

Community Association Letter

May 31, 2018

Dear Mr. Bliet,

I am writing on behalf of the Springbank Hill Community Association in regards to Application Notice LOC2018-0072 from Truman regarding their proposed development in Springbank Hill.

As a community association our role is to advocate for our members and all residents of our community, and to help build a safe, active and vibrant community. We wish to encourage leading edge developments that are aligned with the vision of the MDP, supported by an achievable infrastructure plan, and respectful of the existing fabric of our community.

While we have recently reviewed several outline plan proposals for the Springbank Hill ASP study area, this particular proposal has resulted in a higher level of concern from our residents, and we feel that our comments in this letter are representative of the view of the community at large.

Following is a brief summary of our concerns:

- This proposal **significantly exceeds maximum densities and building heights** as defined in the approved ASP. We believe the city has an obligation to ensure that the parameters established by the approved ASP must not be ignored.
- A key concern of our community is the **apparent lack of a suitable transition in the Low Density Contextual zone** as required by the approved ASP
- Despite a commitment by City Council to give serious consideration to the **need for programmable green space** in the ASP area, we are concerned that this need is not being adequately addressed. As a minimum there is insufficient detail in this proposal concerning programmable green space as a component of the required MR allocation. We would like to work more closely with the Parks Dept. on this matter.
- We believe that the **maximum number of housing units envisioned by the ASP has been exceeded** by this particular proposal and cumulatively across all the proposals submitted to date. We are concerned about the apparent **lack of an integrated infrastructure plan** and the ability of our community to handle the significant additional traffic loading. While each application is required to provide a Traffic Impact Assessment to the city, we believe the Planning Dept. should also complete an integrated TIA for the entire area to assist with infrastructure planning and to identify the maximum number of housing units this area can support. We've also requested more visibility into supporting documents such as TIAs.

We also wish to point out that unlike other outline plan proposals, this particular developer has not reached out to the community association to review their plans directly with us.

Following are additional supporting comments and concerns based on the information provided in the outline plan application. We also wanted to note that we have requested additional supporting information for this file, but have not yet been granted access. Our comments are therefore based on the brief outline plan summary provided to us.

Community Association Letter

1. Building Heights

We understand from the ASP that maximum allowable building heights are:

- 10 storeys for Mixed Use zones
- 6 storeys for Medium Density zones
- No building heights were referenced for the Low Density and Low Density Contextual zones but the ASP proposed a mixture of single-detached, clustered and row housing which we believed would not generally exceed 2 storeys in height.

In the applicant's outline plan:

- a) Cell A (Mixed Use) - From the provided diagrams it appears that the proposed buildings significantly exceed the 10 storey maximum defined in the ASP. Our interpretation of diagrams indicate buildings as high as 16 storeys on the downward slope side when including above-grade parking and retails levels.
- b) Cell B & C (Medium Density) - The applicant proposes up to 7 storeys which exceeds the maximum of 6 allowed in the ASP
- c) Cell D (Medium Density)
The applicant's proposal for building heights in Cell D appears to be aligned with the ASP maximums.
- c) Cell E & F (Low Density / Low Density Contextual) - The applicant's proposal for these cells include buildings up to 3 storeys in height and do not provide any of the diversity and alignment with existing properties as recommended by the ASP

2. Density

Proposed densities overall significantly exceed the maximums established in the ASP:

- Cell B and Cell C - applicant proposes 270 uph versus ASP approved 'medium density' range of 38-148 uph
- Cell D - applicant proposes 152 uph versus ASP approved 'medium density' range of 38-148 uph
- Cell E - applicant proposes 46 uph versus ASP approved 'low density' range of 20-37 uph
- Cell F - applicant proposes 46 uph versus ASP approved 'low density contextual' range of 12-20 uph

3. Programmable Green Space

The community association had requested consideration be given to our request for a programmable green space of 4 acres or more using the MR allocations from all developers. This request was included in the ASP.

It appears that the applicant is planning to use sloped ER green corridors for drainage. They also propose a multi-use pathway along this same corridor which allows them to apply this ER area as their MR allocation. While we support the need for a connectivity solution, we are disappointed that no effort has been made to also provide programmable green space for the community.

Community Association Letter

We request a clearer understanding of the proposed green space plan and a review of options to provide programmable green space.

4. Contextual Sensitivity

Based on the information provided, we are concerned that the proposed development appears to ignore the requirement for a low density contextual zone which would provide the desired transition into the existing community as defined in the ASP. The requested diversity of build-form identified in the ASP for the low density/low density contextual zones are not evident in this proposal. Densities and building heights requested also generally exceed the maximums allowed in the approved ASP across this entire development. We have been receptive to the city's vision to create a highly walkable, connected and innovative community where residents can live, work and play and reduce their reliance on automobiles. We are concerned that this particular proposal is leaning towards densities for a transit oriented development which was not envisioned in the ASP.

Sincerely,

Elio Cozzi

President, Springbank Hill Community Association

website: springbankhill.org