

Walter, Penny

From: City Council
Subject: FW: Email - Request to Speak - Dale Ward - Proposed Amendment to the Willows Plan - CK 4131-24
Attachments: willowssc.pdf

From: Web NoReply <web-noreply@Saskatoon.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 12:33 AM
To: City Council <City.Council@Saskatoon.ca>
Subject: Email - Request to Speak - Dale Ward - Proposed Amendment to the Willows Plan - CK 4131-24

--- Replies to this email will go to [REDACTED] ---

Submitted on Wednesday, November 17, 2021 - 00:32

Submitted by user: [REDACTED]

Submitted values are:

Date Wednesday, November 17, 2021

To His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

First Name Dale

Last Name Ward

Phone Number [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]-301 Cartwright Terrace

City Saskatoon

Province Saskatchewan

Postal Code [REDACTED]

Name of the organization or agency you are representing (if applicable)

Subject Response to proposed Willows CPA

Meeting (if known) City Council, Nov 22

Comments I request to speak at the meeting

Attachments

[willowssc.pdf](#)

Will you be submitting a video to be vetted prior to council meeting? No

Dale E. Ward
[REDACTED]-301 Cartwright Terrace
Saskatoon SK [REDACTED]

November 16, 2021

The City of Saskatoon

To Whom It May Concern:

THE WILLOWS CONCEPT PLAN AMENDMENT

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposed Willows Concept Plan Amendment (CPA). I know you will receive numerous submissions from individual residents of the Willows and position papers from the various Condominium Associations representing the residents. I have seen some those submissions and fully concur with the concerns raised therein. **I strongly urge you to deny the proposed CPA because the scope of the proposed changes is so extensive that approval would betray existing residents that purchased property under the existing development plan.**

After completion of the proposed CPA The Willows neighbourhood will be naturally divided into two very different segments – those 800 properties accessed via Cartwright St. and those 357 accessed via Collector “A”. The former (69% of the residences, 62% of the population) would all be under a condominium plan, have double the residential density (more than 50% are medium density), would have sidewalks on one side of Cartwright St and condo-maintained local streets without sidewalks, and would be accessed via a very busy street (>5,000 vehicles per day) shared with a golf course, hotel, and other commercial development. The latter group (31% of the residences, 38% of the population) will be at least 80% fee-simple (no medium density), will have only City owned/maintained roads with sidewalks on both sides and low traffic volumes (<1,200 vehicle per day) with no commercial activity. Not surprisingly, ***the above scenario drives the Phase 1 residents’ overwhelming opposition to the CPA.***

Before detailing my reasoning in reaching these conclusions, I would like to start with the issue of ‘process’. At the outset, I wish to assure you that my comments are in no way meant to imply malfeasance but rather simply reflect the perspective of a very surprised Willows resident.

1. Deficiencies in the City Admin Report

Dream Development’s proposed CPA is scheduled for consideration by City Council on Nov. 22. The proposed amendments are complex and numerous. The public engagement phase (Jan-Aug, 2021) resulted in more than 500 letters from residents expressing opposition to the proposal. Nonetheless, on Oct 20, the City Planning and Development report (117 pages)^[1a] recommending approval of the proposed CPA was publicly released via the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) agenda for its Oct 26 meeting (the Revised Agenda document is 732 pages!). The MPC subsequently endorsed the recommendation at that meeting. From a resident’s perspective, the ***very short time frame*** available to digest the voluminous report with ***three glaring deficiencies*** thwarted any chance of a robust hearing on the merits of the proposed CPA vs. the merits of the residents’ objections.

1. The ***report does not even attempt to make a case for WHY the amendments should be allowed*** only that amendment of the OCP and DCD4 bylaws is required to allow them. An executive summary of the report could be reduced three sentences: ***This is what the developer proposes to do. This is how the OCP and DCD4 need to be amended to allow the proposal. The amendments are possible – we recommend approval.***

The report acknowledges the high volume of written responses received from residents, and that the overwhelming majority was in opposition. Considering the highly contentious nature of the proposed CPA, a relevant question is:

Why is it not incumbent on CPD to present an explanation for why their recommendation fully rejects all residents' concerns in favor of the developer's wishes?

