
Subject: Subject Properties 606 / 614 / 622 Zelkwas Avenue (City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9138, 2020) - 3rd Reading at Prince George City Council Meeting dated February 22, 2021

Attachments: Zelkwas Zoning Presentation - 2.docx; E-Mail - Underhill - Dated February 19, 2021.docx; Zelkwas Zoning Presentation.docx

From: Mario Nicola Pascuzzi Redacted

Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 11:32 AM

To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>; cityclerk <cityclerk@princegeorge.ca>

Subject: Re: Subject Properties 606 / 614 / 622 Zelkwas Avenue (City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9138, 2020) - 3rd Reading at Prince George City Council Meeting dated February 22, 2021

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

Please find attached my submission relating to the following:

Subject Properties 606 / 614 / 622 Zelkwas Avenue (City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9138, 2020)
3rd Reading at Prince George City Council Meeting dated February 22, 2021

Please ensure that the attachments are included with the packages that will be given to the Mayor and City Council for today's meeting.

I have attached three documents: letter submission (dated February 22, 2021) letter submission (submitted February 16, 2021), and e-mail response from Ms. Underhill (Phoenix Transition Society). Please ensure that documents are put in this order as part of my submission.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mario Pascuzzi

February 22, 2021

Mario Pascuzzi
564 Union Street
Prince George, BC V2M 3S5

City of Prince George
1100 Patricia Blvd.
Prince George, BC V2L 3V9

Attention: Mayor Lyn Hall and City Council
Re: Subject Properties 606 / 614 / 622 Zelkwas Avenue (City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9138, 2020)
3rd Reading at Prince George City Council Meeting dated February 22, 2021

Dear Mayor and Council:

I provided an initial submission on February 16, 2021 with respect to the proposed amendment of a zoning bylaw, as mentioned above, to facilitate housing facilities for the Phoenix Transition Society. The February 16, 2021 submission discussed some of the issues of concern for me. The areas discussed included: rezoning, size access, parking, development size / logistics, and public hearing announcements. I would like to add, amend and clarify (where/if necessary) the information that I had provided and also talk about: volume of site usage, traffic, location, communications, neighborhood respect, and health/safety.

COMMUNICATIONS

The issue of communication is one that, for many reasons, I had made the choice of not making it a concern initially and, rather, look at the entire process with a different lens. I believe it is always important to look at all of the information that we obtain with "a grain of salt", as you don't know whether something is true vs. false.

In approximately the time between June 2020 and July 2020, we had seen a great deal of increased traffic within the neighbourhood. In particular, engineers, surveyors, and other businesses were conducting studies on the subject property. It was difficult to determine the nature and type of studies, but it appeared to be evident that the subject property was being prepared for some kind of special project by the Trinity United Church. We assumed that regular houses would be built, due to the insurrection of new household builds in Prince George.

Last July, we spoke with a church member, who advised my brother and mother that there are plans to build some housing supports. The member did not go into a great detail to my family, I did not have a

negative perspective, and we proceeded to move forward in our day-to-day activities. Later in that week, we spoke with one of the neighbours off Zelkwas Avenue, who advised us of the nature of the housing that was being proposed on the subject property.

Given this information, I sent a message to Mr. Bob K. Fillier, the Lead Minister of Trinity United Church, on his Facebook account on July 11, 2020 and proceeded to get some information on Trinity's web site, which provided information on the proposals. By July 16, he was gracious to respond to me and was unable to disclose any information. He brought up that

- There will be no negative affects on anyone's properties
- There is nothing to share until all steps and assessments are complete
- There is a project development team in place
- Property owners will be invited to engage in conversations as part of future processes

He was very concerned about whether we had heard something and/or what was being said, and wanted information on this. The only information I had obtained was that on Trinity United Church's website. I commented positively on his community engagement with his church, my hopes for contact once he returned from holidays, and the fact that I could be of assistance in getting approval of the project within the neighbourhood. To conclude the conversation, he said, "Like I've said we're waiting until we have answers to the questions we can anticipate. Nothing worse for me than "we don't know" as the only answer. Let's chat in person when I'm back in the office."

A few weeks after this brief Facebook discussion, I saw the following online article on August 19, 2020, posted on the Prince George Citizen website on August 18, 2020:

www.princegeorgecitizen.com/news/local-news/phoenix-society-planning-social-housing-project-1.24188430

The article gives a very brief synopsis of the project, including the fact that the rezoning on the subject property had received 1st and 2nd reading approvals and that final approval was postponed until the three lots on the subject property could be consolidated. I made contact with Kali Holanan (Planner, Planning and Development) with the City of Prince George, and she was able to provide me with the steps that outline the zoning bylaw amendment or rezoning application, as well as information on the waiving of formal public hearings for rezoning applications, passed by City Council.

