

Re: 461 Quatsino Blvd.

To: Mayor and Council

My name is Jack Oviatt – I live at 497 Quatsino Strawberry Meadows. I'm here tonight to speak about inconsistencies that I object to in your fact sheet that was sent out in your agenda starting at page 177. Please follow along so you can see what I am referring to.

My first comment is about changing the official community plan paragraph 2 page 177 – from residential small holdings to neighbourhood. Lot 13 461 Quatsino is still in Strawberry Meadows- which is a residential small holdings. One single lot does not a neighbourhood make and there's no reason at this time to change the designation to neighbourhood.

In the third paragraph under zoning bylaw 1934 has for some reason changed from R3CMixed Use Social Housing zone to R3CSocial Housing Development zone. Could you please have planning explain to me why the naming of the new zone has changed in the middle of this process.

Page 178 second paragraph – once again we talk about the neighbourhood but by adding the word neighbourhood to this zoning and OCP change we have automatically added housing for seniors, group homes, manufactured home parks, neighbourhood supporting commercial uses, temporary worker accommodations, institutional uses and parks and recreation. A lot of these uses were never requested by TSW – why are they automatically being included now?

Third paragraph 461 Quatsino is not located in an intensive and multifamily residential development permit area – it is in Strawberry Meadows and is in a small holdings rural residential subdivision. I object to changing the OCP designation to neighbourhood.

Page 179 paragraph 2 – states that there was an error in the notice of public hearing that the bylaw was to apply to the entire parcel. That not a true fact – TSW only wanted the rezoning to happen on Lot 1 of the proposed subdivision of lot 461. For some reason Planning Department convinced council to change the bylaw to cover the entire parcel. Please have Planning explain to me why the entire parcel is being rezoned when only the portion required by TSW needs rezoning.

The change does not reduce the possibility these lands maybe used for certain uses to which the neighbourhood has objected. The neighbourhood has never objected to G1 zoning and the uses included there in.

Paragraph 4 - states that principle uses for proposed R3C zone are social housing and senior citizen housing. Senior citizen housing was never included in the original request for R3C mixed

use social housing zone. Please have Planning explain to me why seniors housing was added to this zoning.

Page 180 – Assessed value of land. I have reviews both professional appraisals and they are substantially different from one another, I would like to suggest at this time that Council uses the land value that was included in the lowest of the two appraisals. For your information the lowest land value for Lot 1 was \$205,000 – this will help offset the increased cost of lowering the building by \$92,500.

Page 181 – a building height of 15M is the main objection presented by all of the neighbours in Strawberry Meadows and vicinity. The neighbours of this proposal are requesting that the maximum building height be 9 M – the same as their allowable building height. This building height impacts the well-being of the neighbours because of privacy issues. Why is the height of this project more important than the existing neighbours?

Paragraph 2 – of that page indicates that there has been a new estimate done on the building and the additional cost would be \$1,080,000. More than the proposed multi story design. In order to do this estimate there must be a set of drawings for a two story building and the fact that it can be lowered is apparent in this statement.

I have no sympathy for schedule creep or a change in construction start because the construction schedule should have never been set and drawings should have never been started prior to the rezoning and subdivision approval.

Speaking to the \$1,080,000. There are multiple ways to offset this cost by building a two-story building.

1. With permission of Council, the lowest of the two appraisals could be used generating \$92,500.00 savings.
2. If TSW wish to voluntarily lower the building to two stories my \$100,000 contribution still applies.
3. Reduction in the height of the building to two stories will generate a substantial savings in the cost of elevators
4. I am prepared to purchase the remaining portion of Lot 461 and add it to my adjoining subdivision. The only appraisal as to the value of Lot 2 is \$100,000.
5. If Lot 2 remains in the hands of the District of Kitimat servicing costs to the remaining portion of Lot number 2 will be a cost to TSW. Those costs include sanitary sewer, water, hydro, gas, storm sewer and paving. I have first- hand experience in all of those costs and the number is staggering.

6. The reason that there was a covenant put in on Phase 1 of Strawberry Meadows to have a lift station installed on each lot is because there is a conflict between the 10 inch gas line and the sanitary sewer – they are at the same elevation. It is possible that this development will require a lift station to access the sanitary sewer. It is also possible that my 25 lot subdivision north of that site will also require a lift station. If that is the case I am prepared to pay 100% of the cost of the lift station and share the capacity with TSW on a two story proposal.
7. It is also likely that a standby generator will be required in case of a power failure. I am prepared to pay for that generator and share its use with TSW. A connection from that generator can be made to the two story building.
8. Storm water management is going to be a huge issue on the TSW proposal because a majority of this site is hard surface causing extra ordinary storm sewer run off. I am prepared to modify my subdivision plan to accept storm sewer runoff onto my property for a two story building. I am only too happy to work with my neighbour – provided they are prepare to work with me.

All of the above cost savings should offset the increased cost of a two story building.

Page 184 – blocking sunlight building shadow. Boni Madison architects provided a sun shadow report that shows the sun rising at 10:00 AM which we all know is not the case and does not show the effect of sunshade on Cranberry Street. McElhanney Engineering has provided a sun shadow report which shows the effect on Cranberry Street to be very similar to the effect on 483 Quatsino. The fact that Administration has that report and failed to mention it once again shows bias to this process.

Page 184 – Light Pollution. For a staff to say that they expect downward directed lights to be used on the property is nothing more than speculation. With the parking lot up against the lots on Cranberry Street – every time a vehicle pulls in or out of those parking stalls light pollution will be shining into their living room windows.

As one resident of Strawberry Meadows states – *Can you seriously not see the issue with a four-story building?*

If you want to read more about the opposition to the height of this project please go to wwynkitimat.ca. This stands for Work With Your Neighbor. Sandra Mielke was astute enough to point out my spelling of neighbour as NEIGHBOR – it is NOT a mistake – the only thing missing with Work With Your Neighbor is U.