought this down to the current 6 storey – 18m, 7 storey on the walkout side as shown in their A1.10 plan. Out of all the things asked by PEC to do this was the only compromise that Drewlo made in the eyes of our community.

The changes that Drewlo has on this current application have come as a result of several discussions and a couple of community meetings over the past 6 months. When proposal A1.9 came out we presented it to our community, based on their feedback myself and the other committee members felt that we had made some headway based on the changes to buildings 1 and 2 being lower in height and density but we told Drewlo outright that building 3 at 8/9 storeys would not be accepted especially if the access was going to be on Garibaldi Avenue. We provided Drewlo with a formal letter outlining our community's thoughts regarding the A1.9 plan. I have included a copy of that letter in my paperwork submitted for this presentation. Plan A1.9 had been pitched to us as the absolute last proposal Drewlo was going to do. If we did not accept it we were basically

told Drewlo would most probably come back to PEC with their original plan which would be the one they would go to OMB with if necessary. We met with George Bikas and Laverne Kirkness after submitting our letter to Drewlo to discuss our community's points. As we felt some headway with buildings 1 and 2 had been made, Drewlo reduced the height and we were willing to compromise on the higher density, we opened the door to Drewlo that maybe they could look at making building 3 L-shaped. This was an attempt to reduce the height and we again mentioned about how the density was not changing in any way regarding the overall proposal of all 3 buildings, feeling it was our last shot at getting them to take that consideration or having any further changes. Out of that meeting Drewlo did change the shape of building 3 but again did nothing regarding density, the L-shaped building is the one and only compromise made by them and it is a part of this application we are discussing tonight.

When this first started I really felt like we would have a leg to stand on, be in a position where we can get a compromise from the developer, now I am really frustrated with how little we can do, what lack of rights we as citizens have. Back in 98 the city, citizens and the developers got together and did the Uplands Community Plan, a collaborative effort by all including Drewlo. Since September all I have heard is how things have changed, this no longer applies. I work in IT, I am very familiar with how fast things change. This plan is only 15 years old, yes the province has ideas on densification, yes the Official Plan outlines more but not even a generation later you are telling me that plan is no longer worthwhile, it is garbage? What a waste of effort and compromise if that is the case. Hearing some other developments that have come here to PEC I feel almost like the builders believe they can almost build or do what they want. Yes there is a process, we are in it now, but really the ball is in their court. I don't think all builders are like this though, I have been told a couple will really work with a community. I am all for development, growing an economy, bringing in jobs but when it comes to building within an established community I feel that there really is no consideration or respect for the community that exists where the development is being done. This attitude was shown when Mr. Kirkness in one of our meetings when discussing the density mentioned well the city is giving us 75 u/ha and Drewlo just wants to take it. Nothing about how this development will be a benefit or impact on the community or area. Regarding the process, City planning does has to approve the proposal but what can they do, does the proposal meet the zoning, can streets handle the traffic, sewer/utilities etc are they all OK, are setbacks alright,

everything a yes then they can only approve it. Do they have the ability to refuse a proposal, I don't know what has to happen for that, I would have thought that 3 massive buildings with a densification 1.5 x the existing community in an area ¼ the size would have prompted that if they did. As for the PEC committee you can say yes to the proposal which means we have to live with it. If you do say no to the developer, which you did for us in September, then the builder just goes to OMB. We as a community have retirees, people close to retiring but mainly families. We have budgets but in order to go to OMB we have to hire a planner and a lawyer. Can I honestly expect every house to give a few hundred dollars to fight this against a developer who has no reservations when it comes to funds? OMB can be a roll of the dice, if you lose you have to put up with whatever the builder went to them with which we were told once would be the original plan. The favour is even more with the builder if you can't provide the planner or lawyer. Is it worth it?

When we contacted our community to tell them that Drewlo was making this application based on plan A1.10 we asked for their input again. We felt that we had to advise them that we felt our best course of action would be to accept this proposal from Drewlo, not because we really wanted to, but simply because it was the best out of all proposals and if we did not we could wind up with any of the other proposals that Drewlo had shown before, all of which were completely unacceptable and we would have no control or say. We had no other course of action to get Drewlo to compromise more regarding density or height. We told our community that if they did want us to reject this proposal and wanted to keep fighting for some compromise regarding density from Drewlo we would but they would have to be prepared to possibly go to OMB to fight any development from Drewlo and there would be no guarantee what we would get. The amount of feedback we have had has been reduced when compared to feedback on other proposals, possibly people have just given in, but those that have commented I will echo what they have told us and believe myself. We have to reluctantly accept this proposal/application from Drewlo for their apartment buildings simply because:

- a) it is the best proposal that has come from Drewlo and
- b) What other choice do we have in this matter, by not accepting it we could get the original plan which does not work

Based on my concerns above about the lack authority we have and the very little compromising from Drewlo regarding height and density, mixed in with the

constant little threats and reminders during our meetings we have had that Drewlo could take their proposal to OMB if they chose I feel that we really do not seem to have any other rights or position to force a further compromise from Drewlo on density, which is sad seeing as this is where we have elected to live and raise our families or plant our roots. Even though we have gone to every meeting with the intent of working on a compromise, we have offered suggestions, ideas we are in a position that we have to agree to a overall density which we never found acceptable in September but have to now, and that density will be higher in one area than the original plan, because by at least saying we accept this proposal we can control some parts of what happens moving forward.

The acceptance of this proposal is on the basis that Drewlo will honour the following standards/specifications that they have given us in previous meetings. This is just a preliminary list based on our discussions with George and Drewlo and may be added to as the development goes through different phases where more details and standards will be discussed and set. The first points are based on buildings 1 and 2, blocks 64/65 and were listed in our formal letter to Drewlo dated Jan 22. In a meeting on Jan 27 with George Bikas and other representatives from City planning and Drewlo George told us that he and Drewlo agree to these specification from our formal letter.