2. The **report presents a very unbalanced account of the TWO sides of the story**. Appendix 2 of the report^[1b] presents Dream's complete 53-page glossy proposal despite that much of it is either technical, self-promotional, contains statements contested by residents, or is not directly related to the proposed amendments. In contrast, there is no attempt to communicate **WHY** Phase 1 property owners are overwhelmingly opposed to the proposed CPA. 'Public Engagement' is summarized in Appendix 7.^[1c] In both the CPD report^[1d] and in Appendix 7, the residents' opposition is summarized as a list of 'common concerns' and, in Appendix 7^[1e], a 29-page verbatim transcript from the Jan 26 online meeting (the first presentation of the proposal by Dream) is included. To an uninformed reader, this might look like a bunch of incoherent 'whining' and NIMBYism. There is no indication of the presence of **very detailed rationales** behind each of the main 'concerns'.^[1f] Appendix 7^[1g] provides a link to a 199-page uncurated collection of written correspondence from residents; many of these include detailed analyses of the issues (for examples, see pg. 7-14).^[2a] Unfortunately, only the most fastidious reader will ever discover this information. Because the CPD report presents neither the essential elements of the resident's opposition case or the rationale for their recommendation, it cannot facilitate an independent judgement. City Council should expect more from CPD – otherwise, **how can Council make an informed decision?**
3. The **report attempts to create the impression that the proposed CPA has 'evolved' in response to residents' concerns**. A possible objective is to conform to the City of Saskatoon policy on public engagement (C02-046) that includes among its Engagement Guiding Principles: "4.3 Decision-Making – Stresses that the engagement process must include an authentic opportunity to influence the decision." However, the illusion of a CPA evolution in response to residents' concerns is easily debunked.

The analysis in Section 7 below challenges the view that changes to the proposed CPA were driven by residents' concerns. To claim otherwise suggests a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature and reasons for those concerns. An overwhelming majority of the Phase 1 property owners expressed their reasoned opposition to the proposed CPA. Although Dream failed to address any of the major concerns in their revised proposals, City Admin is recommending the CPA.

Did residents have an authentic opportunity to influence the decision?

2. Why the residents oppose the proposed amendments

Residents of The Willows are not opposed to the development of Phase 2 (Revised MPC Agenda, pg. 144).^[1h] Everyone was aware of Dream's future development plans – they were widely available and even a component of marketing The Willows. The proposed amendments (CPA) now before you represent a comprehensive deviation from the approved 2003 concept plan that is protected by City bylaws (DCD4 and OCP). As noted in the City Planning and Development (CPD) report, the vast majority of Phase 1 property owners have repeatedly expressed their vehement opposition to the

proposed CPA (in writing) to both CPD^[2] and the to the Municipal Planning Commission.^[1] In summary, many residents believe:

- *The proposed changes are extreme and will fundamentally change The Willows neighbourhood concept.*
- *Dundee (now Dream) proposed The Willows as a **unique residential golf community** that was approved by the City and its development protected by law (approved OCP and DCD4).*
- *Dundee (now Dream) **touted those bylaws as a selling tactic** to assuage prospective buyers' concerns about the nature of future development.*
- *The **negative aspects of the proposed CPA overwhelmingly accrue to Phase 1 residents** (e.g., proximity to commercial development, proximity to >300 new medium-density residential units, vastly increased traffic, fee-simple lots, loss of adjacent green space, etc.) with much less impact on the future residents of Phase 2.*
- ***Dream is betraying their promises** made to Phase 1 residents (already got their money) to maximize their profit potential in the Phase 2 development.*
- *Dream has **not provided meaningful justification** for the proposed changes.*

The fundamental disconnect between The Willows residents and CPD can be understood in their differing views on the importance of the existing neighbourhood and current OCP & DCD4 bylaws. Residents measure the proposed CPA against the approved Willows neighbourhood concept plan (NCP), protected by the current bylaws. What is the justification for the proposed changes? Why should the NCP 'promises' made to existing residents be abandoned? In contrast, CPD seems to measure the proposed CPA against their interpretation of existing "policies", broadly defined. There seems to be no reference to the fact that The Willows is an existing 'residential community and golf club' (this is literally on the entrance sign!) or of any negative impacts on existing residents. This can be illustrated with the relatively uncomplicated proposed amendment of DCD4 for provision of fee-simple lots.

