

## Lucy Wyn-Griffiths

---

**From:** Dan Wilson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 4:06 PM  
**To:** corporate  
**Subject:** RZ001157 - Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Council,

I'd like to thank you for your efforts to negotiate a much better arrangement for the community with respect to this rezoning. The first proposal was very far from providing benefits to the community, and this particular proposal provides substantial benefits and employee housing in a fantastic location for access to amenities, shopping and natural areas.

I'd like to lend my support for this rezoning and ask Council to consider the following minor improvements:

- 1) Strong oversight during site clearing and protections for the view corridors from the Valley Trail elevation on the South/East side of the lake
- 2) Reducing the cost of the employee townhouse units to no more than \$400 a square foot. By the time these are built, interest rates will be higher and we lower cost will be required to make these affordable.
- 3) In line with our Big Moves strategy. Ensure no fossil fuels used on site for heating buildings, cooking, hot water use or heating of the common pool.
- 4) Consider what ever changes might be required to ensure safety on the train tracks in order to prevent fencing by CN as this will restrict animal movement

Thank you.  
Dan Wilson  
3-3065 Hillcrest Dr.  
Whistler, BC

## Lucy Wyn-Griffiths

---

**From:** Bruce Worden C.C.C. [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 4:11 PM  
**To:** corporate

Bruce Worden

21-5151 Nita Lake Drive

Whistler BC

V8E 1J6

RE: Alta Lake Road Development

Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for taking the time to address my concerns regarding this proposed development at Alta Lake. After having looked over all aspects of the proposal I am concerned about the lack of parking, lack of exit for safety and volume as well the environmental impact should this move forward.

My family and I rent a home in the WHA strata at Nita Lake Residences. We have lived in Whistler for 6 years. We spent four years on the waitlist for WHA housing and viewed two properties. Based on our families needs we were limited to properties but I definitely understand the need for housing and the length of time that can be spent on the waitlist.

Speaking to living in the area there is already a parking issue locally, with good reason due to seasonal needs. The original amount of parking, by design is based on beds. After reviewing the proposed parking, the issue is compounded because even though there is a presented appropriate amount of spots per bed, the reality is that more and more cars and people will live in those beds so you have increased the amount of vehicles both for traffic and parking. Adding more traffic down the lane below our development will pose many issues for local residents and visitors alike. I understand there was a traffic study that was completed in August and watched it happen with no traffic. On any other given year Alta Lake Road as well as Nita Lake Drive are busy with everyone looking for Rainbow Park, I've given directions many times and it is shocking that the results for the study are conclusive based on when completed. The intersection at Nita Lake is a hazard at best of times as the topside blind corner and "speed" of drivers encourages cautious driving not to mention pedestrians.

We have seen many issues with parking at Rainbow Park and that is somewhat removed from a community. With this new park space by Nita Lake and the additional beds aside from the private residences is there thought of what will be done for those visiting from out of town? I can see no good coming from all of those visitors and having only one way out? I understand that there has been a proposed alternate entrance/ exit and think it should be strongly considered if this project goes ahead. It would both suit the owners to not have gravel trucks causing issues with daily commuting as well as a safe alternative later in construction.

Finally I understand the need for homes and I have to question the viability of more homes and garbage and trash into yet another marshland. Again, the environmental assessment is sound as far as I can tell, but is it a smart option for such a small body of water?

Adding another lakeside park for the public from all over the world to visit will cause as many issues as rainbow park has for parking and environmental disaster for the small ecosystem.

Thank you for taking this into consideration.

--

Enjoy your day,

Bruce Worden C.C.C.

## Lucy Wyn-Griffiths

---

**From:** John Konig [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 4:40 PM  
**To:** corporate  
**Subject:** Public Hearing RZ001157

Mayor and Council,

I am opposed to continual expansion of the bed unit cap. Whistler has grown too big and crowded. This proposed development, on Nita Lake, does not provide for a substantial community benefit therefore it should not be considered.

Regards, John Konig

2225 Gondola Way, Whistler, V8E 0B4  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone



March 9, 2021

Mayor and Council

Re: Public Hearing Submission for RZ1157

My name is Cheryl Green. I have written several letters to council regarding the rezoning of this property. I am a full-time resident of Whistler and live near the site of the proposed development, so will be particularly impacted by the increased traffic and other issues created if this rezoning is approved. Although I speak for myself personally, I am also the President of the Nita Lake Estates strata council and have had a duty over the past several years to follow this proposal closely and advocate on behalf of my Strata members. For that reason, I have become much more informed than most about the issues surrounding RZ1157, and although the developer has been at pains to frame this as a typical issue of "NIMBY neighbours" against new development, it has become clear to me that, given the prominent location of the property and its outsized impact on the environment and certain destruction of trees, this is an issue that affects all Whistler residents.

I am opposed to this rezoning proposal.

