


The total investment in the property by Bradford Investments Ltd. as set out in Ratcliff and Company's letter is shown to be \$135,400, including an amount of \$14,000 designated "C.M.H.C. non-refundable mortgage fee". We believe this may refer to an amount paid by the applicant to his lending company in order to secure his mortgage; however we are advised that to date no fee has been paid in to the CMHC office in connection with this proposal. As a result, there would appear to be the possibility of a refund for all or a portion of this \$14,000 amount, resulting in some downward adjustment of the total investment figure quoted.

A further question that was asked during discussion last week related to the discussions that have previously taken place between the developer and municipal staff. Dating from the first contact that Planning Department staff made with the applicant after the original submission, we have stressed that the proposed development of an apartment building on this site is out of character with the surrounding area, and results solely from the spot zoning nature of the RM2 zoning that historically applied to this site. Consequently we have sought a reduction in density, a reduction in building bulk, and an altered form of accommodation to provide for family oriented units, preferably with individual entries and ground-oriented, as opposed to development of a corridor type apartment building, as well as encouraging modification to the building's massing and external features. In view of these concerns, staff took the position that it would be necessary to receive Council's direction prior to approval of the development, and that it might be appropriate to consider rezoning or acquisition of the property if Council concurred in the concerns expressed, but that we were willing to work with the architect toward a scheme that satisfied the concerns expressed and that would therefore be capable of being supported.

The developer proceeded along these lines but concluded that he could not reduce the number of units economically and he was not willing to consider family type units of the sort discussed for rental purposes or to consider a change to strata title development. Hence the only adjustments that were finally made were in the nature of architectural redesign to improve the massing, scale and exterior features of the building and to substitute one bachelor and three 2-bedroom for four of the originally proposed 1-bedroom units in the scheme.

The department has expressed in its previous report that the developer has made improvements in this one aspect of the development proposal, but that the other concerns related to density and type of accommodation have not been fully satisfied. At this point, in view of the concerns expressed by residents of the Eastburn area as well as our own consideration of the impact of an apartment building in this part of the community it has been felt necessary to place this matter before Council in order to decide in which direction to proceed.

The foregoing is for the information of Council.


A. L. Parr,
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING.

DGS:cm

c.c. Land Agent