The OCP allows for golf course communities to be bareland condominiums, fee-simple lots, or a combination of both (section 3.2.e); DCD4 requires all residential development to be under a condominium plan. In justifying the proposed amendment, the CPD report (pg. 4/8)^[1] states: "*The proposed densities and land use plan for the Phase 2 amendment area would not significantly differ from any other areas of Saskatoon; it has been determined there would be no undue financial risk to the City for increased costs of services based on the proposal.*" Hence, **fee-simple lots are possible** in Phase 2. The Willows residents have repeatedly raised their concerns that having one-unit dwellings in Phase 2 as fee-simple lots with similar dwellings in Phase 1 under a bareland condominium plan **would create an unfair two-tier system within the Willows Community** with different costs (taxes/fees) and services. **What is the justification for introducing this inequity?**

The debate should be about the appropriate balance of the developer's wishes and the legitimate concerns of existing property owners. Without justification, the CPD report recommends a singular view while ignoring the existence of others.

3. The compelling case against the HOTEL / SPA

The Official Community Plan (OCP) specifically **prohibits commercial development within a "Golf Course Community" that is not " ... associated with the daily operations of a golf course and the daily needs of golf course community residents."** [OCP 3.2 and 3.2(2)(d)]. Thus, the golf course communities envisaged in the OPC are **purposefully intended to be residential**.

Despite this clarity in the OCP, the proposed CPA now before you include provision for a 120-room hotel/spa. The Willows residents strongly oppose a hotel in the middle of their residential community, as would residents of any suburban Saskatoon community. In their report recommending the CPA, City Admin addresses the non-compliance of the hotel as follows (pg. 4/8):^[j]

*“Administration carefully reviewed this policy in consideration of the proposed amendment and **determined** while a hotel is of a scale appropriate to and complementary to the land use of a golf course, it is not regularly associated with the daily operations of one. The inclusion of this specific land use would be regulated under a direct control district, limiting its size and location”.*

What is the basis for this ‘determination’?

In what the report mischaracterizes as a “*minor OCP text amendment*” (pg. 1/8),^[k] changing the text in OCP 3.2(2)(d) from

“ ... commercial development regularly associated with, and of a scale appropriate to, the daily operations of a golf course and the daily needs of golf course community residents” to

“ ... commercial development is to be complementary to the golf course community”

is supposed to permit the proposed hotel within The Willows. This assumption has several crucial omissions:

1. The proposed amendment to the OCP would completely change the meaning and purpose of section 3.2 (designed to apply to residential communities). ***How is this major change of purpose justified?***

The proposed amendment removes the ‘appropriate scale’ restriction. Why? What does ‘complementary’ mean? Is commercial development both associated with and complementary to a golf course permitted? What commercial development would not be permitted?

2. ***The proposed amendment is contradictory*** to the definition of golf course communities within OCP, section 3.2: “*Golf course communities integrate residential development with an operating golf course, providing low to medium density residential development which is accessory to a **golf course and associated commercial development***”. That is, commercial development is associated with the golf course! This interpretation is reinforced in 3.2(2)(d) and in DCD4. A possible alternative approach would be to add one or more subsections to OCP 3.2 that would set out the objectives and policies applied to other types of golf course communities; e.g., resort golf communities.
3. What would an amended OCP have to do with The Willows? Surely golf course communities ***would not be required*** to have a hotel or any other commercial development ‘complementary’ to the golf course community. ***The Willows is an existing RESIDENTIAL community and golf course*** whose development is under DCD4 – ***a hotel/spa is not permitted under DCD4***. Both the Purpose (13.4.1) and Objectives (13.4.2) of DCD4 are intended for a residential golf course community. Neither Dream nor City Admin has provided any justification for amending the purpose and objectives of DCD4 to expand commercial development within our residential community. ***Why should this be allowed?***

4. The Golf Course

The proposed Willows Concept Plan amendment (CPA) includes a provision for a significant change in the existing golf course – from 27 to 18 holes. Obviously, major changes to the Willows golf course will have major impacts on The Willows residential golf course community. ***What is the justification***

for this proposed change? Sadly, this issue is not even mentioned in Dream’s “*The Willows Concept Plan Amendment*” document^[2b] or in City Administration’s report^[21] recommending the change.