This rezoning proposal is a very difficult one given the current zoning on the property. Back in 2002, council needed to consider whether the original zoning for a single family lot should be substantially increased to build a small boutique hotel surrounded by cabins nestled in the woods. "It was to be a unique tourist accommodation experience not available in Whistler at the time. Designed for retreat functions, all buildings would be sensitively placed within a forested lakeside site, creating an ambiance of "cabins in the woods" with emphasis on the beauty and tranquility of the natural setting. The development design would reflect local culture and celebrate Whistler's history." The nature-sensitive development was so appealing, it in fact that it received very little opposition (only one person spoke at the Public Hearing) from the same neighbours who are now opposing this development. However, now 20 years later, laws have changed with regards to Fire Smarting and riparian setbacks, the Nita Lake Lodge has been built, along with the homes in the Nita Lake Estates and the 41 Employee Units at the Residences at Nita Lake. In 2006, council rejected a proposal for the Hillman House as it was not "special enough". *The Pique* (July 7, 2006 "Nita Lake development not 'special' enough") reported [REDACTED] (who had been a councillor at the time of the original rezoning) as saying, "It wasn't an easy decision [to rezone the property...Here's a piece of property that's zoned for one house and... there's no good rationalization to increase the density on a very beautiful property on a lake without a special benefit to the community." The London Mountain Lodge (the Depner proposal) was deemed to be special and unique. The development proposal in 2006 not special enough; it was essentially private single-family homes, just like any other tourist accommodation in Whistler and that's not what in keeping with the character of the site. Given that the 2006 proposal was rejected, it is doubtful whether the council in 2002 would have even considered the proposal before you today. They were hesitant to rezone from a single family home. Since then, nothing has changed. Should council today compound the problem by approving an even bigger and more dense development? There is an opportunity for the council of today to do a reset, to listen to the community and recommend a creative solution that is in the best interests of Whistler. *Whistler's OCP (4.1.2.12) calls for "seek[ing] creative solutions for optimizing land use and respective interests"*; surely there is a more creative solution than the present proposal that might better balance the property owner's ambitions with the needs and priorities of the community, while protecting Nita Lake.

This developer does not want to build a hotel, it is simply not profitable and the lack of feasibility is why it has not been built in the 20 years since it was rezoned. Others have tried, but never succeeded. [REDACTED]

**in her Feb. 4, 2019 email to the RMOW even conceded that the existing proposal could not be built in its current form.** Council should not be afraid that the current zoning will be built if they tell this developer to go back to the drawing board and insist they come back with a rezoning proposal that is more in keeping with a lakeside development and the original vision first. The developer desperately needs rezoning so council is in

the driver's seat. When the applicant purchased the property, they knew full well what zoning it came with and what restrictions were bound to title by covenant. I do not know what kind of assurances he received from municipal staff or members of council that guaranteed a change of zoning, but the residents of Whistler should not have to suffer because he made a risky business decision. The RMOW should not be in the business of bailing out developers for poorly-conceived purchases. Nita Lake is still a very special piece of property and more deserving than the uncreative proposed development that will certainly clear-cut 5 acres of the site. Nita Lake remains one of the best-preserved of Whistler's lakes; it has been developed enough.

The developer is trying to frame this as a debate between public housing advocates and NIMBYs, but we know this is a red herring. It is easy for the developer to point fingers and just say NIMBY and try to deflect from what the real concerns are from citizens from all parts of Whistler. As I have a Jordan Lane address, I am likely one of the NIMBY's that is referred to. I want to point out that I do not have a view of Nita Lake and in none of my correspondence have I ever said I was opposed to employee housing. In fact, I have been saying there should be more employee housing and less market townhomes. There needs to be a better balance. The real issue is the promotion of sustainable, appropriate development on one of Whistler's last forested lakefronts for now and for the future generation. The developer seems to think that by including a small employee housing component they deserve a blank cheque for whatever rezoning is most favourable and profitable for them; I say I would welcome an employee community on this site. I am asking council to not make the same mistake and to realize that this is not just a debate for or against employee housing it is about the future of Whistler and sustainability of the assets we have for future generations. The developer has not engaged the public or taken concerns raised at Public open house or from the direct neighbours.

### **So why is this a Bad Deal for Whistler?**

- 1) The massing of the proposed development is simply too big for this site. The developer has been forced to locate the entire development at the south end of the site, which has reduced the buildable land to a much smaller footprint of 19,214m<sup>2</sup> (4.7acres) which results in an increased density of 275%.  
*PSHE # 12. Proposed densities, scale of development and form of housing should be appropriate for the site context. Impacts on scenic views, and views and solar access for adjacent properties should be minimized*

The Empire Group has been gifted additional density or sq meters that they should not be entitled to which adds significant value to this rezoning proposal. How did this happen? Why has the developer been handed such a great deal? It appears the Mr. Hutchinson was in talks with Mike Furey long before the company was purchased to get the land asset of 5298 Alta Lake Road. The original Feb. 21, 2019 email sent from Roman Licko to Caroline Lamont lays out:

*Staff review indicates that RZ1157 proposes:*

- *An increase of 2500 m<sup>2</sup> for tourist accommodation from 1,900 m<sup>2</sup> to 4,400 m<sup>2</sup>.*
- *An increase of 310 m<sup>2</sup> for employee housing, and*
- *An overall increase in the density on the site of 1236 m<sup>2</sup> (13,304 sq. ft.)*

*Staff have concerns regarding the increased amount of market value tourist accommodation development (from 1,900 m<sup>2</sup> to 4,400 m<sup>2</sup>) through the conversion of hotel support facilities, and note that the increase in proposed employee housing is significantly less (from 800 m<sup>2</sup> to 1110 m<sup>2</sup>).*

Prior to sending, this letter was reviewed by many RMOW staff including Director of Planning, Mike Kirkegaard. From my dealings with Mr. Licko over the years, I have always found him to be very professional and very knowledgeable, he simply does not make mistakes and would not make one as big as this along with the other senior RMOW staff to insist the starting point for the negotiations was 1900m<sup>2</sup> for TA and 800m<sup>2</sup> for Employee housing.

This starting point is important to fully understand how much more density the developer is receiving and is key to the discussions taking place in the community. The legal opinion presented by [REDACTED] confirms that the starting point is actually 0. The developer does not get to transfer any new density to the rezoning request. The concern is that the density is too high and the community benefits too low and the ratio of market homes to Employee housing units too high.

**My question is What was the rationale for the planning department to backtrack from its initial position and move the starting point from the 1900m<sup>2</sup> of TA to 3500m<sup>2</sup>? This clearly puts the Whistler community at a disadvantage by allowing more market townhomes and less employee units that would otherwise be provided under the private employee guidelines. Does council understand this is a Bad Deal for Whistler?**

- 2) No overall vision for this property and the west side of Nita Lake. What is the vision for all of Whistler's lake fronts? What is your vision for Nita Lake? Do we want further intrusion into the riparian zones with increased access to these areas through the addition of a park? The riparian zones contain important habitats that can be impacted by human intrusion into these areas. It will be human nature for people to try to gain access to the lake. The piecemeal approach to development is not in the best interest of Whistler. It is hard to see the cumulative effect of the decisions made in this manner. In the case of this property, development on this parcel could set precedent for these two other sites owned by the Stonebridge group with all 3 parcels covering the entire west side of the lake, all with high density development. It will set a precedent for development of other properties under the PSEH. This is already evident with the letter from the Tyrol Lodge and the letter from [REDACTED] where he asks council "if you endorse the Nita Lake project—would you also be in support of allowing all other stratas to sell parcels of their land to further develop, increase the density, and profit, just like the project in question? **Is it going to be the policy of the RMOW moving forward that any land-owner can add a small employee housing element to a project and guarantee a massive rezoning that will help turn a profit? Council needs to have a clear vision for the west side of Nita Lake.**

3) **Environmental Concerns**

***"The proposed development shall not have unacceptable negative impacts on any environmentally sensitive lands and shall adhere to all development permit guidelines for protection of the natural environment and applicable provincial and federal regulations". PSEH #16***

***"OCP 4.16.4 (d) all proposed developments and changes in land use must be evaluated to the satisfaction of the municipality to assess impacts on:***

- iii. the character of Whistler's forested mountain environment, including preservation of green buffers, views, scenery and distinctive natural features;***
- iv. Whistler's sensitive ecosystems and biodiversity"***

In order to build the proposed development on this reduced site, to achieve this in a way consistent with Fire smart principles, there is no doubt that significant clear cutting of the 5 acres will need to occur to allow this increase in density in such a small area. I ask council to please look carefully at the drawing showing the Firesmart requirements for the proposed development. The drawings show that there will need to be thinning and pruning of the trees along the Valley Trail portion and the lake.

Green buffers between neighbourhoods will be difficult to maintain with Fire smart regulations and replanting of deciduous trees. The views from the east side of the lake will be significantly impacted from the lake to the top of Whistler. The developer took no care in maintaining any green space in his Baxter Creek development. **What assurances does the council have that this will not occur again? What further tree loss can be expected during construction? Can we get binding assurances that the trees will be protected and the views maintained?**

The picture below shows an estimation of the clear-cut area using the Firesmart directives for the project. What is not taken into account is the pruning and thinning of trees along the Valley Trail



section in the riparian zones that will be required. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] took significant time to refute some of the objections on the Friends of Nita Lake Website. The most interesting point of her document, also the most concerning, is what is missing. She has not disputed the artist's rendering of the clear cut of the proposed site which is on the Friends of Nita Lake website and she herself posted on her social media account for others to see. To me and others, it seems clear that we are all correct, this piece of the property will be clear cut at the minimum as shown.