Over the past few months, there was a growing concern within the immediate neighbours surrounding the proposed properties. One of these neighbours requested that I forward the documentation received from Kali Holanan to her, and members of the neighbourhood sent copies of the correspondence to the residents surrounding the area. This was followed by a completion of a petition, which was only signed by homeowners. There were still questions relating to the proposed project that remained answered, and it was difficult to obtain any information.

Since this time, obtaining any further information had been a challenge. I respect the City of Prince George staff, who were able to provide me as much information as they possibly could.

Over the months up to (and leading to) the public engagement process, information from some of the members of the church were knew was limited. I have spent time talking about the engagement sessions on my previous letter and have provided other information on this process later in this submission. I still wanted to give the rezoning application a chance, and it was important to me to get even further information about the Phoenix Transition Society itself. In other words, I had not made a formal decision as to whether I was in favour or opposed to the proposed project.

On February 12, 2021, I made multiple telephone calls to the Phoenix Transition Society, enquiring about how to obtain annual general meeting (AGM) minutes, regular meeting minutes for the past two years. Although I had gone to the Phoenix Transition House and Harmony House websites, respectively, obtaining more information was still important to me. After a few calls, I was able to speak with both Maria Brouwer (Program Coordinator, Harmony House) and Karen Underhill (Executive Director, Phoenix Transition Society). As my request was one that had never been received, Karen forwarded my contact information to Sandra Sasaki (Board of Director and Chair, Phoenix Transition Society), who contacted me on the same day.

Ms. Sasaki was very kind to provide me with some information about the Phoenix Transition Society, including the goal of moving Harmony House operations to the subject property. I advised Ms. Sasaki of the need for information about the Society, as I had not made a formal decision as to whether I was in favour of (or opposed) This was something that had never been disclosed to me, but had always thought this could have been a possibility. She also talked about two of the three properties around the current Harmony House that were also mortgaged. At the end, I requested AGM and regular meeting minutes, and she had noted that the 2020 financials were not reviewed and approved by an independent auditor and was not sure what she could provide. At the end of the conversation, Ms. Sasaki said that she would have to look into this and be able to have some information available for pick-up by the end of the following week (i.e., February 19, 2021).

On February 18, 2021, I followed up with Ms. Sasaki to enquire about the information that I had requested on February 12, just to confirm I would be obtaining the information that I had requested. Unfortunately, she could not talk to me at the time, and noted that she had to step back and go through the same processes, providing me with an e-mail address to forward my request to Ms. Underhill. That afternoon, I submitted an e-mail to Ms. Underhill and was given an e-mail response by the end of the following day (February 19, 2021).

In Ms. Underhill's February 19, 2021 response, which I have included at the end of my submission, did not assist me in obtaining the information that I had requested. The information that is provided on the Canada Revenue Agency web site did not assist me in making a decision, as the information was limited and restricted. Additionally, obtaining the other information that I had requested would have been a challenge and, even if I had a chance to review the information on February 22, 2021, It would have been difficult for me to provide you with any feedback.

In conclusion, lack of information has continued to be a struggle, and no further discussion regarding this is required.

SITE ACCESS

In my letter dated February 16, 2021, I spoke about the parking and the applicant's suggestion that the area where the proposed project is to take place is located adjacent to multiple road networks to dissipate travel increases. The applicant is also stating that the entry way across from 564 / 580 Union Street would be the only way to get to the subject property. In my analysis, I provided details of all of the different road networks in detail, including the concrete laneway to the west of the subject property as a second route a person could gain access to the subject parking.

In addition, there is also a third way a person could get to the subject property: the parking lot located on the front side of 3555 5th Avenue (i.e., facing 5th Avenue). By driving through the front parking lot going around the Trinity United Church to the subject property. This route also intersects to the entrance off the concrete laneway, also discussed in my previous letter. When there are multiple activities (where Covid-19 restrictions do not apply), driving through the front parking lot going around the Trinity United Church to the subject property can be a tricky exercise, particularly if vehicles are parking on the west side of the Trinity United Church. This wall located west of Trinity allows for up to three vehicles to be parked there. If someone tries to pass this area when vehicles are parked there, in addition to the full parking when you have meetings, daycare pickup, and the music studio operating in front of the building, navigating the area can be troubling. And, with the already difficult routes to/from the subject property, the traffic could be a major concern.

With respect to my initial letter, I would like to comment on some items that were addressed:

1. I discussed the barricades that were once located between the back parking lot of the Trinity United Church and the laneway. In particular, I specified that barricades about 30-40 mm in height were placed there quite a few years ago, were later removed by members of the public, and were never replaced since that time. I erroneously stated that the barricades were 30-40 mm, rather than the more accurate number of about 30-40 cm.
2. With respect to the barricades, they have now been replaced with snow. Large stacks of snow have since been plowed immediately left of the non-barricaded zone.

