

To: Mayor and Council- R.M.O.W.

Re: RZ1157 – 5298 ALTA LAKE ROAD REZONING –EMPLOYEE/ MARKET HOUSING

I am writing to you about the proposed redevelopment of the site noted. First of all I would like to thank Mayor and Council for all your efforts in helping to run this Resort town as it has become larger/busier and I know it is a thankless job much of the time. Covid has certainly turned it all upside down making your job even more difficult.

I am not against WHA employee housing or Tourist accommodation uses but as far as the RZ-1157 application goes I would expect more from the RMOW's planning department and Council in 2020. The report to council is not complete, is misleading and is missing key information. The proper course of action is to reject the current proposal and go back to square one. The developer needs to provide a more comprehensive study with complete and accurate information.

The traffic report is not acceptable. How is it that the RMOW relies on this kind of traffic study that was purposely done on a quiet day during the quietest time of the year? You are well aware that the busiest times are usually on long weekends though the average day increasingly has very busy times at any time of the year. Has the traffic study considered that Alta lake road is an old and narrow, poorly designed and poorly maintained road. The number of vehicles is not the only issue. See attached pictures of winter chaos on the steep hill. This hill descends to the railway crossing and is the normal route for residents at the south end of Alta Lake Road and Nita Lake Drive. This road would not be built today as it would not meet current standards. Adding more traffic to this unsafe road is irresponsible. (See attached photo below).



The road design of Nita lake drive is also questionable as it may not have capacity for additional traffic loads as the road is already narrow and steep as designed. Although the RMOW does a reasonable job of clearing and sanding most of the time, there are periods during winter when the plows fall behind and there are problems with vehicles getting stuck. It has been suggested that traffic from Tyrol lodge may use Nita Lake Drive as well. This is disturbing as this is additional commercial/nightly vehicle usage beyond the 330% increase proposed for 5298 Alta Lake Road. The Tyrol lodge which is zoned RS-E1 Zone (Residential Single Estate One) appears to be “underzoned” as it is a club cabin type of use which is not a pure single family use as envisioned by the Zoning bylaw designation. There is a conflict with the property as to the permitted uses and actual uses which are not consistent with the current zoning. There should be consideration of both Tyrol lodge and 5298 using a new access to Alta Lake Road that would cross the hydro ROW to the northwest.

The recent increase in “no parking signage” indicates the RMOW recognizes the problem of increasing use and traffic on Alta Lake Road. The problem will certainly get worse before it gets better. Any recent weekend has shown that the situation is basically out of control. Putting up more signs is not a positive long term solution!

Confirmation that a Riparian Areas Assessment report regarding Gebhart Creek has been submitted to and approved by the Provincial Authority is a condition of approval by the RMOW as specified. This statement is incorrect and misleading as it refers to Gebhardt creek only while the environmental regulations apply to lakes as well as creeks. Drawing A-1.0 indicates a 15-meter riparian setback while Current B.C. legislation requires a 30-meter setback to Alpha Lake. The drawings do not appear to be consistent with provincial regulations or the current report. Perhaps the report should be complete, accurate and consistent with the drawings. Will there be a track crossing for pedestrians or an ugly chain link fence be installed in a (failed) attempt to stop access to the “parks” at Alpha lakeshore?

The zoning of the site TA-17 currently allows 4,600m<sup>2</sup> of floor area. Maximum FSR 0.12 . The proposal for development is 19,786m<sup>2</sup> and a FSR of 0.51, **a stunning increase of 330%**. This project belongs in a commercial zone like the Whistler village or downtown Creekside.

Sheet A-1.5 shows the current site area of 39100m<sup>2</sup> on applicant design drawings. The drawings and calculations make it appear as if they are reducing their development footprint. This is a classic developer trick. The proposal for development is 19,786m<sup>2</sup> and a FSR of 0.51, **a stunning increase of 330% over what is currently permitted by the existing zoning.**

Sheet A-1.6 appears to show the previous development would include 100% of the property. This is misleading as the developer is not permitted to develop the area near the lake or in setback areas. Hopefully there are tree preservation requirements for the site though the report does not specify the extent of such areas.

The proposed employee housing site “gifted” to the WHA is steep, rocky and not suitable for development without extensive blasting. (See attached photo below).





Has an independent consultant reviewed the site? It is likely that even a driveway and onsite parking will be challenging and expensive to provide. See design drawing A-1.1. It appears that the WHA will receive the least developable part of the site. Smart developer. This type of extensive excavation/blasting and foundation work is very energy intensive with embodied energy costs which are not considered under current sustainability guidelines. There are definitely better sites for WHA housing.

Registration of a green building covenant consistent with Council Policy G-23: Green Building Policy is specified as a condition of approval. Has council asked for an increased level of standards on this project? The report is unclear on this point. Surely, with council's other statements on protection of the environment and green building importance, now is the time to discuss this requirement- before the covenant is registered. Will the developer step up and build to passive house standards such as the WHA is doing on some projects?

The July 9, 2020 Pique had a story about how the RMOW plans to "bank on big moves" to reverse course on increasing Whistler GHG emissions. "to be successful the municipality must embed its reduction targets into its decision making and planning from the get go" and "external emissions from visitors aren't something the RMOW can control but we can influence by leading by example". It could be argued that rezoning proposals such as RZ 1157 are situations where the RMOW could influence GHG emissions. Granting a 330% density increase is not likely to reduce GHG emissions.

Jack Crompton, quoted from the Pique December 20, 2018 after sending a letter criticizing oil companies for increasing climate change said, "You'll hear me say this often going forward: We must act locally." The letter, dated Nov. 15 and signed by Mayor Jack Crompton, requests that companies "begin taking financial responsibility for the climate-related harm caused in our community by (their) products." "Our goal was not to ignore our own role in climate change but to encourage change and action on climate change," said Crompton's statement.

It is clear that RZ 1157 will only increase oil consumption by at least 330% of what current zoning allows. I hope this Mayor and council will take responsibility for the climate related harm caused by this rezoning.

This appears to be an attempt by council to get points for creating employee housing in a less than ideal location. Clearly it is time for a new RMOW approach to employee housing. The majority should be located near the village proper where jobs are and closer to easy transit. The day lots or the golf driving range seem like a logical location-on top of a public concrete parkade. More walking and biking. Less cars. Additional customers for transit. Win-Win-Win.

This proposal highlights bad planning principles that will only increase traffic on already busy roads. The current year is 2020, not 1990. What happened to all the talk about sustainability and smart communities? The current proposal only encourages more private vehicle use for transportation, an archaic model, one I hoped RMOW was going to discourage. I read that many of the residents will walk and ride their bikes. This is great except it is not true for most residents most of the year. Even during the nicest days most residents will "need" their vehicle for various reasons. The current end of trip facilities in Whistler village and Creekside are woefully inadequate for current/future needs and uses. Where is the secure bike storage? Where is the e-bike parking with electric recharging facilities? The valley trail for Nita lake estates was cleared only once last winter making it very difficult to use regularly as it became a two foot thick layer of bumpy ice and snow. You are incorrect if you think foot and bike traffic will be a significant percentage of resident transportation methods year round (though that could be dramatically improved).

If the RMOW supports this type of density I hope they will consider a density increase in the entire valley. I know many homeowners would welcome an FSR increase to 0.51 as in line with this proposal. It could provide significant employee housing opportunities without the great financial and environmental costs of over-developing raw natural land in locations poorly served by roads and transit.

Respectfully yours,



Craig Koszman

#44-5151 Nita Lake Drive

Whistler, B.C. V8E-1J6