In contrast to the conspicuous omission above, Mr. Zurevinski (Dream’s representative) has often verbalized that the golf course is not ‘economically sustainable’ in an attempt to support the CPA.^[3a, 4a]

But this is irrelevant to the CPA! Given the substantial profit that is likely to result from converting golf course land to residential development, it is prudent to be skeptical of Dream’s reasoning, especially when it is not presented in writing or with any evidence. In the 2020 and 2021 seasons, golf courses throughout North America experienced a tremendous surge in business; if The Willows is not making money, perhaps the management should be questioned. Dream is a property developer not a property manager! The high turnover in the General Manager and Head Golf Professional positions at The Willows over the past five years is a clear sign of problems. Currently, there is no General Manager – instead replaced by a 5-person management committee that reports to a Dream VP in Regina. **Is this how successful golf courses are run?**

What does it mean when Mr. Zurevinski states^[3b] “*The Willows golf course is definitely not in a very healthy financial position*”? ‘The Willows golf course’ has several operations separate from the golf course proper: the behemoth club house includes a pro shop (both golf course and retail sales), restaurant, lounge and bar, and catering business (includes the ‘Red Barn’). The businesses within the club house are definitely faltering – but this **has nothing to do with the golf course operations** per se. Golf course maintenance costs are inflated because they include property that is not really a part of the actual golf course (e.g., the ribbon park within 602 Cartwright St.).^[3c] For this property, the golf course assumes the costs of landscape maintenance in the summer and clearing the sidewalks and pathways in the winter. In their promotion of the CPA Dream promises several new amenities (e.g., tennis courts, pickle-ball courts, swimming pool, new walking pathways) for the golf course. All of these will bring additional maintenance costs without additional revenue. Both golf course revenues and maintenance costs will be reduced (as a consequence of 27 → 18 holes); however, because the ratio of golf course property to other property being maintained will be lower, **the golf course might be expected to be less ‘economically sustainable’** with these new amenities. The proposed scenario only makes sense in a private ‘country club’ model where the members cover the costs. There are none of these in Saskatoon and few in any city where the golf season is less than six months long.

I expect that Dream has no intention of running a golf course once the Phase 2 development is complete (or even well underway). Consequently, an important question is: **What is Dream's exit plan with respect to the golf course?** The relationship of a golf course community with its golf course is best protected when the golf course is owned by the community.

5. Residential Density

The proposed CPA includes provision for a significant increase in the number of residential units compared to the approved plan (2003). This is achieved by a combination of building on the additional land made available by incorporating the North Development Area (NDA; 6.4 ha) and reducing the golf course from 27 to 18 holes (see part 4 of this series) and by building at a considerable higher density than in the existing Phase 1 or approved Phase 2 (2003). Using the data provided in Dream’s “*The Willows Concept Plan Amendment*” document (Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3, pg. 11-13).^[1m] Table 1 provides a comparison of the residential densities. Comparing the proposed and approved plans, the number of units in Phase 2 increases 2.74 fold using 2.26 × more developable land at 21% higher density (units/ha). The density in the proposed Phase 2 is also much higher than in the existing Phase 1 (17% based on da; 31% based on ga).

Why should the density in Phase 2 be so much greater than in the existing Phase 1?

Table 1. Residential densities in existing, approved and proposed Phases of The Willows.

	dwelling units (du)	developable area (da)*	gross developable area (ga) [†]	units/ha (du/da)*	units/ha (du/ga) [†]	Population projected
Phase 1 (existing)	371	21.21 ha	32.23 ha	17.49	11.51	860
Phase 2 (approved)	283	16.74 ha	20.19 ha	16.91	14.02	697
Phase 2 (proposed)	776	37.86 ha	51.45 ha	20.50	15.08	1697
total units accessed via Cartwright St. [‡]	800	30.59 ha	41.61 ha	26.15	19.23	1597
total units accessed via Collector “A” [‡]	357	28.48 ha	42.07 ha	12.53	8.48	960

* Developed area less roadways, parks and ponds. † Developed area including roadways, parks and ponds but not the golf course. The golf course is omitted in this analysis because its area is significantly different in the approved and proposed plans and, being 60-70% of the total area, its inclusion obscures the comparison. ‡ Within The Willows neighbourhood after completion of proposed Phase 2.

The greatest difference between the approved and proposed Phase 2 developments is the number of medium density dwelling units. ***Whereas the approved plan has no medium density development, the proposed plan adds 308 such units.*** Of these, 149 units are within the ‘neighbourhood node’ – a 1.21 ha parcel that would also include 929 m² of commercial space. The residential density of this parcel (du/da = 123.5) is ***more than 50% greater than any other medium density housing existing or proposed at The Willows.*** The ‘neighbourhood node’ was introduced in the Jun 4 version of the CPA in an attempt to appear aligned with the Official Community Plan (OCP). The OCP states [2.2(4)]:

“ ... “Neighbourhood Node” has the potential for a mix of *low density residential, commercial, institutional, and community uses that are compatible within a neighbourhood setting.*”

Given the OCP description, how can a mix of 149 medium density residential units (123.5 units/ha) and a meagre 929 m² of commercial space be considered a ‘neighbourhood node’?