The park has also not been discussed very much. When reviewing the preliminary plans for the park contained in the bylaw, it is evident that many trees will have to be cut in order to make the park. The plans are for more deciduous trees and plants and the area will appear to be a barren piece of land in the winter. There will be increased traffic into the Nita Lake neighbourhood with those trying to access the park. There is no parking currently in the plans for the park. Will we be paving part the park to allow for cars? If there is no parking, this will lead to parking in residential neighbourhoods which has already been noted as problems in other Whistler neighbourhoods as more people try to access outdoor recreational spaces.

**Along with other future planned developments along Alta Lake Road, this development will contribute** to further congestion along Highway 99 and Alta Lake Road. This will clearly be harmful for CO2 emissions around the Lake and added pollution in our community. **The increased number of car trips as a result of the increased density in this development** is not consistent with the goals of Whistler to reduce carbon emissions. *Let's think more carefully how we will decrease our CO2 emissions NOT give approval to increase them.* **Why is it not mandated for the developer to provide EV charging stations** in each of the units or covered shared EV charging stations that can be also used in the winter in Whistler to support the Green initiatives and policies. Many letters express concerns about the environmental impacts and would rather see less development. **How does Council respond to those residents who feel the environmental impact is not worth approving this development in its current form?**

The environmental impacts and loss of green space for residents today and for our future is a common theme in many of the letters. Council needs to ensure that the developer is only given the minimum extra density to make the project viable and is that is truly consistent with private developer guidelines. **How can council ignore the concerns of residents who feel that council is giving away the future for short term gain of a few employee housing units and market housing that is no longer wanted or needed in Whistler?**

- 4) ***"The natural environment that sustains our local biodiversity, provides our connection to nature and sustains Whistler as an attractive mountain destination, has been protected by carefully managing the amount of development, its location, and design and construction, and proactively preserving sensitive areas." OCP 4-1***

***"Whistler is now realizing the potential of its existing developed capacity, and community members and stakeholders have expressed concern over the ultimate size of the community and further growth, which impact the unique characteristics of the resort community; demands on the natural environment and its ecosystems; infrastructure and services capacity; economic vitality and sustainability; quality of life; and the capacity of the resort community and its surrounding area to provide enjoyable experiences for visitors and residents." (OCP 4-4)***

This proposed development impacts the health of our Whistler wildlife and ecosystems put at risk, along with the future of tourism, and the health and well-being of future generations. Our community depends upon a thriving tourism industry based on Whistler's outstanding natural environment. It is clear that tourists come here to enjoy many outdoor activities, as well as the natural beauty that Whistler is known worldwide for - mountains, lakes, and magnificent forests and all of the biodiversity that come with it. There are very few tourists who would come to a destination to see clear cuts, row housing and over- development, as is proposed for Nita Lake. There are letters in the package from long time visitors to Whistler for over 20 years that express a concern with this development. **Has council considered the impact of this decision and the promotion over development will have on future tourism, the livelihood of many Whistler residents? How does this development comply with the above mentioned sections from the OCP?**

- 5) **This is not an employee housing project but a market/tourist accommodation project. Does Whistler need more market housing? Should we be allocating remaining bed units to support more tourist accommodation?** Many of the letters to council have expressed concern that more market/tourist accommodation leads to over development that then requires more infrastructure requirements and more employee housing to support these additional units. Is nightly tourist accommodation what is needed for this site? Would this type of accommodation so far away from any amenities and services and with no lake access be a desirable rental? There is no easy way for people to get back late in the evening from the village except to drive or take a taxi.
- 6) **Not enough Employee Housing for the increase in Market Zoning.** This is one of the first proposals under the Guidelines for Private Developers, which are based on the basic principle that a project "optimize the amount of employee housing within the proposed development." These guidelines allow for "limited amounts of new unrestricted market accommodation to support project viability"; even though council is desperate for additional employee housing, the principles of the guidelines still have to be applied. The developer appears to have got this backwards by optimizing the for-profit market development and limiting the employee housing. There is not enough Employee Housing and too many large market townhomes.
- 7) Are these Employee Housing units actually affordable at \$425/foot? There have been lots of comments on social media that these units are out of reach for many of the people council is trying to reach. This is also supported in the Letters to Council. There are also letters questioning whether this is the right place for employee housing given the distance to services. I read in astonishment last July that Mayor Crompton and Councillor Ford, both champions of employee housing voted against moving forward with the Wedgewoods employee housing project. This project would have provided 36 townhomes at

\$315/ft and 16 rental units. In perspective, the proposed 141m<sup>2</sup> unit built at Nita Lake would cost \$645,000 but the same size unit built at the proposed Wedgewoods location would be \$478,075, a **difference of \$166,924**. This is a deal breaker for many Whistler residents desperate to own their own home. Heck, the developer is even putting in EV charging stations. One of the reasons this was turned down was the distance to services. I did a little experiment last summer. I timed my drive from my home in Nita Lake Estates at 11am on a Sunday morning to Lorimer Road and then from Lorimer Road to Wedgewoods and then did the same for the return trip. Guess what? It took more time for me to get to the Village than to Wedgewoods. Also keep in mind, it would take less time for Wedgewoods residents to reach services at Rainbow. Why would members of council vote against a very good solution that provides much more employee housing stock than this proposal (although the stock would not all go to Whistler) but totally embrace a more expensive option that has a negative impact on one of our lakes? The other thing that needs to be considered is that more people are working from home and that this is forecast to continue. In all areas of BC, people are leaving the cities and moving to outlying areas that are most cost effective. This is certainly the case with the Wedgewoods area that is will be a thriving community and a great option for a young growing family.