PARKING

With respect to parking, I have addressed all of the issues of concern in my initial letter. As the main access point between 513 Ahbau Street, 3555 5th Avenue, and the subject property, parking will be crowded with more vehicles and will make it difficult to drive through Union Street when multiple vehicles are parking left and right on the street (in addition to other matters previously addressed).

A major correction relating to the parking lot located on the back side of 513 Ahbau Street needs to be addressed. In my February 16, 2021 letter, I stated that this parking lot contains about 35-50 parking spaces. Upon further review, if you look at this parking lot from any direction, it is safe to have about 18 to 20 vehicles parked comfortably (unless all of the vehicles parked are small). Having more than 22 vehicles on that parking lot is tight, and staff and members of the public still have no recourse but to park either on Union Street or along the front and back parking lots of 3555 5th Avenue. Outside of this

project, I would recommend that a review of some of the parking lots within the neighbourhood is conducted to determine whether they can support the number of businesses that a building is serving.

DEVELOPMENT SIZE / LOGISTICS

In my submission on February 16, 2021, the following information about the subject property and the proposed build was discussed:

- How many units are going to be built in the currently proposed building?
- How many buildings will be on the proposed site? Will there be more than one building to be built in the short-term (i.e., less than three years)?
- How many people will be residing on the proposed building? And what is the goal for the total number of people that may be residing on the proposed building? Will it be 60 (or less)? When other builds are added on the proposed site in the future, how many people could potentially be residing there (and will another zoning amendment be required)?
- How many storeys will be on the proposed build on the subject property? Will it be only two storeys (or could it possibly be three storeys)?
- What will be the size of the proposed building be? Will the building be extended in width or length? And, will another property that may possibly be built on the subject property be larger or smaller in comparison to the proposed building?

The questions I have addressed above are reasonable for any reasonably prudent person to ask about. Here are some of the considerations:

- As I have mentioned before, the residents have not been given full confirmation relating to total number of units that will be on the one building that is currently being proposed on the subject property. It has been communicated that the “ground floor will operate the Harmony House program and the second floor will include independent living units. When women complete the Harmony House program they can move into the independent living units with their children.” In reading this, it appears to be a simple process. However, the engagement session I attended also talked about possibly having two buildings to facilitate this (which has not been confirmed on the subject property) in the future. We are being communicated that Harmony House program and the program to include independent living units are different. In essence, if a person is not fully prepared after going through the Harmony House program, she can be moved into an independent living unit. The Harmony House program will have individual units for each woman, with one large, shared kitchen, while the independent living units will each have their own space (i.e., like an apartment). I am having a difficult understanding how one building only will be able to support both stages of the process. Without a second building to have one building support the Harmony House program, while the other building to have independent living units, is this the rationale for the design to not be finalized?
- What is the long-term future of the entire property?

PUBLIC HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS

With respect to the public hearing requirements, I was disappointed with the communication process. Although I was able to get understanding of what was possibly going to be happening on the subject

property, the neighbourhood was not aware of the 1st and 2nd Readings zoning bylaw amendment proposal. This is what led to neighbours starting to go door-to-door around the neighbourhood, providing documentation and information to them.

I have had the opportunity to read all of the letters that have been submitted by medical professionals, including those from similar facilities, as well as a Minister for the Government of British Columbia and members of the Phoenix Transition Society and Trinity United Church. One of the letters submitted by Madeline Wilson suggested, for instance, that she believed that “the concerns that have been brought forward by current residents in the neighbourhood have been addressed ... [and] the benefits of the proposed site are significant ...” It is difficult for me to respond to this without emphasizing that the public engagement process, as stated by the developer, was expected to be minimum. Their final report that has been posted confirms this. However, the developer has also stated that properties within 100m of the subject properties received invitations to this process. For a project of this nature, a larger pool of public engagement (beyond 100 m of the proposed site) did not take place. Neighbours canvassing door-to-door to obtain petition signatures noted that the only people that received invitations included those residing from:

- 564 Union Street to 632 Union Street,
- 611 Zelkwas Avenue to 691 Zelkwas Avenue, and
- 650 Vedder Crescent to 670 Vedder Crescent

Please note that, even assuming that people within 100m received invitations to the engagement sessions, this was not a reasonable representation of the neighbourhood. And, in my opinion, this may have even further discouraged multiple residents who were communicated about the proposed developments by members of the neighbourhood only and were not invited to the engagement sessions. Based on these premises, it will be difficult to suggest that neighbourhood respect and support will be an integral part of this process moving forward.

