



**A3. Correspondence**

None

**A4. Late Correspondence Regarding the Matter**

None

**A5. Input from the Public regarding the Bylaw**

None

**A6. Questions from Council:**

None

**Part B - Applicant: K. Buick dba District Development Corp. 4000 Burde Street - Anderson Hill**

**B1. Description of the Application**

The City Clerk provided a summary of the application:

The applicant is applying to amend the Zoning Bylaw to facilitate Phase 2 of the Anderson Hill development at 4000 Burde Street to include a mix of higher density residential dwelling units. The proposed re-zoning of the property is to the RM3 High Density Multiple Family Residential zone.

The proposed Bylaw is:

- "Zoning Bylaw Map Amendment No. 30 (4000 Burde St - Anderson Hill), Bylaw No. 4977"

**B2. Background Information from the Development Services Technician**

The Manger of Planning provided background information regarding the proposed amendment by way of summarizing the Development Services Technician's report of November 27, 2018, attached hereto and forming part of this report.

**B3. Correspondence**

None

**B4. Late Correspondence Regarding the Matter**

Correspondence dated January 14, 2019 from Karen Mitchell, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue resident, opposed to the amendment attached hereto and forming part of this report.

**B5. Input from the Public regarding the Bylaw**

Al Echlin, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, asked about height restrictions for buildings? He stated that everyone on that street has a view and don't want to look at an apartment building. He suggested that if a high rise is proposed it should be along the treed area so as not to impact views. He noted there is no issue with single family dwellings but that the height of buildings is really important.

The Consulting City Planner advised that the maximum height in the RM3 zone is four storeys - 14m or 45.9 ft taken from the average grade.

Pete Milliken, 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue enquired about the access on to Burde Street noting how busy it is already. He also expressed concerns about truck traffic and whether they would be responsible for City roads.

Pat Kermeen, 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, suggested extending single family development to the end of Burde St makes more sense and would be a better fit with the neighbourhood.

Ian Thomas, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, asked about the elevation plan and if it is available to the public (included in agenda package available on City's website). He also asked about a geotech study, commented on sewer infrastructure and asked what will be done regarding stabilization of the property recognizing the elevation changes rapidly from 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Thomas talked about a natural spring that runs below the property; asked about who bears the cost of replacing roads torn up by heavy dump trucks; he stated water/sewer will need to be re-done as they are sinking. He felt the proposal should be re-thought with proper documentation and plans provided to the public.

Al Echlin stated he has a right to be concerned. He said taller buildings should be against the woods so that buildings can then tiered down.

**B6. Questions from Council:**

In response to a question from Council the Consulting City Planner advised that the height restriction in R1 is two storeys.

In response to a question from Council regarding access to the development, it was noted that a geo-technical evaluation will need to be completed as a condition of subdivision approval.

## 7. Calling for any Further Input:

The Chair asked for any further input from the public.

Ian Thomas urged Council not to put all the property into multi family high density.

The Chair called a second time for input.

Pat Kermeen suggested a traffic light was required at Burde/10<sup>th</sup>.

Brandon Crema, District Development Corp. (representing the Applicant) provided the following comments:

- The plan is developed to section the site up for flexibility over the long-term
- They wanted to respond to demands
- Open to proposals from service groups
- They have tried to open up view corridors for potential purchasers as well as for existing owners
- Regarding seniors homes, Berwick is not ready for this community but he encouraged other groups to reach out
- They have undertaken a geo-tech study (water levels; ground conditions) advising they plan for the worst, they have done a servicing study, placing additional manholes on 16<sup>th</sup> and will be doing so on the development site
- They are evaluating a plan for 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue traffic; there may be different methods to control traffic at 10<sup>th</sup>/Burde that they are currently studying
- It is a development permit area
- Their master plan considers all uses – currently not as high demand for single family

In response to a question from Council regarding seniors wanting to move from larger houses into something smaller, Mr. Crema responded that stratified 1250-1450 sq.ft. single level duplex homes are envisaged as part of the development.

Al Echlin asked about access to the development. The Consulting City Planner advised the map shows planned accesses to Anderson/Burde but details need to be confirmed.

Karen Mitchell, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue asked whether there was any control over what is to be built where on the property?

The Consulting City Planner explained the Development Permit process which governs the form and character of developments (not land use). The Development Permit will be required to come back to Council for approval.

Ms. Mitchell asked that Council consider any apartment buildings be built on the lower portion of the property and not impinge on views.

Ian Thomas commented that if the property is zoned now to RM3 there is no control over what is built there. He felt that RM3 would destroy what is there now and for the future.

Pete Milliken expressed disappointment not to be able to see the accesses to the development. He recommended Council does not approve the Bylaw

The Chair asked for input for a third and final time. There was none.

**8. Closing Remarks by the Chair:**

The Chair made closing remarks on the matters of the public hearing.

*It was moved and seconded:*

***That the Public Hearing terminate at 7:35 p.m.***

CARRIED

Pursuant to Sections 464, 465 and 466 of the *Local Government Act*, I hereby certify the foregoing to be a fair and accurate summary of the representations made at the Public Hearing held January 14, 2019 regarding:

- "Zoning Bylaw Map Amendment No. 31 (3503 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue - Sattar), Bylaw No. 4978"
- "Zoning Bylaw Map Amendment No. 30 (4000 Burde St - Anderson Hill), Bylaw No. 4977"



Davina Hartwell  
City Clerk

