Community Association Response

Re: LOC2021-0014 (114 9A St NE)  
October 15, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

The Bridgeland Riverside Planning Committee has reviewed the response to the above-mentioned LOC submitted by Camargue Properties. The committee is grateful for the updates that have been made and the proposed changes to the concept in consideration of our concerns, as outlined below. Thank you for reviewing the feedback from the community and thoughtfully considering it in your proposed updates.

We understand that the neighbour on 9A to the South of this property have been consulted and that they are in full support of this project, as well as the Land Use Change proposed for 110 9A Street NE, which is in much need of redevelopment. We are unaware of the level of engagement with neighbours to the East of this lot who had raised concerns as part of our initial response and committee engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Previous Proposed Concept</th>
<th>Proposed Development Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Amendment</td>
<td>Proposed land use change for all four lots to MU-1f3 height: 17.5m</td>
<td>Proposed land use change for one southerly lot to MU-1f3 height: 16m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Height                           | 5 Stories  
Maximum height proposed 17.5m (estimated at 17.1 in concept drawings)                  | 4 Stories with rooftop amenity  
Below 16m maximum (+/-15.74m north elevation to +/-13.90m south elevation) |
| Rooftop Amenity                   | None proposed in concept                                                                  | Rooftop amenity proposed with a pavilion enclosed area set back from perimeter of building |
| At Grade Setbacks                | 1st Street Setback: 2.7m  
9A Avenue Setback: 0.6m  
Southerly Setback: 3.0m  
Lane Setback: 7.5m from property line of residence across lane (7.5 required) | 1st Street Setback: Majority of the building is setback 4.3m from 1 Street, with the exception of patios/balconies and the stairwell on the northeast corner  
9A Avenue Setback: 0.67m  
Southerly Setback: 3.3m (3.0m required)  
Lane Setback: 7.5m from property line of residence across lane (7.5 required) |
| Treatment 1st Street and 9th Ave. Corner | Additional landscaping.                                                                 | A unique, interactive and age accessible art piece with landscaping has been added on the corner to help support the main street initiative, by encouraging pedestrian activity and enlivening the main street. |
| Parking                          | Three laneway surface parking stalls on the northeast corner                               | Parking spaces have been removed from the alley.                 |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR)           | 2.99 FAR  
Total development area: 4,928 sq m                                                     | 2.75 FAR (3.0 FAR allowed)  
Total development area: 4528.8 sq m                                                  |

Bonnie Kemp  
Director, Planning and Transportation  
BRIDGELAND-RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION  
Per: BRCA Board of Directors  
Planning Committee
To Whom It May Concern:

Re: LOC2021-0014 (114 9A St NE)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment with respect to the land use change application noted above. Our planning committee gave notice to adjacent neighbours by notice dropping and inviting them to our online meeting which was held February 16, 2021. Two neighbours who live directly behind the proposed development, 3 houses to the south joined the meeting. The comments below reflect those of our Planning Committee and those neighbours who participated in our process. The applicant team was also invited to the meeting and they joined with the architect to present their proposal which was greatly appreciated.

The applicant mentioned that they would be submitting a “concurrent” development permit application shortly and that the two items would proceed to Council at the same time. This would be strongly encouraged by our committee to have certainty as to what is planned to be built. This would prevent the potential for upzoning of the parcel and a subsequent sale or other future significant change of direction in regards to the future structure on the site.

The Main Streets rezoning in this area occurred only very recently, and its southern boundary overlaps with only three of the heritage-style houses along Center Avenue that are affected by this application. By including a fourth house / lot in the proposal for re-zoning here, the application raises several issues:

- The massing of the proposed building can now be significantly higher than would otherwise have been permitted, with implications for shadowing, overlooking, block patterns of the DC District etc.
• The resulting massing is considerably larger building than the Main Streets engagement has contemplated, which will interact more intensely and incongruently with the single family homes adjacent.
• During Main Streets engagement, residents in homes proximate to first Avenue were comforted with assurances that that there would have to be significant step-backs of any larger scale buildings at the point of interface with lower density residential homes. We do not see any indication of step-backs in this proposal. Can this be ensured with the land use?

All else being considered, we at the very least see a priority need for stepback consideration on the south and east sides of the building.

Furthermore, an application asking for additional height and additional massing relaxations so soon after comprehensive Main Streets engagement should demonstrate some persuasive additional community benefit such as a very high design quality, street trees/landscaping for the main street along 1st Ave, the use of high-quality materials, etc.

What is the planning rationale for the proposed additional height and expansion of land use redesignation to include the 4th lot? All of this planning area was only very recently the subject of extensive engagement—and the outcome based upon engagement inherently included a “give and take” and a balancing of interests. The idea of rebalancing interests again and so soon after Main Streets, on a single-lot basis, requires very significant planning justification.

Sincerely,

BRIDGELAND-RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Per: BRCA Board of Directors
Planning Committee