

January 31, 2021

To Mayor and Council

Re: Development Permit Application for 461 Quatsino Blvd

We live at #2 Cranberry Street and we do **NOT** support this Development Permit Application.

We object to the height of the building, just as we did back in 2019. A four-storey building is just as too high today as it was in 2019. There is nothing in this neighborhood that high and this building doesn't fit with the neighborhood at all. This is going to be a 30 unit apartment building as well as the 18-bed transition house. This means there could be as many as 48 families all living in this building that towers over all the other existing buildings in the neighborhood. This equates to a large amount of traffic, garbage, noise and light pollution.

We object to a 24-hour business being run right behind us. Apparently this will be a District owned Day Care. Where is the money coming from for this? What does this mean in terms of light and noise pollution with cars coming and going at all hours now? What about the snow clearing that will be required to upkeep this parking lot. Where is all of the snow going to go? What about the drainage from the snow clearing? How are they allowed to build 14.9 feet from the property line in the front?

We object to the lack of a tree and fence buffer between this development and our Cranberry street properties. We bought our property because we wanted the feel of country living in the city and the privacy that comes with that. A twenty-four hour business, four-storey building and enormous parking lot most definitely do not contribute to a country living feeling!

Back in 2019 we attended a meeting with Mayor, Councilors, Administration and TSW representatives, where there were discussions about a lot of issues, including leaving some of the trees already on the property as a buffer between it and the neighboring properties, as well as building a fence. Now from what we've seen on the Landscaping drawing, it appears that the biggest (highest) tree will be only 2 meters. Currently the existing Spruce on this property average 15 – 20 meters in height. They are not going to keep any of the existing trees even though the 2019 Danger Tree Assessment Findings found only one danger tree, and it wasn't one of the Spruce in the perimeter. There was nothing in those findings that necessitated the removal of all of the existing trees. Leaving some of the existing 15-20 meter tall trees around the perimeter would go a long way to alleviating the noise and light pollution that are unavoidable with a project of this scale. Also from the Landscaping drawings it appears that there will no longer be a fence anymore. A fence would certainly help to serve as an additional buffer to alleviate the noise and light pollution. According to the landscaping plans there will be light standards basically in our

backyard. We are most definitely not in agreement to having our back yard lit up like day all night long!

Once again there has been no consultation, no consideration given to the neighboring properties. The first we've heard of this new design was in the Public Notice emailed to us Jan 14, 2021. We have been given 2 weeks to read all of the plans and study the drawings (which is not easy since we aren't engineers or architects) and try to respond.

During the re-zoning process we asked about changing the design to make 2 buildings, each 2-storey's high, rather than 1 building that would be 4 storey's high. We were told it would be too costly to make any changes. Now there are going to be 3 buildings on this property and one of them will still be 4-storey's high! If buildings can be added, why can't the 4-storey building be split into 2 buildings, each 2-storey's high.

All I can do is reiterate our concerns that we voiced during the re-zoning process. The neighboring properties will all be negatively affected by the traffic as well as the light and noise pollution from a project of this size. Lowering the height of the 4-storey building as well as having a tree and fence buffer would go a long way to addressing these concerns.

Dan and Tanya Allen