

**From:** Samuel E Trosow

**To:** City Clerk, Mayor and City Councillors

**Subject:** Re 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the PEC, Item # 3.2 -- Concerns regarding density bonus for Z-8905

I wanted to reiterate some of my concerns about the Wellington/Grey Project (Z-8905, 147-149 Wellington, 253 and 257 Grey Street) that I raised at the public participation meeting before the Planning and Environment Committee on September 10<sup>th</sup>. I understand that the city will be in further discussion with the applicant about the terms of the bonus arrangement before a staff report is issued with a recommendation, so I hope these suggestions are helpful,

This project seeks a massive density bonus to allow 593 UPH with a height of 63 meters (current zoning would allow 250 UPH with a height of 12 meters). It is quite understandable that many consider the request is too large for the area and out of proportion from other uses in the vicinity. This could also have the effect of creating similar expectations from other developers in the vicinity.

However, I will limit my comments to the terms of the bonus arrangement

The benefits listed in the "Planning Justification" document submitted by the developer's consultant are very weak and need to be improved quite a bit. The developer is offering things like quality of design, quality and mix of materials, underground parking and provision of balconies. These types of "benefits" are all internal to the project and they should not be acceptable trade-offs for a bonus, certainly not for one of such magnitude.

Noticeably absent are provisions for enhanced landscaping, a dedication to civic space, improvements to the streetscape, location of waste/recycling facility and bicycle storage and parking (secured and temporary). There was no mention of an affordability component and no discussion of enhanced accessibility measures. In my view *these* would provide public benefits and are the types of amenities that could warrant a bonus. The need for a civic space dedication is particularly important given the location and the "gateway" nature of the project. At the very least, there should be larger setbacks or some provision to guarantee a mixed use on the first floor that would be open to the public. Further, 5 accessible spaces for such a large space (200 parking spaces seems small).

Another serious problem is the lack of a pull-in short-term loading area in the front of the building. There should be a semi-circle so vehicles can get off the main road. Even with an entrance on the side or in the back, this is likely to be a hazard. Consider the dangerous situation that has developed in front of the *Luxe* on Richmond. Delivery trucks, postal vehicles, pizza delivery cars and taxis stop in front on Richmond because there is no pull-in delivery area.

It creates a very dangerous condition especially when there is congested southbound traffic coming off the bridge.

In any event, as it stands now the project is not supportable. Some combination of scaling back the height/density back and increasing the benefits of the bonus are needed.

I was encouraged by the committee's discussion and the added clause about affordable housing. Yet I worry that if the developer refuses to accept meaningful additional measures they could still receive a substantial bonus. A review of the existing bonus provisions suggests that the city needs to be more aggressive with applicants when negotiating these agreements.

Thank you again for your attention, I appreciated the chance to speak to the PEC and I hope that the City follows through in requiring obtaining significant public benefits.

Samuel Trosow