Public Hearing,

I unfortunately will be out of town on November 14th. I do, however, want to make my views known.

While I am generally very pro-development, this project makes no sense for a number of reasons.

1. In the morning and the afternoon rush hours, S.W. Marine Drive is a parking lot. There is just no more room on the street for more traffic unless you want more pollution from idling cars.

2. Unlike almost every street in the city, there are no sidewalks on either side of S.W. Marine Drive nor is there any parking on either side of the street. Is there any other street in the city with no sidewalk and no on street parking at any time? As there is no parking or lay-by, whenever a garbage truck, leaf collection or other city vehicle is doing its job, all traffic is halted. This makes no sense.

3. Someone exiting a property on foot cannot go anywhere without jaywalking, walking down the roadway or walking down the bike lane. Is there any other street in the city where one has to break the law to leave their house on foot? A development on the other side of the street would at least give people a way to exit the property on foot.

4. As there is no on street parking, to have a comprehensive development on the street would require a substantial amount of parking on the property. This is not consistent with the existing streetscape.

Solution

This project should not be permitted to go ahead unless:

(a) the whole of S.W. Marine Drive is rezoned multi-family and the roadway is widened to four lanes. Allowing one zoning change will undoubtedly lead to more zoning change applications and there would be little justification for not allowing subsequent changes if this application is approved; or

(b) the driving restrictions on Marine Drive that were imposed during roadworks this summer, are made permanent.

In summary, letting this project go ahead would be a terrible mistake.

Regards,

Bill Rand
I am writing to comment on the Casa Mia development for which I believe I submitted observations a few years ago.

As is the case with most of the city’s judgments on zoning, I recognize that you will allow this latest “flavor-of-the-month” developer to build the usual slightly-reduced facility; particularly as there is now an aspect of “public good” included in the facility.

Notwithstanding the city’s prejudgment, isn’t it about time that someone looked at the broader picture of what you are really doing?

When this zoning goes through, you will be allowing one of the last upper-scale residential areas of the city close to the airport to be commercialized.

This city has suffered losses in head offices, often for reasons not under their control, but if you eliminate another potential area of executive housing, the city will pay the price in attracting a level of executive and corporate leadership that actually provides jobs and not just fills them.

Make no mistake, putting a commercially run old-age home on the street will cost the city.

I only ask for fairness. Give us what you intend to give your developer.

Privileged & Confidential

F. David Radler