

Community Association Response

Hi Brian and John
February 19th 2021

Thank you for organizing the zoom call on February 17 and thank you John, for joining us when Wallace was unable to join the conversation. We discussed several concerns and issues during the call, and I volunteered to compile a list of the issues where we have a need for further discussion and resolution.

1. The City appears ready to approve a development permit before approving the land use change which is an action of putting the cart before the horse. The development permit aligns the type of business with the approved land use zoning. We are working with the applicant to get a mutually acceptable DC classification and are getting close. A new development permit approved now will approve a business to be located at that site which is not approved under the existing DC land use.

2. We appreciate your efforts to continue to use the DC land zoning and adapt it to the needs of your client. You have listed several businesses which should be moved from permitted to discretionary based on the C-N1 District and would ask you to expand that list or better yet remove the following from both permitted and discretionary uses:

- a. Convenience food service
- b. Retail and consumer service
- c. Take-out food service

3. We understand that Steve Alfaiate, the developer and property owner, is planning to open an optical clinic at the location which is a permitted use under the proposed amendments to the existing DC. We think this is reasonable proposal but had issues with understanding the traffic and parking impacts from the business. Steve has agreed with the First Assembly church to use their parking lot for staff which is a good proposal but of course may not be continued if the ownership of the property changes or future Church plans do not support the arrangement. For client parking he plans to use Melville Place (east side) or along Malibou Rd in Mayfair (where there is a 2 hour parking limit in place)and possibly Malibou Rd where it continues into Meadowlark Park. As you might expect we need to have some idea of the additional vehicle load generated by the business to inform neighbours and the community about the impact of the business on traffic safety and parking. Hopefully, City traffic analysts will have looked at these issues too and can advise us on their findings.

4. Another idea discussed was using the upper east end of the new Malibou Lane Park (beside the back lane) for parking for the business as it will remove the negative impact of client parking on residential streets. Of course, it raises new questions particularly about the loss of limited green space in the community and ingress and egress from the back lane onto Elbow Drive where there are currently traffic and pedestrian safety issues which need to be carefully examined. Such a use would also involve a land or rental cost which we presume would be to Steve's account. In addition the large traffic sign directing drivers to exit Elbow Drive to Glenmore trail currently sited at that location would probably need to be relocated

5. The recent Council decision to remove parking restriction on nonresidential street for commercial businesses was discussed but it appears that the issue of commercial parking on

residential streets remains unclear. The proposal for this business is to use residential street for its client parking requirements.

6. We understand that the City sold the lot where the business is located as a fully serviced lot but now is trying to understand how they can fulfill that commitment with electric connectivity. Currently the business has remained unfinished for the last several months primarily due the lack of adequate power being supplied to the location. Currently we understand the City is considering adding another power line and/or power pole in the alley but the plan to provide power to the location is not clear and especially not clear about what impact it will have on the back lane and residential property that is adjacent to the lane. This is an issue which should have been considered by the City ,among others before they offered the property for sale and needs to be discussed with the community before any direct action is implemented. We would recommend that an underground connection to the location is preferred although the cost of such a connection will be higher than adding another power pole at some location on the back lane and connection to the business. Such an extra cost is related to the difficulties of developing the site which we understand was recognized by the City prior to offering the site for sale.

7. As an addendum we have reached out to the Community for other suggestions on how to deal with the numerous concerns we have on traffic safety and parking plus questions on the City's actions in offering such a limited site for development. In that context, we understand that the City Law Department was informed in writing that this piece of land was not properly developable by a top municipal lawyer. Let us discuss some of these ideas after we have had an opportunity to explore them further.

We understand that Steve has a considerable investment in the location which the City sold him without much apparent consideration of the specific development difficulties related to that site. With the building almost completed there is a need to get the project completed and in operation, but we also need to resolve the outstanding issues as best we can before moving on. We appreciate that Steve is working with the Community to deal with these issues but let us work together to develop some sensible restrictions/guidelines on traffic and parking which meets the current and future needs of the business, the residents and location.

Regards

Bruce Williams
Director
Mayfair Bel-Aire Community Association (MBCA)