A further point of note is that a representative of the developer was running the public engagement session I attended (and I am assuming she ran the other sessions as well). One submission suggested that the meetings were handled by persons (i.e., M’akola Development Services) that were independent of all of the groups involved in the proposed rezoning and building processes, which is not correct. The developer, in my view, would most definitely have a benefit to this project.

VOLUME OF SITE USAGE / TRAFFIC

My preference is to not make further comments about the amount of site usage and traffic. These issues have already been addressed. All of the properties I have spoken about can get crowded and congestive. Union Street is used as an alternative parking location for 3555 5th Avenue and 513 Ahbau Street. This area is already congested, especially when all programs and operations are working at 100 per cent capacity (pre-Covid). This does not include the concrete laneway located west of the subject property. Parking will most definitely be impaired if (and when) the entire subject property is developed, leading to further parking along Union Street.

LOCATION

Concerns about the volume of site usage and traffic can also be tied up with location issues. I do not want to further digress on this matter. Although the proposed property is located beside amenities, including a grocery store, the busyness of this area will be even further noted. The proposed building (and other buildings that could be built) on the subject property will more than likely reduce parking spots behind 3555 5th Avenue. In essence, parking and the ability to drive north and south on Union Street will be a daunting task, particularly if vehicles are parked across from each other on the street.

HEALTH/SAFETY

Concerns about health and safety are important to me. Many articles written have articulated this to the best of their knowledge and view. Residing across the street from 3555 5th Avenue, a lot of health and safety issues exist. An article as part of the submissions talked about a woman who was slouched on the back parking lot and was ignored by the Pastor when he proceeded from the church to the vehicle, with a fire truck arriving at the scene after my brother contacted the local authorities for assistance. My hope is that the neighbours and all members of the Trinity United Church will take incidents like this seriously, as they also have the obligation to contact local authorities when unforeseen events like these occur.

In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to speak about this matter. I do not want to talk about some of the letters that have been written about residents within the neighbourhood. My goal is to see some form of positive resolutions and peacefulness. I have expressed my opinions on all of the issues that are of concern to me moving forward. I have included a copy of my initial submission dated February 16, 2021, as well as an e-mail response from Phoenix Transition House's Executive Director, dated February 19, 2021.

I would have liked to see more open dialogue and communication relating to this project. I was also hoping to obtain more information about the Phoenix Transition Society's financials to make an objective opinion. Little information that I have obtained makes it difficult for me to do so.

Sincerely,

Mario Pascuzzi

Enclosure(s): Submission to Mayor and City Council, dated February 16, 2021

E-Mail response from Karen Underhill (Executive Director, Phoenix Transition Society)
dated February 19, 2021

February 16, 2021

Mario Pascuzzi
564 Union Street
Prince George, BC V2M 3S5

City of Prince George
1100 Patricia Blvd.
Prince George, BC V2L 3V9

Attention: Mayor Lyn Hall and City Council
Re: Subject Properties 606 / 614 / 622 Zelkwas Avenue (City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9138, 2020)
3rd Reading at Prince George City Council Meeting dated February 22, 2021

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am making this initial submission with respect to the proposed amendment of a zoning bylaw, as mentioned above, to facilitate housing facilities for the Pheonix Transition Society. This submission discusses some of the issues of concern for me. The areas discussed below include: rezoning, size access, parking, development size / logistics, and public hearing announcements. There are multiple other issues that I would like to address to you (i.e., volume of site usage / traffic, location, communications, neighborhood respect, health/safety, and other issues), I will be submitting that information in a separate letter and will be provided to you at the February 22 meeting. In addition, I will possibly be adding further information relating to what will be explained in this letter. The separate letter will also be e-mailed to each of you over the next few days.

REZONING

Part of the proposal is to (a) amalgamate three properties into one property, and (b) rezone the property from a zoned P2 to a zoned RM3 (i.e., to provide for multiple residential housing with a maximum density of 60 dwellings/ha). The proposal has now added an amended RM3 rezoning to add "Housing, Supportive" as a permitted use on the subject property; that is, permitting the applicant to develop a housing facility providing sleeping accommodations including individual or cooperative kitchen facilities for people reintegrating into the community. There has been a lot of amendments requested, as well as multiple additional documents that may change the rezoning even further. It is not clear to me what the rezoning is and requires clarification. My problem is that the rezoning language is making it difficult for me to navigate, especially when these changes may be proposed without the public having any knowledge.

SITE ACCESS

The applicant is stating that the area is located adjacent to a number of road networks to dissipate potential traffic increases (i.e., 5th Avenue, Union Street, Zelkwas Avenue, Rainbow Drive, and a laneway located to the west).