The most disturbing aspect of the proposed CPA is that it would leave a neighbourhood that would be ‘naturally’ divided into those properties accessed via Cartwright St. and those accessed via Collector “A”. ***Although both groups of properties have a similar development area, the two fold differences in the number of dwelling units, the densities, and the populations are not acceptable to Phase 1 residents. The distinctions between these groups are further exacerbated by additional differences in traffic volumes, sidewalks, and maintenance of roads and parks.***

6. Traffic

The proposed CPA includes provisions that will result in a significant change in the traffic pattern in the neighbourhood. In the approved plan (2003), the 27-hole golf course and the residential development in Phase 1 is accessed via Cartwright St. whereas all residential development in Phase 2 would be accessed via Lorne Ave. (Table 2). Cartwright St. was constructed during the Phase 1 development according the above design – it is a two-lane road (ca. 9.5 m curb-to-curb) with no parking permitted and is classified as a “residential Collector” with a capacity of up to 5000 vehicles per day (vpd). Importantly, ***the approved Phase 2 development would have no impact on Cartwright St. traffic.***

The City of Saskatoon recently reported its neighbourhood traffic review of The Willows.^[5] The major issues identified were speeding, short-cutting, and pedestrian safety. Cartwright St. traffic data were collected for 24 hours a day for one week starting September 14, 2020 (moderate golf course traffic compared summer months) and gave a traffic volume of 2,991 vpd. Consistent with the above, the City’s annual average daily traffic (AADT) table^[6] shows counts of 3,100 and 3,600 for the years 2020

and 2016, respectively. This traffic volume is associated with the Phase 1 residences (371), the golf-course, and short-cutting.

Table 1. Residences and population in existing, approved and proposed Phases of The Willows.*

	# of residences	Population projected
Phase 1 (existing; accessed via Cartwright St.)	371	860
Phase 2 (approved; accessed via Lorne Ave.)	283	697
Phase 2 (proposed; accessed via Cartwright St./Collector A) [†]	776	1697
total residences accessed via Cartwright St. [‡]		
	371 (Phase 1)	860 (Phase 1)
	<u>419</u> (Phase 2)	<u>737</u> (Phase 2)
	800	1597
total residences accessed via Collector A ^{†‡}		
	357 (Phase 2)	960 (Phase 2)

* Data from Dream’s “Willows Concept Amendment” document; Tables 3-1 to 3-3. [†] Collector A connects to Cartwright St. and to Lorne Ave. [‡] Within The Willows after completion according to proposed CPA.

The proposed CPA adds 419 low and medium density residences **AND** a 120-room hotel accessed exclusively via Cartwright St. Given the City’s measured traffic volumes, doubling the number of residences served and adding a hotel is highly likely to result in traffic volumes well in excess of the 5000 vpd capacity of Cartwright St. In supporting their recommendation of the CPA, City Admin cites the Dream-commissioned traffic-impact study (rather than the City’s own measurements) that suggests traffic on Cartwright St. will reach 5000 vpd but “... *the quality and efficiency of traffic flow will meet acceptable levels.*”^[3d]

Acceptable to whom?

Doubling the traffic flow on Cartwright St. will not only exceed its designed capacity but will transform a quiet residential neighbourhood into something else. ***What would the requirements for Cartwright Street be if it were being built now according the proposed CPA?***

Finally, concerning the impact of hotel/spa traffic, the Dream-commissioned Location and Commercial Feasibility Analysis states “***It is our opinion that the hotel and spa are not desirable in this location if the proposed concept to add additional roadway capacity is not approved.***”^[7] However, the proposed CPA lacks additional roadway capacity – the hotel site will be accessed exclusively via the existing Cartwright St.

7. The Illusion of the CPA Evolution

Dream^[3e,4b] and City Planning and Development (CPD)^[3f,4d] have each made a considerable effort to create the impression that the proposed Concept Plan Amendment (CPA) has ‘evolved’ in response to residents’ concerns. Presumably this objective arises from the City of Saskatoon policy on public engagement (C02-046) that includes among its Engagement Guiding Principles: “***4.3 Decision-Making – Stresses that the engagement process must include an authentic opportunity to influence the decision.***” However, the illusion of a CPA evolution in response to residents’ concerns is easily debunked.

