

I would be grateful if City Council would allow me to present several points to provide context with respect to proposal RPC19-31. Without context, I believe some of the proposal is unintentionally inaccurate and misleading.

I am a resident of the Velocity condos across from the proposed development, I own property across James Hill Road where my brother's family resides and I am registered as a Professional Engineer in Saskatchewan.

Residential Density

The proposal states the medium density proposal is appropriate given the high density areas located to the north of the subject property. I would counterargue that the proposed development is inappropriate as it does not align with the concept plan and capacity of adjacent roads. The Harbour Landing Concept Plan was designed with mixed density in mind; low, medium and high density residential. The two Velocity condominium buildings and three Deveraux rental buildings north of the proposed development are high density. Referring to Appendix A-3.1, the proposed development is 0.62 hectares of the 5 hectare low density portion. Contrary to the proposals summary, the proposed development is surrounded by medium density residential to the West and South and all of Mitchinson Way and Jim Cairns Blvd to the East of James Hill Road up to the creek is medium density. Over twelve percent of the low density residential zone in the immediate area will be removed from the original plan.

Parking

The projected traffic patterns and volumes for the neighbourhood were evaluated during the review of the proposed amendments but were the parking volumes studied? The proposal states "the street" is wide enough to have parking on both sides of the street. Mitchinson Way has no parking signs posted on the south side of one third of the street. The surrounding streets, Senecal Drive, Vedette Road and Delhaye Way only permit parking on one side. Mitchinson Way, Senecal Drive and Vedette Road have no parking available on weeknights. Neighbours in Velocity are participating in online fights over parking and are calling Parking Enforcement to ticket their neighbours in an effort to obtain a parking space. A sample walk around the site revealed two parking spots available on Senecal Drive, two on Vedette and four on Mitchinson Way. Several cars were parked in the back lane of the proposed development. I am not asking Council to take my word for it but to conduct a parking study before making a decision and consider how many parking spaces are required on the original or proposed development to accommodate the current state of parking.

Population Density

The proposal states the overall population density of the Harbour Landing Concept Plan Area will have a nominal increase from 13,047 to 13,079. However, the

harbourlanding.ca website boasts Harbour Landing is home to just under 14,000 residents. The proposal was also written at a time when we were not aware of overcrowding at Ecole Harbour Landing school. The school has reached capacity. The last Census took place in 2016. Is there any data available to determine what the present population is in Harbour Landing and if we have reached capacity?

Possible Error in Density Classification

The proposal states, “The proposed development is consistent with the purpose and intent of the R5 – Residential Medium Density Zone with respect to permitting fourplex development in suburban areas of the city with net density between 25 to 50 units per hectare”. However, if one calculates a ratio of 32 units within 0.62 hectares, the range appears to be exceeded at 51.2 units per hectare. Both proposals put forth to City Council appear to be high density development proposals in a low density residential zone.

Policy/Strategic Implications

Under the heading “Policy/Strategic Implications”, the proposal attests to the fact it is consistent with the policies in Part A of the Official Community Plan. It says it meets several goals regarding New Neighbourhoods and Mixed New Neighbourhoods in Map 1 of the Growth Plan. However, Harbour Landing is NOT defined as a New Neighbourhood or Mixed New Neighbourhood in Map 1. Harbour Landing was designated as a “Built or Approved Neighbourhood” in Map 1 of the Official Community Plan. The proposals policy and strategic implications with respect to Goals 1 and 4 appear invalid.

Administration’s Response

Administration’s response pertained only to traffic, it did not address the parking issues raised in the public feedback.

Issue Changing the Original Plan

The Applicant responded that there is a need for additional rental homes in Harbour Landing. No evidence has been provided that there is a need for additional rentals. In fact, rent has decreased in Harbour Landing due to a surplus of rentals. Why are rental homes being introduced as a topic? Will the homes be sold as private residences or will they be rented by a business?

Dr. Graeme Drysdale P.Eng.