- If you are driving west on Rainbow Drive from Ahbau Street, a person can gain access to the subject property by taking a right on Union Street and driving about five blocks.
- If you are driving west on 5th Avenue from Highway 97 (Central Street West), a person can gain access to the subject property by taking a left on Union Street and driving less than a block.
- If you are driving east on Zelkwas Street, a person can gain access to the subject property by either taking a left on Union Street (and driving less than a block) or taking a left on a concrete laneway (this will be explained below).

The concrete laneway to the west of the subject property is located between the subject property (and part of the Trinity United Church parking lot) and a number of other properties (i.e., 650 Zelkwas Avenue, 636 / 642 Vedder Crescent). The laneway is about 35-40 percent smaller in width compared to residential streets within the neighbourhood (excluding 5th Avenue). Residents of both 636 / 642 Vedder Crescent utilize the laneway to back their vehicles in/out of their property. The laneway is also utilized to get to/from a back alley used for parking for properties located at 534 Stuart Drive and the properties at 3579 / 3593 / 3595 / 3599 / 3609 / 3611 / 3633/ 3653 / 3655 / 3675 / 3677 / 3723 / 3725 5th Avenue). The laneway ends at an intersection between Trinity United Church and 3579 5th Avenue. (There is no access point to the laneway from 5th Avenue.) At this intersection where the laneway ends, the entire back alley is mostly gravel and paved road. There are multiple ways to gain access to this intersection: off Stuart Drive, off Zelkwas Avenue, and off the parking lot located between the Trinity United Church and the proposed property. About five (5) years ago, barricades about 30-40 mm in height were placed between the parking lot and the intersection described. Within a few months, the barricades were removed by members of the public and the access point was (and is currently) reopened. Since that time, the access point from the parkade has always been open. This has since changed very recently last month, where the snow accumulated on the laneway has been (and is being) cleaned by City staff to prevent traffic from the parking lot. This is forcing people who want to gain access to the back alley take the concrete laneway route instead. Regardless of the current barricade of snow that has cut access from the Trinity United Church parking lot, the snow will melt and members of the public (including residents located on the properties on 5th Avenue) will utilize this access point.

Excluding the issues surrounding the concrete laneway, most people will go to the subject property by driving on Union Street until they find the entry way located across the street from 564 / 580 Union Street. The entry way is the basic entrance leading to the Trinity United Church parking lot. The applicant is saying that the entry way across from 564 / 580 Union Street will be the only way to get to the subject property. This entry way can become a very congested part of our neighbourhood, due to the number of vehicles coming in/out of the parking lot, including those that want to take a shortcut to the concrete laneway. Another issue related to access is the matter of parking (to be brought up in a separate section of the letter). When people want to gain access to/from the back alley described, we see vehicles that are treating the parking lot like a road (sometimes, people are driving up to 40 km/hr there). This has been a disruption from our view on Union Street, as the intersection seems to be more like a traffic stop than anything else. These issues have never been addressed in the past and, even if there is indication that the issues will be addressed, I cannot guarantee with certain that it will be safer than what it looks like presently.

PARKING

The applicant is stating that the asphalt area (which is gravel road) on the northern portion of the proposed site is currently not being utilized for parking. The entire parking lot of the Trinity United Church (which is asphalt) is located:

- Between the front of the Trinity United Church (on 3555 5th Avenue) and 5th Avenue, and
- Between the back of the Trinity United Church and the northern edge of the subject property (which is gravel).

The edge of the subject property (that is asphalt) changes into gravel and then grass. (The subject property from Zelkwas Avenue to the gravel section on the property is grass, which turns into gravel and then asphalt.) Basically, the gravel section which is on the proposed property is located between the grassed portion of the subject property and the entire parking lot behind the Trinity United Church. The applicant is stating that the gravel section (which would be part of the subject property) is not being utilized for parking.

The asphalt area is currently being used in a few situations:

- For members of the staff located at 513 Ahbau Street. This location provides a number of services to the general public, including Krell Wellness Center (chiropractic, naturopathic, chiropractic, physiotherapy, acupuncture, massage therapy, orthotics, etc.) and many other businesses, including: Dengarry Professional Services, James Secord Personal Health Design, Li-Car Management Group, Elevate Performance Realty & Management, Yoga PG, and other services. This building has two (2) parking lots – one along the front side of 5th Avenue, and the other along the back side of 5th Avenue. The front side of 513 Ahbau Street contains about 8-10 parking spaces, while the back side of 513 Ahbau Street (where access is available off the corner of 5th Avenue and Union Street) contains about 35-50 parking spaces. From our knowledge at our viewing distance, the Trinity United Church allows people who work at 513 Ahbau Street to park on any part of their property, with most of the staff parking behind the Trinity United Church. There are other employees who park behind the Trinity United Church and usually park either on the asphalt portion or the gravel part, located on the subject property.
- When there is an overload of vehicles for Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Narcotics Anonymous (NA), or other meetings. The vast majority of the meetings for user groups are located in a designated room located on the back side of the Trinity United Church. (This room has also been used as a voting station for the most recent provincial and federal election campaigns.) This room is currently being used for weight loss, yoga, and other purposes. The largest amount of people attending these meetings at this time are for AA (Sundays at 1:00PM and Mondays at 8:00PM) and NA (Tuesdays at 7:00PM) meetings. On any one of either the AA or NA meetings, approximately 7-25 vehicles are parked behind the Trinity United Church, the asphalt area (on the subject property), or alongside Union Street. This does not include other events or other meetings that may be occurring on the front side of the Trinity United Church.
- During special ceremonies (not including Sunday service at 10:00AM) where parking is required (e.g., wedding, funeral, or other church and non-church related event). For obvious reasons, we are not aware of any large special ceremonies at the Trinity United Church taking place due to

Covid-19 restrictions. (This also includes concerts hosted by the Prince George Conservatory of Music.) Prior to Covid-19, the Church would have multiple ceremonies of the nature described and, for most of these events, most of the available parking spaces, including the asphalt area, were utilized.

- Members of the general public who park their vehicles on the subject property to keep their cars idle and/or park their vehicles for other reasons. This is an occurrence that might take place anywhere from one (1) to five (5) days per week. They will park either on the church parking lot or on the subject property, even the grass in some cases.

There are also other considerations relating to the parking situation:

1. There are two (2) operations located on the Trinity United Church (3555 Union Street) site – Prince George Conservatory of Music and Edge Meadows Preschool.
 - a. The Prince George Conservatory of Music is located on the front side of the Church (facing 5th Avenue) and has its own separate entrance. During the day (particularly between 3PM and 6PM on most of the weekdays), this area of the property was particularly hectic, as you had vehicles from the 513 Ahbau Street site parked there AND vehicles with either adults or family members dropping off their children for music lessons. If there was no room to park at the front side of the Church parking lot, people would either park on Union Street or the back of the Church parking lot. (Since the restrictions from Covid-19, the congestion on the front side of the parking lot has been reduced drastically from the 3PM to 6PM time slots. Although there has been an increase of vehicles from the 513 Ahbau Street site parking on the front side of the parking lot, the congestion and traffic from the Conservatory has lessened.) The primary point I would like to make is that, when there are no Covid-19 restrictions (and the Conservatory is operating at maximum levels), there is an over-congestion of vehicles in that area, which has also congested Union Street. Additionally, if someone needs to enter either the Trinity United Church front parking lot or the back parking lot behind 513 Ahbau Street, that intersection is extremely difficult to slow down, find what you are looking for, and park.
 - b. Edge Meadows Preschool is located on the back side of the church and faces the subject property and the concrete laneway (located west of the subject property). The congestion is usually on weekday mornings (between 8:30AM and 10:00AM) and later in the day (between 11:00AM and 12:30PM), when most of the drop off and pick up of children takes place. Most of the parking for the Preschool faces the subject property, and you could probably have 10 (ten) to 15 vehicles parking there. As I have discussed previously, the space between the concrete laneway and the Preschool has a lot of traffic, which makes this part of the area difficult to circumvent when driving within that particular section of the parking lot.
2. As mentioned prior, the applicant is stating that part of the northern portion of the proposed site (which is gravel) is currently not being utilized for parking. I have provided you with concrete examples showing when the gravel road is utilized. During one (1) of the community engagement sessions, parking was brought up. Specifically, we enquired about what would be happening with parking once the proposed property has its constructions completed. Bob K. Fillier, the Head Minister of the Trinity United Church, informed us that night that the parking lot

behind Trinity United Church would be shared, which implies that people who will be living and/or working on the proposed site would share the same parking lot (i.e., between the Church and the proposed property) with any meetings and activities at the Church.

