

Alysha Saville

From: Nathan Rand [REDACTED]
Sent: October 27, 2021 2:05 PM
To: Alysha Saville
Cc: Mike Pecora
Subject: Town of Golden Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1460, 2021 – CD-1

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[External Email - Use Caution & Verify Links Before Clicking]

To: Golden Town Council

Expectation: That this correspondence be registered at the proposed Public Hearing Tuesday November 2, 2021 at 7:00pm, and the concerns herein reviewed by council.

Desired Outcome: First and Second reading are not passed and Council Selects another course of action with regards to this zoning amendment.

My name is Nathan W. Rand, I am a Pine Drive resident and home owner affected by the proposed Town of Golden Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1460, 2021 – CD-1.

While I appreciate that the purpose is to add regulatory clarity for potential developers in its current form I oppose this amendment and would like to see further consultation, development, and restructuring.

Concerns I have with the amendments are as follows.

- As ‘Permitted Use’ amendments have not been included in the proposed amendments comparison to the OSO and Kaurhause developments is loose as the only residential allowance for the use in CD-1 zoning is a Live-Work Unit.

I have included the definition from the town bylaws below, but neither of those developments are single occupancy and none of the other permitted uses meant to be used as household.

“Live-Work Unit” means a Use which combines a permitted commercial Use with a Dwelling Unit as a single occupancy within the Building. (Town of Golden Bylaw No. 1294, 2011; pp. 16)

- “Dwelling Units” as mentioned in the amendment part i) Other Regulations; are problematic as they are meant to be used permanently for a household. Nothing in the Permitted Uses portion of the bylaw allows for dwelling units as defined from the town bylaws below, save the Live-Work unit.

“Dwelling Unit” means a self-contained accommodation for one or more persons containing cooking, eating, living, sleeping, and sanitary facilities used or intended to be used permanently for a household. (Town of Golden Bylaw No. 1294, 2011; pp. 11)

- Lot coverage at 50% is incongruous with the green space aesthetic of adjacent neighbourhoods and town as a whole, particularly when parking ratios and commercial mixed use are considered. Green space needs to be reconsidered as tenet of Golden’s redevelopment and when comparing this amendment to the reality of the OSO and Kaurhause developments it clearly is not. The lot coverage percentage should be reduced.

- Affected viewsheds are a huge concern and apprehension with 50% lot coverage and 6 stories in height. Depending on the number of 6 story structures subdivided compounded by homeowner perspective views could be almost completely blocked. There is not a resident potentially affected who did not consider the vistas a selling feature when they purchased their houses and property values could be adversely affected.
- Parking and commercial loading areas have not been addressed in the language amendment to CD1 zoned properties
- Access, road planning, snow removal, and landscape upkeep have not been addressed.
- Further CD1 amendments towards potential higher density housing so distant from the Core in a town without public transit and limited pedestrian access to the area does not make sense.

I am particularly concerned with two of the seven parcels included in the amendment, 121 and 123, as noted on the map provided to Pine Drive residents by the Town Of Golden and published on the town's website.

**By deleting the "All subdivision and Development regulations, such as minimum Lot dimensions, site coverage, maximum Building Height, Setbacks, parking, loading and Landscaping, shall be as negotiated on a site-by-site basis" (Town of Golden Bylaw No. 1294, 2011; pp.106) clause from the CD Zone regulations affected residents will have no further voice on their development.*

These are the two lots which will affect residents the most.

I realise that this is part of the Town's development plan, but would appreciate a better vision of the development over the coming years and decades. The CD1 development zone, particular to only this area in Golden, gives the impression of encouraging either a second "Strip" with truckstops and hotels, or a secondary downtown core. With those two concepts diametrically opposed clarity of vision is key and cannot be lost to encouraging development for developments sake.

I urge Council to send the amendment back to the Planning department for revision and resubmission.

I do not support this Amendment and give my consent to be contacted by Town of Golden employees for further feedback.

Nathan W. Rand