- Berms in the size/height of 1.5m and a width large enough to allow a zig zag pattern of mature trees (from George Bikas Nov 28, 2013)
- Mature spruce trees with a minimum height of 10' on top of the berms (from Nov 28, 2014 mtg)
- Maintenance of existing swale between houses on Garibaldi and subject property (from Nov 5, 2013 mtg)
- Set back from fence line on Garibaldi to beginning of asphalt parking to be approx 65' (from Nov 28, 2013 mtg)
- Lot area of the 2 buildings: 2814128m² (2.8141 ha)
- Apartment building area: 484140 m²
- Building/site coverage: 17.2 %
- Building height: 11.85 m @ 4th storey parapet
- Storeys: 4 (5 on the walk-out side)
- Parking spaces: 268 including 4 h/c
- Number of units: 88 units each building
- Density: 62.54 u/ha

There is one part of the plan A1.10 proposal/application you have that has changed since Drewlo submitted it, that is the entrance to Blackwater has now moved further north by 4m. This will allow for the berms and landscaping that exist between the property lines of Garibaldi and the subject land blocks 64/65 to be extended to Blackwater providing more privacy to the first houses closest to Blackwater Road.

The following are standards that must be met by Drewlo regarding building 3, block 62

- Berms in the size/height of 1.5m and a width large enough to allow a zig zag pattern of mature trees (from George Bikas Nov 28, 2013)
- Mature spruce trees with a minimum height of 10' on top of the berms (from Nov 28, 2014 mtg)
- Lot area of the 2 buildings: 13972.02m² (1.3972 ha)
- Apartment building area: 2547 m²
- Building/site coverage: 18.22 %
- Building height: 17.55 m @ 6th storey parapet, 20.35m from walkout
- Storeys: 6 (7 on the walk-out side)
- Parking spaces: 116 on the surface, 100 underground for a total of 216 which includes 4 h/c
- The underground parking MUST be a full underground parking unit not just a parkette. The surface parking lot must be level with the first floor of the apartment building on the west side.
- Number of units: 138 units
- Density: 98.77 u/ha

We do ask that the berms and trees be setup early during the construction because a) it was a strong deciding factor for all three blocks of land; b) they will act as a buffer to a construction zone and; c) make sure they get installed. Given the past history Drewlo has with the residents of our community I am sure you can appreciate the distrust that exists and we need to ensure Drewlo follows through on the berm and tree setup, doing this early will be an act of good faith and will not give way to any excuses later for them not being done.

Although not required for this application, for blocks 64/65 and block 62 we would like to see additional trees in the parking lot areas to break up all of the asphalt that will be there. We also ask that the parkette area and the path joining

Garibaldi and the commercial area Drewlo has in their A1.10 plan have sufficient lighting for safety at night as well as benches for people to sit if desired.

Should any of these specifications be changed by Drewlo or there be any changes to the buildings themselves regarding height or density we request that our committee be notified. If we feel that the change alters the plans for these apartments in a negative way, if there is any increase in height or density we will remove our acceptance of this application immediately and ask for an explanation of the change and a meeting with city staff.

With this latest proposal we are extremely pleased with the full access to Adelaide that building 3, block 62 has, our gratitude goes out to City traffic for allowing this access so that there is no traffic from this unit coming out to Garibaldi and Blackwater. We do ask for one additional consideration from council regarding this application, that right in/right out access be granted to Sunningdale for buildings 1 and 2, block 64/65. The plan A1.10 provided by Drewlo during the submission of their application does show such an access but City Traffic has not endorsed this access like they did for Adelaide and building 3. As the traffic from building 3 will not be coming into our community I will not include it in any of my following numbers. Considering just buildings 1 and 2 with this latest proposal there will be 176 units, when you consider there are 204 single dwelling houses in our community this proposal will bring our community to around 185% of its current number, which also raises the traffic level up potentially to 185% of its current volume, this is almost double. At an estimate of 1.5 cars per unit that will bring approximately 265 additional cars to Blackwater, our one main community street, and the one street used to enter and exit our community to Sunningdale and Adelaide. As stated in September we have a park at the bend of Blackwater road as it goes from a north south road to a west east road. This park has a playground which is very active during the warm months with children from our community. We recognize that new tenants in these new apartment buildings will come down Blackwater from their apartments to Adelaide when heading south into the city, it is the logical route instead of going north to Sunningdale then to Adelaide. We have a major concern with the safety of our children, and families in general, who are coming and going to this park as well as just being out for activity due to the easy access our street provides to the arterial roads. We have a retirement home at Adelaide and Blackwater which on a regular basis has cars parked on both sides of the street which can easily reduce

Blackwater to a one lane road. Our street is not designed in a way where access to Adelaide or Sunningdale requires several turns or points where one has to slow down. It is a very wide, secondary collector that is very appealing to a quick exit heading south into the city. We have seen already over the years several cars using our street as a cut through from Sunningdale to Adelaide. With some of the speeds we see cars come around this bend and approach the retirement home, the added volume of traffic simply raises our concerns even more. By allowing a right in/right out access to Sunningdale you can effectively remove almost all of building 2 traffic from this equation as that access to Sunningdale then Adelaide will be the quicker and more logical route to head south into the city rather than go all the way past building 1 to get to Blackwater and then Adelaide. Please consider and grant the access to Sunningdale to help us reduce the traffic coming through our community, past our park and provide some more safety to our community. City traffic's concern with the access to Sunningdale is not sufficient space for a turn or access lane. As Sunningdale will be a 4 lane road in the years to come I would think that incorporating access to Sunningdale would be easier and a decent option.