3. Between the proposed property and the property on 513 Ahbau Street, Union Street is an access point. Union Street is utilized for parking for both locations, mostly for clients and employees at 513 Ahbau Street. This makes it difficult to drive through the street or to back out of one's own driveway. When clients or employees are parked on Union Street, especially if there is one across the street from another,

DEVELOPMENT SIZE / LOGISTICS

The proposal is to rezone the site to RM3 (Multiple Residential) to allow for a 14-unit supportive housing development (with a density of 60 units/hectare). I have had the opportunity to look at the correspondence that has been written and the information that has been provided by outside sources prior to asking questions of the actual sources. The questions are as follows:

- How many units are going to be built on the proposed site with 100 percent certainty? A review of the documentation shows that there will be a total of 14 units on only one building. During the virtual engagement session I attended last December, I raised this question to all parties involved in the construction phase. The response I received from the developer at the engagement session was that they could not answer the question, stating that the number of units would be determined in the design process. To obtain even more information, I recently had a telephone conversation with Sandra Sasaki (President/Chair, Phoenix Transition Society) on February 12, 2021, who stated that even she did not have this information. How many total units will be on the proposed property? My expectation would be to know this information at the inception of getting knowledge about the project. To expect to receive this information at the 3rd Reading stage and/or after the final sketches are presented to City Council a few months later is unacceptable.
- How many buildings will be on the proposed site? A review of the 12th slide as part of the Virtual Meeting Presentation Slides that was part of the engagement session I attended shows that there will only be one (1) building that will be built on the proposed property, which will be located on the corner of Union Street and Zelkwas Avenue. However, other information that has been discussed is the construction of two (2) buildings, not one, on the proposed property. How many buildings will there be on the proposed property? As the site will have a density of 60 units/hectare, will there be 14 units in one building and up to 46 units in another building? Will the 14-unit building have the potential of being expanded in the future to have more than 14 units? When you look at the rezoning of three large lots on one piece of property, the issue of expansion will most definitely be a concern. From some of the drawings, it appears to be evident that another building, larger than the one that is being proposed, can most definitely be built. Additionally,
 - If the one building that we are being communicated about has a mother, a baby, and other children in each unit, this amounts to about a maximum about of people of 42, not including staff and the possibility that the one building could have staff and all of the other supports available?

- If the current proposal as part of the bylaw change is for a maximum density of 60 units/hectare, this number will have to be amended when a larger building is possibly built on the same property?
- How many storeys will each building have on the proposed site? A review of the one building to be built on the corner of Union Street and Zelkwas Avenue indicates, as part of the RM3 zoning change, that the size can be up to 12 feet in height and up to three storeys. On the slide presentation, it indicated that the building would be between 7.5 and 8.25 feet in height and only two storeys. How many storeys will the one building be? Will the building be adjusted in size (i.e., up to 12 feet)? And what will the size be of the 2nd building, where will it be, and why is it not part of any of the documentation? In the most recent presentation to the City, the applicants are saying that the residents who attended the public information sessions wanted buildings that conform to the neighbourhood and, as a result, the type of building will be built will be changed, who is to say that this will be changed back to the original idea of a stacked mobile home structure. If a stacked mobile home structure is built instead, this will give the applicant the opportunity to either increase the height of the building, add more units (which is still to be determined), or widen the building.
- How many people will the facilities on the proposed site serve? And is there a maximum amount of people that can be served on the proposed site? A review of the initial paperwork presented last year indicates that the property will have a density of 60 units/hectare. This suggests that there will be a maximum of 60 people that could potentially be housed on the proposed property. Given that some of the units will have families, what is the maximum number of people that could potentially be in one unit? For a 14-unit facility

For ourselves, the list of questions to be answered have not been addressed in any of the paperwork available. It is irrational that the information that will be presented at the City Council meeting giving 3rd Reading to the rezoning will address all of these issues.

PUBLIC HEARING REQUIREMENT

It was recommended that public hearings be waived in relation to this proposed bylaw change as one would not expect or show significant public input.

In M'Akola Development Services' rezoning request, they indicated that, as a public hearing would not be required, they would lead and host an on-site neighbourhood meeting with representatives from M'Akola, Phoenix Transition Society, BC Housing, and the United Trinity Church, one where neighbouring residents had the opportunity to learn about the project and ask questions. We received mail correspondence around November 21, 2020, inviting us to attend one (1) of three (3) online events through Zoom. I attended the final online event. (There was another information session for the stakeholders, which was held on a separate date.)

Although we did receive a letter in the mail inviting us to the meetings, along with a 2-page brochure explaining the project in some detail, we were unable to see any other information. Before the meeting began, Hillary Morgan (who was running the meeting), said that we were only allowed to answer questions solely based on the information that we were receiving. The problem was that there was a lot of information provided within a short period of time and it was difficult to prepare any questions. It

would be normal to assume that we would be able to see what the proposed project on the proposed site would actually look like, rather than a slide showing the building highlighted in red.

At the time of the meeting, each of the representative parties spoke about who they were and some information on the project itself. My preference for such a meeting would have been to:

- (a) See what the proposed project would look like (rather than being informed that we don't know what it will look like),
- (b) Have copies of the slide show ahead of time so we would have known the information to be explained in further detail, and
- (c) No information relating to the number of units and the number of people that would be on the proposed facility, stating that they did not have the information and that the plans have not been done to confirm this.