- 8) Inadequate community benefits in exchange for the rezoning and estimated 30 million in profit that [REDACTED] version of the Pro forma would indicate. The developer is already obligated to provide the amenities as well as many that have been deleted such as the Arts Facility. It does not appear these costs have been accurately accounted for. **Does the municipality get a “credit” for the amenities he no longer is providing?**
- 9) **Traffic Concerns:** Issues are well documented in my previous letters to council; increased traffic, at least 72 more cars traveling through the current Nita Lake neighbourhood, adding to the existing traffic south of the village and causing long lines at the intersection of Highway 99 and Alta Road. At peak times, traffic re-routes along Alta Lake Road. The current proposal fails to provide for adequate parking for residents, their guests and nightly rentals.

**“OCP 4.16.4 (d) all proposed developments and changes in land use must be evaluated to the satisfaction of the municipality to assess impacts on: xi. traffic congestion and safety, including traffic volumes and patterns on Highway 99 and the local road system”**

***“PSEH # 17 . Additional traffic volumes and patterns shall not exceed the service capacity of adjacent roadways.”***

Nita Lake Drive cannot handle any additional traffic. The safety concerns of residents living along and using Nita Lake Drive have been well documented in many letters to council. **As the second required traffic study has not been released, can staff confirm that there is no impact on the above section of the OCP?**

***“PSEH # 13. Proposed developments shall be within a comfortable walking distance to a transit stop, and in close proximity to the valley trail, parks and community facilities, convenience goods and services and places of work. Housing has been developed close to transit, pedestrian and bicycle routes and amenities to reduce auto dependency.”***

**The proposed new development is a car-dependent neighbourhood:** Sure, some days people will walk and cycle from this proposed development, but let us be real and acknowledge that people will also be using their cars most days, especially the market townhomes. No one will be trudging from the development to the ski hill, or back with groceries for a family of 4 or to use any shops, services or restaurants in the village. Parts of the grade on the valley trail back to the Employee Housing units is

very steep and will be difficult to negotiate in the winter. Letters to Council from those living at the Residences at Nita Lake have clearly identified that they are dependent on their cars from this location.

### **What is the Solution?**

It is great to see the new Cheakamus Development moving forward producing a significant stock of employee housing in a vibrant family neighbourhood. Why has it taken so long to get this next phase going? It has only put pressure on council to look for smaller amounts of employee housing in other areas. Here, small amounts of market housing has supported this development from the beginning and seems to be a model that the PSEH could be based. In the RZ1157 proposal, there is simply too many market townhomes and not enough employee housing to really say it qualifies under the PSEH guidelines. Less market townhomes more employee townhomes is what this proposal needs. Negotiate a better balance of employee housing for market townhomes. **As we all know, the starting point is actually Zerom2.** Consider this to be a single lot as what is being done with the Nordic proposal. I would suggest that for every 100m<sup>2</sup> of market townhomes, the developer should be providing 200m<sup>2</sup> of employee housing. Limit the density to what is currently allowed without the hotel, 2700m<sup>2</sup> (1900m<sup>2</sup> of market and 800m<sup>2</sup> of employee) and council can decide how to distribute it. For this the developer would still need to provide the covenanted amenities. For the park donation, you could suggest a small amount of additional market housing combined with employee housing units by splitting the hotel facilities of 1600 at a ratio of 2:1 employee housing to market. On the other hand, the property could be returned to zoning for a single family home with the park dedication required and suggest the developer find a more appropriate and less expensive piece of property to which the bed units could be transferred. A more affordable piece of property would translate into more affordable employee housing units just like the WedgeWoods proposal. Density on this property needs to be kept to a minimum to reduce environmental impacts. If any development is approved, it must respect the wilderness nature of this land, be very carefully eased into this treed, lakeside setting.