History: The City’s Nov 30, 2020 public notice of the proposed CPA consisted of a very brief (7 sentences) summary of the proposed amendments and a small (< 5” x 5”) rendering of the proposed land use map (Figure 1). A much more detailed version of the CPA was already available to City Planning and Development (CPD) at this time (otherwise a technical review would be impossible) but

the details were not publically released.^[2b] For example: there was no indication of the mix of single and multi-unit dwellings, the density, or the commercial development in block 18 (designated “mixed-use”). The Public Information Meeting on Jan 26, 2021 produced some new information (i.e., that the projected Phase 2 population was 1713, an increase of 991) but also revealed the high level of confusion of residents due to the lack of publicly available details.^[1e] Over the next five months, CPD had meetings with representatives from most of the Condominium Associations within The Willows and received a large volume of correspondence from residents. The vast majority of the residents’ objections stem from a belief that the proposed amendments are so comprehensive that they would impose a fundamental change in the character of the neighborhood. Common specific objections include:^[1i,2]

- The provision for *fee-simple lots* that create an unfair two-tier system within the Willows Community with different costs (taxes/fees) and services.
- Commercial development that exceeds that allowed in the current DCD4 bylaw. In particular, *a 120-room hotel/spa within the existing residential golf community was not acceptable.*
- A proposed CPA that greatly increases the developable land, the residential density, and the projected population to levels *not compatible with the existing Phase 1.*
- A proposed roadway network and increased residential (and commercial) property that will produce *unacceptable traffic volumes on Cartwright St.*
- *Loss of green space* – reduction of the golf course does not need to equate to additional housing development.
- The provision for new *development within the existing Phase 1 boundary* (Block 19) is unjustified.

On June 4, a detailed version of the proposed CPA was publicly released and a Public Information Meeting was held on Jun 23, 2021. Both Dream^[3e,4b] and the City Admin^[3f,4d] stated that these changes were made in response to residents’ feedback. The listed changes are:^[1n]

1. “13 metre (45’) lot minimum was replaced with 15 metre (50’) lot minimum for one-unit dwellings.”
Current DCD4 has the minimum at 18 m (60’). Any concern from residents over a lower lot width minimum relates to the resulting increased density (smaller homes on smaller lots). Although the above change altered the mix of one-unit, low density, and medium density units in the blocks 10-12, *the new projected population in Phase 2 is only 1% less* (1697 vs. 1713) than the Nov 30 version – *Cosmetic.*
2. “The southern half of the Mixed-Use development site was replaced with Neighbourhood Node (a mix of commercial and residential adjacent to the outdoor amenity area).”
The Nov 30 version shows a 2.4 ha ‘mixed-use’ (residential/commercial) parcel. The Jun 4 version simply refines this description into a ‘northern’ 1.4 ha medium density residential parcel AND a ‘southern’ 0.96 ha so-called Neighbourhood Node parcel (residential and commercial). This adds definition to the Nov 30 version but is *not a change.*
3. “The northern half of the Mixed-Use development site was replaced with Medium Density Multiple Unit Residential (consistent with existing medium density residential development in the Willows).”
See #2 above; *not a change.*

4. “Proposed location of commercial development was restricted to the Neighbourhood Node.”
See #2 above; **not a change.**
5. “Total floor area for all commercial units combined was restricted to a maximum of to 929 m² (10,000 ft²).”
See #2 above; **not a change.**
6. “Individual commercial units were restricted to a maximum of 279 m² (3,000 ft²).”
See #2 above; **not a change.**
7. “The proposed property lines for the commercial site (proposed hotel) were adjusted to reduce the site area and increase the distance between the existing residential and the commercial site.”
This change was 7.5 m (<0.01 ha!) The hotel remains! – **Cosmetic.**
8. “The treed area between the residential condominium, and commercial property remaining with the Willows Golf Inc., as a buffer.”
This is the <0.01 ha from #7. The objection is to a hotel in a residential community. One of the numerous reasons for the objection is proximity to existing residential property. This ‘change’ merely increases the tree buffer from a minimum of 5 m to a minimum of 12.5 m – **Cosmetic.**
9. “Right-out only intersection at Lorne Avenue was proposed as a right-out, left-in intersection.”
Adding the left-in at this intersection might encourage a greater fraction of the Phase 2 residents living on Collector “A” (or connected locals) to enter Collector “A” from Lorne Ave. rather than from Cartwright St. This would have only a minor impact on Cartwright St. traffic volumes (traffic that will overwhelmingly arise from the hotel, the golf course, and the residences accessed exclusively via this street) – **Cosmetic.**
10. “Additional landscaping requirements under the DCD4 zoning district for the commercial development site and the neighbourhood node.”
The meaning of this is obscure but it does not directly address any residents’ concerns – **Unknown.**

