To whom this may concern,

I'm writing you today to voice my strong disapproval on the proposed development at 3690 and 3660 – 152 Street. As I understand it, many people have already written to you and expressed their feedback pointing out a number of concerns of which I share. This vocal minority represents a small sample of the general sentiment the majority of the community feels. I am all for thoughtful planned development, but this adds no value to our community and will only exacerbate already existing issues (traffic, school, parking, environmental, etc.). The original NCP is widely regarded as a successful model for community planning, and stated that the Retreat Lands, due to the environmental sensitivity of the area, be designated institutional only for the parts already built out.

I read in the PeaceArch News the announcement of planned parks and amenities in the area and I have to commend the city on efforts in that respect. I've been following the plans for the south surrey path and park along the Nicomekl river for a number of years, and I understand that most of the pathway was *donated* to the city simply because the land was unusable for development. Adding the Retreat Center lands to this pathway would truly create a park that 1) Recognizes the lush nature of the area and 2) keeps the wildlife corridor intact.

I would like the city to:

- Recognize that in order to build successful communities proper planning and infrastructure needs to be addressed, and unfettered densification lead by development proposals is a recipe for disaster.
- Keep the zoning intact and use the land for its intended purpose (parkland/institutional). The already developed land would work very well as a school.
- Recognize that this land is a wildlife corridor and ranked 5th among all of surrey's hub-to-hub corridors. Because of its ranking, the City should place a high priority on protecting it from development.
- Appropriate the land as was previously done for the golf course on King George and Crescent Road. Offer fair market value for land zoned as parkland/institutional. If the developer complains respond with "well perhaps you shouldn't have purchased land that was never intended for or able to support high density housing"

Thank you.