**Need for a Separate Entrance for the 5298 Development** The original access to the Hillman property, which was the predecessor to the currently zoned development, was from Alta Lake Road, not Nita Lake Drive. There are easements in place with an existing gravel road and bridge. Traffic and parking issues for users of Nita Lake Drive and access to Alta Lake Road have been well documented by the residents of this area. A separate entrance makes sense and is something the developer could easily make happen to limit the impact on existing residents and the residents in the new development. The owners of the new employee housing would not be subject to constant traffic going into the park area and market/tourist accommodation. This would reduce conflicts and make it safer for all residents. This separate access would also allow much needed access into the Tyrol Lodge. We are requesting council to help make this happen. This will solve many of the safety concerns of the people who live in the Residences at Nita Lake on Nita Lake Drive as well as providing better Fire Access. [REDACTED] in his submission has provided an idea of the very reasonable costs for the making this road access a reality. As existing easements are already in place, I am sure Councillor Jackson would agree that the completion of this roadway would have very little impact on his property that is adjacent to the 5298 and would be a huge win for all the all parties involved, including other Whistler residents.

### **Conclusion**

It is abundantly clear that the current rezoning proposal is inconsistent in terms of density, concentration and visual impact with how our strata neighbourhood and adjacent neighbourhoods have been envisioned and developed on the shores of Nita Lake.

It has been very difficult to promote awareness to this rezoning application, even more so now during a Pandemic. A sign for the proposed development is posted at the intersection of Nita Lake Drive and Jordan

Lane: not a prominent location but on a road to nowhere. Councillor Jewett told me back in November of 2019, that we would need letters into council that did not just have a Jordan Lane address (which represents only 13 owners); council has now received over over 200 letters from around Whistler. Mayor Crompton has promised that every written submission will be given the same weight as a speech at the hearing. Some people didn't have the time, or the energy, or who knows, to compose an original poetic letter, but they still took the time to investigate this issue, they wanted to make a difference, and by downloading and submitting our form-letter they had the courage to commit their name to it publicly. Council should give these form letters the same consideration as any other correspondence, and the fact that they repeat the same points over and over is just further evidence of how important these points (traffic, density, the environment, appropriate employee housing) are to so many members of our community. Many of residents submitted the form letter, but edited it to represent the highlight the points that most resonated with them, and you need to consider this input.

From the letters received to date, the majority of Whistler residents are telling council that we want sustainability and protection of our lakes and natural views, the reasons we are all live here. More luxury market townhomes and tourist accommodation are not what this community needs or wants. The density of the site is simply too much. The cost to Whistler if this rezoning is approved is simply too high.

***“OCP 4.1.6.3. Proposed OCP amendments or rezonings that increase the accommodation bed unit capacity, alter the WUDCA, or alter the Whistler Land Use Map and Designations (Schedule A) will include significant community engagement, and should only be supported if the Proposal:***  
***(b) is supported by the community, in the opinion of Council;***  
***(c) will not cause unacceptable impacts on the community, resort or environment”***

Council needs to act in best interests of Whistler residents and needs the support of the community. When you weigh the conflicting interests of the OCP the priority of protecting the environment can be realized by insisting on a better balance of housing. What is clear however, is that Whistler residents are concerned.

Please take a careful look at the density being gifted to the developer in relation to the ratio of market to employee housing GFA and the proforma. It should be clear that the numbers are skewed in favour of the developer and not Whistler residents. [REDACTED] has revealed that the community benefits are costing \$1.3 million but this is only a fraction of the estimated 33 million in revenue that the developer will make with the extra density he is obtaining by building an additional 12 employee units (which are not are a gift to the community but which he will still sell at cost). The best deal for Whistler has not yet been negotiated through the rezoning process.

The original vision took into account the sensitivity of this site. **Why are you considering approving a high-density development on the lake when you have the power to make changes?** The Empire Club does not want to build a hotel, it is not profitable and not the type of development from which can cash out quickly. Demand they build something more in keeping with a lakeside development. Please take another look so that if any development is approved, it will respect the wilderness nature of this land and be very carefully eased into this treed, lakeside setting.

**I am asking Council to weigh the needs of all Whistler residents, be responsible stewards of this land, and ensure that my grandchildren can grow up in this same beautiful town that my children did. We need to protect our assets for our future generations so that they can come to Whistler and appreciate and value what we all now are so grateful to have. Once it is gone it is gone forever! Before this development is approved and built, we need to make sure we get it right!**



My previous letters submitted to Mayor and Council, dated September 5, 2019, February 18, 2020, June 17, 2020, August 12, 2020, November 24, 2020, January 13, 2021 are still relevant and as such I request them to be considered with this submission.

Respectively submitted

Cheryl Green  
5205 Jordan Lane  
Whistler, BC

March 8, 2021

Mayor and Council  
Resort Municipality of Whistler  
4325 Blackcomb Way  
Whistler, BC  
V8E 0X5

Dear Mayor and Council,

Re: RZ001157 Regarding 5298 Alta Lake Road

As a long time member of the Whistler community and successful business person here. I believe this project would have an excellent impact on our community especially pertaining to the resident housing to be built. As a resort community, Whistler has always maintained it to be essential to provide housing to a minimum of 75% of our staff within our boundaries. This is of vital importance to maintain a blended socio-economic community and is truly paramount to our future as thriving Resort.

