

From: [Marcelo Capucci](#)
To: [Regular Council Meetings](#)
Subject: Development Permit (DP 13-21)
Date: January 12, 2022 5:38:30 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Deputy Corporate Officer and City Council,

I'm a property owner and resident at 55A Avenue, and I have received notice of proposed bylaw amendment No. 184 (RZ 10-21) and Development Permit (DP 13-21) to rezone the properties at 19701-19729 55A Avenue to accommodate a 6-storey, 96-unit apartment development.

It would be in the best interest of the neighbourhood to permit townhouses to be built on that land in keeping with the rest of the neighbourhood. Failing that, we would certainly expect that the City does not permit an apartment with 6 stories and 96 units. At the very least, I would request that the City only consider a 4 story building with fewer units and require the developer to add elements to the neighbourhood to mitigate the problems this development would cause concerning congestion, traffic flow onto 198th, parking, and pets.

As a resident in this neighbourhood, I am very concerned about this proposed bylaw amendment for several reasons, and I hope that the City of Langley thinks very carefully about the impact of this rezoning application and does not approve it for the reasons below:

1.) Traffic Congestion on 55A Avenue: This section of 55A Ave. is a no-thru road that is already very congested with residents, guests, and commercial vehicles often double-parking because there is nowhere for them to stop when all of the street parking is full. When people double park, it is necessary to wait for oncoming traffic to pass to drive around them. There are also sections of the road that are not wide enough for two cars to pass, even without anyone double parking. The congestion that 96 additional units would cause on this already crowded street would be unbearable. While the entrance to the parkade of the proposed apartment is off of the alley, 55A Avenue would still be a main access point for the apartment due to the congestion in the alley and the fact that it is a no-thru road.

2.) Traffic Congestion in the alley Between 55A Ave. and 56 Ave.: This alley would be the entrance to the proposed apartment's underground parkade. It is already very busy with the Montessori school and daycare parking lot access and the entrance to Madison Station parkade, Madison Place parkade, and City Park Townhouses being right there as well. Parents are rushing in to drop off and pick up children from the school and daycare, and people are trying to get to and from work and activities from the parkades and garages, and it is difficult to get in and out of that area lot of the time. Adding 96 additional households to add to this small area would be unmanageable. To avoid the congestion by the Montessori school, residents of the proposed apartment would have to drive the entire length of 55A Ave. and loop around behind Elation, Winston Terraces, and the older townhouse complex, past everyone's garages and driveways due to the road not going through.

3.) 198th Street Congestion: The only way in and out of both 55A avenue and the alley is via

198th street. Most often, people need to get to 56 Avenue or 200th street to get where they are going. Still, it is already difficult to turn left or go straight across 198th, and this will become more problematic as traffic congestion increases with more people moving into the area and the proposed Skytrain being built. Adding 96 more units will make it virtually impossible to get across 198th or turn left to access 56th avenue or to go north on 200th. When you turn right onto 198th, you end up being forced to drive south on 200th and taking a long route to get turned around.

4.) Parking: Parking is already a major challenge in the neighbourhood. Many residents have more vehicles than they have parking spots, and so they regularly park one or more cars on the street. Housing costs are high, and so most of the homes in this area (both condos and townhomes) have at least 2 adults living in them, often with 2 vehicles if they have different jobs they have to get to. Some units have more than 2 adults and/or children of driving age who have their vehicle. Some residents also have work vehicles in addition to their vehicles. Visitor parking is limited, and Stratas has been towing residents parking in visitor spots when they can't find parking on the street so that visitors have somewhere to park. While I realize that the proposed apartment building will have some visitor parking in the back, I am sure that some of those 96 proposed units will have additional cars that they will be parking on the street and that the parking will be full in short order.

5.) Pets: Dog urine ruins grass. While there is a dog park nearby, people will not walk that far in bad weather or if they just want to let their dog out quickly before work, for instance. Townhouse complexes strata pay high premiums to have landscaping companies maintain their lawns. When people from other developments allow their pets to damage the property and/or leave feces, it causes added work and cost for those developments. There will be a huge increase in the number of pets on the street if we allow 96 additional units to be built without yards. This cost and work will be passed on to the complexes with grass, and that is not equitable.

6.) View and Privacy: The entire neighbourhood has only buildings that are between 1 and 4 stories. There are no buildings in the area that are 6 stories. There are multiple developments with rooftop patios, which are the main reason for people buying in the area. Having a building that towers 2 stories over every other building would infringe on the privacy of the surrounding buildings and would negatively impact the view of many existing properties, unfairly devaluing them. Not to mention that allowing 6 stories allows for a greater density that would contribute to the congestion and parking problems in the neighbourhood.

Regards,
Marcelo Capucci