

August 22, 2022

City of Prince George

1100 Patricia Blvd

Prince George, BC V2L 3V9

RE: Public Hearing regarding: Amendments to "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No.8383, 2011" AND "City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No.7850, 2007"

Dear Council:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the above noted application before city council, set for Public Hearing on August 29, 2022.

As a homeowner for the past **35 years** in this location, I have:

- 1) Water/Sewer Services Concerns:** There has not been a month in the past 2 years in our streets (Azure Ave, Delta Pl, Elkhorn Cres, Beirnes Pl and Cascade Ave) that pavement/driveways aren't ripped up because of repairs to sewer and/or water lines. I wish I could say this is an exaggeration, but it is not. Shown below are 4 properties on Elkhorn Crescent which back on to the proposed development area that have had extensive repairs at least 3 times this past year, each time a new concrete driveway had to be replaced/repaired.



The most recent issue was last week on Elkhorn between Cascade and Azure Avenue



Our neighbour behind us on Elkhorn Crescent had a City of Prince George pump truck attend their home every 2 weeks for the last couple of years as sewer kept backing up into their basement. When our area was developed in the mid 1970's, many homes water/sewer lines were cross connected. My property was one of them and was repaired in the early 2000's.

In May 2021, the home across from us and another backing on to Cranbrook Hill had their yard/road dug up.



There are more homes in our area that have had issues with water/sewer however these are only the ones I have taken photos of. City Utilities could provide council with additional information regarding additional utility repairs in our little neighbourhood.

It is my belief that any additional stresses on our water/sewer services will undoubtedly have a negative impact our homes should the city approve this development.

- 2) **Insufficient Parking:** The memorandum from McElhanney, (dated Jun 22, 2021) states that it is assumed each unit will have an average of 2.8 people per unit and the number of proposed units in the building of 127, there could potentially be over 300 vehicles at a minimum. The parking spaces on the proposal states only 122 (surface stall 56 and underground stall 66) will be included but no mention of guest parking. The concern with the disparity of parking provisions is that there is a walkway adjoining said property which will most certainly result in guest/residents parking on Elkhorn Crescent and walking thru to the proposed property as parking is not permitted on Foothills Blvd. This would create a negative impact on the enjoyment and use by those homeowners on Elkhorn Crescent. The residents of the Westbridge Apartments on Azure Avenue often park on Azure Avenue which makes it difficult during the winter and impacts the surrounding neighbourhood. The impact of not enough off-street parking can be seen at the Fourwinds apartments across from the PG Golf and Curling Club with both sides of the road being used by residents and club members not having parking in their own parking lot.
- 3) **Increased traffic:** I walk daily and cross Foothills Blvd at both the crosswalk located at Ochakwin Crescent and at the light controlled cross walk at Limestone and Cascade Avenue. There is a speed monitor at the light controlled cross walk and I often stop to see the speed of the never-ending motorists who try to 'make up' time on this stretch of road in the morning, evening and pretty much all day long. There have been several accidents between Cranbrook Hill Road and the Ochakwin Cres crosswalk due to vehicle speed and slope of the road. It is harrowing enough turning left from Cascade Avenue onto Foothills and I have enough distance and sight lines which is not the case at the proposed site of 1177 Foothills. I do not feel there is enough distance between the Cranbrook Hill Road and the proposed sight to have safe access to Foothills Blvd (left or right turn) especially in winter road conditions.
- 4) **Density:** The density of development in the Foothills Subdivision is excessive compared to other areas of the city. In the past year, 382 new units have been approved/ begun construction /completed construction within a .8 km distance to the proposed development at 1177 Foothills Blvd. The number of new units **does not** include the 3rd building in the Foothills Crossing Development located at 1755 Foothills Blvd as no information is provided on the Kelson Group website.

This is a list of all the apartment buildings ***within .8 km (.5 mile) of the proposed development at 1177 Foothills Blvd:***

- 1) Forest Glenn Apartment 1 – 4427 Glenshee Rd
- 2) Forest Glenn Apartment 2 – 4441 Glenshee Rd
- 3) Forest Glenn Apartment 3 – 4413 Glenshee Rd
- 4) Carriage House Apartment 1 – 4414 Glenshee Rd
- 5) Carriage House Apartment 2 – 4444 Glenshee Rd
- 6) Foothills Crossing 1 - 1755 Foothills Blvd
- 7) Foothills Crossing 2 - 1755 Foothills Blvd
- 8) Foothills Crossing 3 – 1755 Foothills Blvd

- 9) Pacific Peace Properties dba Briarwood Place 1330 Foothills Blvd
- 10) Pacific Peace Properties dba Briarwood Place 1380 Foothills Blvd
- 11) Pacific Peace Properties - Building 1 – Building # unknown, Foothills Blvd
- 12) Pacific Peace Properties - Building 2 - Building # unknown, Foothills Blvd
- 13) Pacific Peace Properties - Building 3 - Building # unknown, Foothills Blvd
- 14) Westbridge Apartment 1 – 4501 Azure Avenue
- 15) Westbridge Apartment 2 – 4509 Azure Avenue
- 16) Lakewood Manor Apartment – 4320 15th Avenue
- 17) Panorama Place – 4288 15th Avenue

In addition to these **17** apartment buildings, there are another **9** apartment buildings within .8 km (as the crow flies) from the proposed development. It is my belief that **26** Apartment buildings within such a small geographical area is excessive and the rationale for 'Infill services' should not be considered an asset due to the locations instability and potential future costs associated with maintenance/remediation.

Perhaps Council could find a creative solution to re-locate this proposed development other than downtown as there are many parks that had their playgrounds removed and are no longer utilized. Freimuller Park is an example of such a property. Perhaps in North Nechako or Otway? Pine Centre as the new Save On would be more accessible/closer for the seniors. There is property beside Aimhi (Lakewood Elementary) on Kerry Street/Rainbow Drive that is vacant. There are other locations that are more suitable than the proposed location.

- 5) **Ground Instability:** The stability of Cranbrook Hill – The one thing I know for sure about Cranbrook Hill is that its always moving, *always*. My blacktop driveway is a testament to that fact each spring. The large heaves/cracks are clearly evident. The report from Soiltech Consulting Ltd clearly states 'the lot lies near the contact of glaciofluvial sand and gravel deposits and glaciolacustrine fine grained soil deposits'. If this property is developed as proposed, there could be worse results than the University Hill construction and additional costs to this day with the continued sloughing as evidenced each spring during thaw.
- 6) **Location and Slope :** The applicant's offer to register a Section 219 Covenant on the subject property to restrict land disturbance and building from the area is not sufficient to address the issue with the **significant slope of the property**. Can the applicant 'pave' the restricted area? There is little to no sunshine on the proposed development especially behind any proposed building which could result in unsafe/unwalkable areas during the winter. How can this be safe for Senior Housing? The sun 'sets' behind Cranbrook Hill in our little neighbourhood around 6 pm in the middle of summer, during the winter, closer to 1 or 2 pm. Vehicle headlights coming down Cranbrook Hill would most certainly shine into the rear units of this 6-storey building in addition to the road noise (Jake brakes) are often used coming down the steep hill.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns and lodge our opposition to this proposed development.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark and Cheryl Barlow
4588 Cascade Avenue
Prince George