

Alysha Saville

From: Shannon Dickson [REDACTED]
Sent: October 28, 2021 11:24 AM
To: Alysha Saville
Subject: Zoning amendment bylaw to zoning bylaw 1294, 2021.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Date: October 28, 2021

alysha.saville@golden.ca

To: Golden Town Council

I am writing with regards to zoning amendment bylaw to zoning bylaw 1294, 2021.

My name is Shannon Dickson and my property directly backs onto the CD-1 area and I am opposed to the proposed amendment.

The notice states that “Regulations proposed in the amendment bylaw are built on the C4 Corridor zone and provide for a height similar to the OSO development on 7th St N or the recent Kaurhause development on 11th Ave N.” These developments were already in commercial zones before the start of development. Any residential housing in this area was therefore purchased as such. I moved to Pine Dr. for the privacy, the large lots and the view; as well as the families that live on Pine Dr. This is a family community and adding in commercial space adjacent to this community is irresponsible and will have negative affects on the families that live on Pine Dr.

With the proposed amendments it would allow, for example, the ability to build a building that is up to 14 meters high. This will block any views that we have from Pine Dr. It is also worth noting that the comparison of the CD-1 lots having an allowance of 14 meters to the aforementioned OSO developments and the Kaurhause development having an allowance of only 12 meters maximum. Removal of the language from the bylaw allowing for site by site assessment of new builds and developments removes resident’s abilities to protect their views, and their investments. This is particularly of concern with Parcels 121 and 123.

It seems that the Town of Golden is attempting to create a ‘Secondary Downtown strip’ without a long-term plan of what that will look like, not only for the residents of Pine Dr, but also for the existing landlords and business owners that operate in the downtown core.

High density residential building need infrastructure to support living, with out ease of access to services it does not make sense in a town without public transportation options. There is land closer to the downtown core that such residential buildings make more sense. For example, the eyesore of a building that is half completed on 11th Ave. North.

Lastly, the town of Golden has not successfully controlled the speed of traffic and increased traffic on Golden Upper Donald since the installation of the Skybridge. The increase of traffic from having more commercial spaces up, with people pulling out of spots and limited parking spaces is an increased safety risk to the families that make Pine Dr. home.

I would like to see this amendment reworded to provide more clarity to, and protections for, the residents of Pine Drive and do not support any of the council members voting in favour of it in it until that has been done.

Regards,
Shannon Dickson
