

September 14, 2020

**Mayor and Council**

**Resort Municipality of Whistler**

**RE: 5298 Alta Lake Road Proposed Development**

Although I support development of the subject property in general, in the current form I do not believe it to be mindfully nor respectfully developed.

First off, what is extremely bizarre and concerning is the proposed access, if the civic address is Alta Lake Road why is the access not from Alta Lake Road? Why is the developer proposing to access their development by turning onto Nita Lake Drive and then accessing the property from the rear? Why is it civically known as 5298 Alta Lake Road if the original planning intent was not for direct entrance from Alta Lake Road?

Considering the amount of density being proposed, funneling access through an already densified, tight, over parked Drive is not only dangerous through negligent planning. The only thing this achieves is a cost saving measure to the developer and hardship to the existing neighborhood. Urban Planning would suggest a "Road" is designed for and expected to carry large volumes of traffic, while a "Drive" is a traffic slowed meandering street. Nita Lake Drive was not designed to be a driveway entrance for a 43 Unit development, that will accommodate at a minimum 70 vehicles.

Secondly, what seems oddly misleading are the FSR density ratios and calculations. It appears to me the developer is using the benefit of 100% of the entire site area when calculating FSR, however gifting area for future development by means of subdividing. Therefore, those lands need to be removed from the FSR calculations, when doing so, the proposed FSR far exceeds the existing zoning and appears to be closer to a 0.50 FSR. If this is correct, the developers should be providing something much more meaningful to the community, bonus density costs in every community I have seen. I would suggest that you request the developers Architect remove the future development area from the FSR calculations and re-submit the drawings to properly and accurately consider this proposal.

The notion that the developer is being granted bonus density in exchange for gifted future housing development land is simply a raw deal for the RMOW. The subject area is not financially developable given the terrain, slope and geology make up. This is undoubtedly a lost leader and ethically questionable.

Where is the Visitor Parking? Meeting the minimum parking requirements under the existing Building Code without visitor parking consideration is troubling in many regards. How has this not been addressed in earlier readings? Not only will this create congestion and on street parking, this is a huge miss on the developers part if they intend to compete with market townhouses, any buyer of such townhouse would expect the development to have an area for their guests to park.

It is not clear to me why this project seems to be being fast tracked through the process though I would respectfully request that you oppose this development in favor of a direct access, mindfully appropriate densified development.

Yours truly,

Chris Sherry - 5229 Jordan Lane