Comparing the publicly available Nov 30 and Jun 7 versions of the proposed CPA suggests that *the ‘changes’ are either cosmetic or simply add detail where there was none. **How do any of these ‘changes’ address any of the major objections repeatedly expressed by residents? Fee-simple, the hotel, the high residential density, population and traffic volumes, the loss of green space, the building within the Phase 1 boundary all remain essentially unchanged!***

Public engagement continued after the Jun 23 meeting and residents continued to express their opposition to the proposed CPA. In Aug, Dream submitted the final changes to the proposed CPA; CPD deemed the changes too minor to warrant continuing the Public Engagement phase. An updated version of the proposed CPA was released on Oct 5. The additional revisions were:^[10]

- “The hotel/spa commercial location was moved from Block 19 (east of Cartwright Street) to the north half of Block 18, (now located west of Cartwright Street);” < Swapping the hotel parcel with a medium density residential parcel is a wash – the hotel is a bit further from some existing residences and bit closer to others. **We still have a hotel in the middle of a residential development.** >
- “Medium Density Multiple Dwelling location was moved from the north half of Block 18 (west of Cartwright Street) to Block 19 (now located east of Cartwright Street); and” < **We still have a 3-storey building within the Phase 1 boundary.** The projected population of Phase 2 is unchanged at 1697. >

- *“Block 19 was reduced in size to no longer include the tree bluff area.”* < By preserving the entire tree bluff (ca. 0.8 ha), ***this is a minor concession*** to concerns raised about loss of green space. >

The above analysis challenges the view that changes to the proposed CPA were driven by residents’ concerns. To claim otherwise suggests a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature and reasons for those concerns. An overwhelming majority of the Phase 1 property owners expressed their reasoned opposition to the proposed CPA. Although Dream failed to address any of the major concerns in their revised proposals, City Admin is recommending the CPA.

Did residents have an authentic opportunity to influence the decision?

Respectfully submitted
Dale Ward
█-301 Cartwright Terr

References to publicly available material

- [1] Revised MPC Agenda
<https://pub-saskatoon.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=148119>
a) pg. 15-131.
b) pg. 24-76.
c) pg. 91-131.
d) pg. 20-21.
e) pg. 94-122.
f) For one of many examples see: pg. 143-45.
g) pg. 93
h) pg. 144
i) pg. 133-732
j) pg. 18
k) pg. 14
l) pg. 15-22
m) pg. 41-43
n) pg. 21
o) pg. 22
- [2] “Willows Feedback Compiled Document” under the “Written Correspondence from the Public” tab at <https://www.saskatoon.ca/engage/willows-concept-plan-amendment>
a) For examples see, pg. 7-14.
b) For possible reasons why CPA details are not publically released see pg. 137
- [3] Video of Oct 26 MPC meeting
<https://pub-saskatoon.escribemeetings.com/Players/ISISStandAlonePlayer.aspx?Id=32977245-a321-4a96-a5ca-c1e02c5ce82f>
a) time marks: 51:50, 52:39, 59:15
b) time mark 59:15
c) time mark 52:00
d) time mark 26:40
e) time mark 53:05
f) time mark 24:33–26:40
- [4] Video of June 23, 2021 Public Information Meeting
<https://www.saskatoon.ca/engage/willows-concept-plan-amendment>
a) time mark 1:00:08
b) time mark 16:45–26:07
c) time mark 8:42–16:10
- [5] https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/transportation-utilities/transportation/neighbourhood/append_1_-_the_willows_neighbourhood_traffic_review_report.pdf
- [6] https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/transportation-utilities/transportation/2020_average_annual_daily_traffic_aadt.pdf
- [7] https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/community-services/planning-development/development-review/application-forms/willows_hotel-spa_site_analysis.pdf; pg. 17.