The Whistler Housing Authority(WHA) has done an excellent job to date in providing and maintaining such housing throughout the valley. The WHA has been clear that it would be best to have private partnerships in developing new housing to keep up with housing demands. This project is an ideal opportunity for our community benefit as a result from the development of other market housing that we haven't had for some time.

Some other projects that have been developed within existing neighbourhoods by private partners in similar fashion have enjoyed good successes through the years. Making changes within an existing neighborhood is never an easy task but we can look to several excellent complexes that added extremely well to our rich history of affordable housing. Some great examples of these private developments include Fitzsimmons Walk, Spruce Grove, Beaver Flats, Bear Creek and Millar Ridge. They were all designed and built with the neighbourhood's character and aesthetic in mind and worked into the community exceedingly well. They continue to provide opportunities our friends and colleagues to grow deep roots in our Resort Community. Without these opportunities, the ability to have a stake in our community, our resort, we would not be the world class destination we are today.

It is clear to me that we need to continue to develop these opportunities today more than we likely know. Over the past several years there has been an increasing number of families decide to call Whistler their full-time home. In fact, I would not be surprised if our number of full time residents has increased by 20-25% again from our most recent census in 2016. These new families are not only building new homes, but they have buying existing older homes and renovated or buying and knocking down old cabins. These older homes and cabins were often housing for our community members. I am quite concerned that we have not kept up with the demand for resident housing of this type and therefore run the risk of continuing to lose great people because they can't find adequate affordable housing.

Specific to this project, bringing 21 additional Employee Price Restricted Units will continue to enhance the WHA Inventory. This will serve to continue our effort to house at least 75% of our work force within our boundary. The fact that Whistler will receive other benefits is an added bonus that should not be

overlooked as well. Other benefits include other future Employee Housing, a park, protected natural area, improved Valley Trail access and the preservation of a heritage building.

Having followed the development application process and understanding the people involved, I am very happy to support this development.

Yours truly,

Rob Palm  
8545 Drifter Way  
Whistler, BC  
V8B 0S6

## Lucy Wyn-Griffiths

---

**From:** [REDACTED] Ken Roberts [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 8:04 PM  
**To:** corporate  
**Subject:** Amendment bylaw no. 2283, 2020

Dear Mayor and Council

There are a few items that were not clear in the submission.

Will the TA zoned properties need to be managed by a single management company as per the original zoning proposal?

In regards to the parking. The number of visitor parking stalls in the existing parking bylaw seems to be lacking. I would propose that the number of visitor parking stalls need to be reviewed to ensure that it is adequate for the site.

The biggest concern for the neighbours is the increased traffic. Part of this concern is related to the poor condition and maintenance of Alta Lake Rd. We would ask that the RMOW look at the what can be done to repair and improve Alta Lake Rd. I would also ask that the RMOW look at the regular snow management of the road.

Regards

Ken Roberts

37-5151 Nita Lake Dr.

Sent from my iPhone

## Lucy Wyn-Griffiths

---

**From:** heidi groot [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 7:10 PM  
**To:** corporate  
**Subject:** Nita Lake Development

**Categories:** Red Category

Hello

We, (Mike and Heidi Groot) would like to register our support for the proposed development at Nita Lake. The 21 WHA units are a much needed addition to meet the needs of our long term. The Whistler Housing Authority has provided us personally, with the ability to participate in home ownership in Whistler. This has enabled us to afford to raise our family here, and by being able to continue living in whistler we have been able to purchase a locally owned business, "The Grocery Store" and Delish cafe where Mike had previously been employed for 20 years. WHA housing for purchase is an integral piece of affording the opportunity to our long term community members a permanent place to call home.

Aside from the obvious urgent need for more affordable housing in Whistler, we feel privileged to have lived in two WHA neighbourhoods and so appreciate being able to live in community with other long term & mature locals & professionals. Communities where owners take great pride in their property, who's children are able to grow up together, where neighbours water each other's gardens and take care of each other. Aside from affordability, the sense of community WHA neighbourhoods provide are an invaluable part of the social fabric that make our town the amazing place it is. It is our hope that this proposal will move forward and provide our community with much needed & affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Heidi & Mike Groot

8201 Black Bear Ridge Whistler BC V8E 0G8

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to you regarding the re-zoning proposal RZ1157 and the Zoning Amendment Bylaw (5298 Alta Lake Road) No. 2283, 2020 as part of the Public Hearing process.