From the information session I attended to present date, many people (including owners of properties on 5th Avenue) were not aware of this project. This may explain why there were so little people attending the public sessions. When some of the neighbours conducted petition signing sessions around our neighbourhood over the Summer and Fall of last year, many were not even aware of this project, nor did they receive correspondence inviting them to the public information sessions. This suggests an inaccuracy relating to the lack of questions surrounding the project. It was difficult to attend an information session when most of the questions could not be addressed or answered. It is unacceptable to expect these issues to be addressed during a 3rd Reading at a City Council meeting.

I would like to take this time to thank all of you for giving me the opportunity to voice my concerns about this rezoning. I am a strong proponent of supportive housing of this nature; however, the objective issues surrounding this project, not including the ones yet to be mentioned, are too difficult to ignore. I believe in strong relationship building and full openness and communication. Residing very close to this proposed property for more than 30 years, and respecting one another through the years, I would expect this to also apply with this proposal (but I have not seen this relationship building, openness, and communication to date). For many reasons, I have been afraid (like a lot of people in our neighbourhood) to speak my opinion about this matter and am worried about any negative impacts on me. (I will also be discussing this in my other letter.)

If it is possible, I would like some communication from any of you to discuss the issues described in this letter (and those to be provided at a later date). Some of us within the neighborhood would be more than willing to have a meeting with any one of you. I am also willing to speak to you by phone at the City Council meeting, if any of you feel that my feedback is going to assist. (I feel strongly that my feedback will be beneficial). My contact information will be at the end of this letter.

Once again, thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Sincerely,

Mario Pascuzzi
564 Union Street

Prince George, BC V2M 3S5

E-Mail Redacted

Phone/Text: Redacted

Re: Request for Information

Karen Redacted
Fri 2021-02-19 4:24 PM



Reply all



Forward



More actions

To:

. You

Hello Mario Pascuzz,

Thank you for your email, I also spoke with you last Friday and with Sandra (Chair) of Phoenix Transition Society this is where information is available to the Public Phoenix Transition Society, is a Register Charity, since 1974, Please check the following websites:

Canada Revenue Agencies website: https://apps.cra-arc.gc.ca/ebci/hacc/srch/pub/dsplyBscSrch?request_locale=en

For more information on the proposed housing project on the corner of Zelkwas and Union, behind the Trinity United Church please check out the <https://letstalkhousingbc.ca/prince-george-zelkwas>

More information for Phoenix Transition Society <http://phoenixtransitionsociety.com> Harmony House: <http://harmonyhousebc.com>

Phoenix Transition Society, has been in operation for 46 years. We offer transitional housing and supports for women and women with children who are at risk of violence and/or experienced violence and trauma in their lives. We have built healthy strong relationships with various service providers, medical providers, community members, donors, and our neighbors.

I hope you check out the websites to help enhance your formal decision, I believe it takes all of us to activate change and create positivity in people lives.

Thank you again, for your interest.

Respectfully,

Karen Underhill
Executive Director
Phoenix Transition Society

From: "Mario Nicola Pascuzzi" Redacted
To: "karen phoenix" Redacted
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 12:58:49 PM
Subject: Request for Information

Good afternoon Karen:

I am contacting you as your name has been forwarded to me by the Chair of the Phoenix Transition Society.

On Friday, February 12/21, I spoke with a number of individuals and was initially forwarded to the Chair, who kindly returned my call on Friday afternoon.

In this conversation, I enquired about some of the issues, as I had not made a formal decision as to whether I was in favour or against the proposed housing project on the corner of Zelkwas and Union, behind the Trinity United Church in Prince George, BC. My goal was to get some information regarding the Phoenix Transition Society so I could make an informed decision about the organization, the project, and the positive impacts it may or may not have on the neighborhood. She indicated to me that she could probably provide me with meeting minutes from 2019 and 2020, but was not sure about last years, as it the financials were not reviewed and approved by an independent audit.

She advised that she would probably be able to come up with a package by Friday, February 19/21, but would need to call the Province and enquire about the Societies Act to see what information could be requested and provided to members of the public.

This morning, I spoke with the Chair about my request and she advised to contact you with respect to this request.

My request is to obtain all meeting minutes and AGM documentation from 2019/2020.

I am hopeful you can provide the documentation before tomorrow, if possible. This might assist me in reconsidering my position about the project.

Kind regards,

Mario Pascuzzi

Redacted

P.S. My regret today is that, by accident, I re-contacted the Chair today after my initial call today, as described in this letter. I had my phone in my pocket and accidentally pocket-dialed her in error. I then realized that it was close to 4.5 minutes in length. I am truly sorry about doing that accidentally.