I am against this Zoning Amendment for the following reasons:

- 1) This appears to be a very high density development on lakeside property that will undoubtedly result in clearcutting of significant trees. There will be even more tree loss with the development of the proposed park and WHA parcel. All of this will be visible from the valley trail and mountain and ruin the appearance of Nita Lake. Council should be doing everything possible to preserve our lakesides for future Whistler residents.
- 2) The impact of this development on the environment needs to be more carefully managed. Council should extract binding assurances now to preserve the trees and protect the forested appearance of the lakeshore.
- 3) The limited employee housing being built in exchange for this rezoning is inadequate and not commensurate with the huge number of market townhomes proposed.
- 4) The current proposal does not provide enough for the Whistler Community in exchange for what the developer is receiving in return.
- 5) Council needs to have and communicate a clear vision for the future of this beautiful lake: not just the Hillman Site, but also the neighboring properties. Now that the Tyrol Lodge has jumped on the bandwagon and publicized the possibility of developing parcels of its land, this is more important than ever. The cumulative effect of these decisions may have unintended consequences.
- 6) More development means more traffic woes on local roads and the intersection of Highway 99 and Alta Lake Road.
- 7) Currently there has not been a complete and thorough geotechnical site investigation, therefore current zoning of the lot has not taken into consideration possible issues, construction or ground improvement methods that may be necessary during development of the site.

We need to create a better balance between delivering Employee Housing, protecting the natural appearance of this site, and allowing the developer a reasonable profit. Reducing the density of the proposal would go a long way to achieving this better balance.

The citizens of Whistler deserve a rezoning process that will get us the best deal and will protect our most precious assets, holding any lakeside developments to the highest standards. Under the proposal currently before Council the cost to Whistler and the irreversible damage to Nita Lake are both too high.

I respectfully request that you vote against the zoning amendment.

Yours sincerely.

Rachel Choboter  
4134 W 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, BC

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to you regarding the re-zoning proposal RZ1157 and the Zoning Amendment Bylaw (5298 Alta Lake Road) No. 2283, 2020 as part of the Public Hearing process.

I am against this Zoning Amendment for the following reasons:

- 1) This appears to be a very high density development on lakeside property that will undoubtedly result in clearcutting of significant trees. There will be even more tree loss with the development of the proposed park and WHA parcel. All of this will be visible from the valley trail and mountain and ruin the appearance of Nita Lake. Council should be doing everything possible to preserve our lakesides for future Whistler residents.
- 2) The impact of this development on the environment needs to be more carefully managed. Council should extract binding assurances now to preserve the trees and protect the forested appearance of the lakeshore.
- 3) The limited employee housing being built in exchange for this rezoning is inadequate and not commensurate with the huge number of market townhomes proposed.
- 4) The current proposal does not provide enough for the Whistler Community in exchange for what the developer is receiving in return.
- 5) Council needs to have and communicate a clear vision for the future of this beautiful lake: not just the Hillman Site, but also the neighboring properties. Now that the Tyrol Lodge has jumped on the bandwagon and publicized the possibility of developing parcels of its land, this is more important than ever. The cumulative effect of these decisions may have unintended consequences.
- 6) More development means more traffic woes on local roads and the intersection of Highway 99 and Alta Lake Road.

We need to create a better balance between delivering Employee Housing, protecting the natural appearance of this site, and allowing the developer a reasonable profit. Reducing the density of the proposal would go a long way to achieving this better balance.

The citizens of Whistler deserve a rezoning process that will get us the best deal and will protect our most precious assets, holding any lakeside developments to the highest standards. Under the proposal currently before Council the cost to Whistler and the irreversible damage to Nita Lake are both too high.

I respectfully request that you vote against the zoning amendment.

Yours sincerely,



Name Dr Lauren Donaldson Bramley

Address 5694 Alta Lake Road  
5630 Alta Lake Road



**From:** patrick bougie [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 10:57 PM  
**To:** corporate  
**Subject:** RZ001157

Dear Mayor and Council,

I just want to make sure that my concerns are clear for the re zoning applications.

I believe that my wife and I are #1 on the WHA list and currently under housed so we do stand to benefit from this, but we are concerned with the cost of the proposed Employee Housing. We support Employee Housing and the WHA but we are concerned about this being handed over to a for profit developer. It was 400\$ a square foot at last year's meeting, I believe it has already increased. What will it be come time for the actual build? Spec homes nice enough to be featured in magazines for their design have been built in Whistler for 300\$ a square foot in recent years. Will this be affordable for the average community employee?

Safety concerns are already an issue for Alta Lake Road and Nita Lake Dr. Many accidents continue to happen at the intersection and below on Cardiac Hill, also Hwy 99 and Alta Lake Rd are an ongoing issue apart from shoulder seasons. Please consider another access or at least look into all the current safety issues on the Westside before proceeding.

Thanks,  
Patrick and Miriam Bougie

9-5151 Nita Lake Dr  
Whistler B.C.  
V8E 1J6

---

This e-mail is a public record of the Resort Municipality of Whistler and is subject to public disclosure unless exempt from disclosure under the [Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#) legislation. This email is subject to the Resort Municipality of Whistler's Corporate Records Bylaw and Retention Schedule. The information contained in this email is intended only for the named recipients to whom it is addressed. Its contents, including any attachments, may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not an intended recipient you must not use, disclose, disseminate, copy or print its contents. Disclosure of this email to an unintended recipient does not constitute waiver of privilege. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately, and delete or destroy the message, including any attachments.