

Eric Schneider

From:
Sent: Thursday, October 3, 2024 5:23 PM
To: Eric Schneider
Cc: Stephanie Stretch; Julie Wright; Mayor; DMcCabe@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: 864-872 King St W proposed development

Dear Mr.Schneider

I participated in the Neighbourhood Engagement Meeting on September 18, 2024 and among the myriad of issues and concerns that were raised, a particular comment from Pierre Chauvin struck me. Without access to the recording I'll paraphrase: "You can't control human behaviour". While this statement was addressing motorist actions, it seemed the planning consultant is abdicating the use of good design principles to modify human actions.

Our community requires densification and intensification. I'm concerned that poor design choices on the way to these community needs will leave our neighbourhood worse off. The site being developed is well-connected to transit and community infrastructure (schools, hospitals, retail) but the development proposal, other than creating housing, contributes little else: no retail space, no public community space, no aesthetic benefit and no engagement with current residents. "It's all taking and no giving."

I question the submitted traffic impact studies. While they may reflect a singular building on the proposed site, multiple buildings are in the future and it's only fair to account for the future transparently. Do the current submitted studies reflect impacts on the Waterloo portion of Herbert Street, Mary Street and Roger Street as well as the Mt. Hope U-turn on King? What mitigation on construction traffic will you impose on the builder to rectify the inequitable burdens that Herbert Street residents face? How will congestion generated by delivery drivers be kept from spilling out onto Pine Street and Mary Street?

The funds for green space that will be collected from the developer are inadequate and their use not transparent. How will the neighbourhood see local green space grow and improve? Is their any thought of leasing Mackenzie King field from WRDSB as a use-at-risk community space/dog park during off-school hours?

I'm sure others have raised issues equally concerning. Perhaps this should indicate the developers can do better.

Peter Dedes

Eric Schneider

From: Charlotte Hancock
Sent: Wednesday, October 2, 2024 11:56 AM
To: Stephanie Stretch; Eric Schneider; julie.wright@waterloo.ca; Mayor; DMcCabe@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: King St. West, Kitchener development

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I am one of the many concerned citizens living in the neighbourhood of Mary Allen/Midtown. Followi a public meeting on Wednesday, September 18, many of us were upset and disturbed that many questions were left unanswered, and many things hadn't been considered in planning for this development.

While we understand and encourage densification in the downtown/midtown/uptown core, we also want to ensure that proper measures are being taken to develop these areas being mindful of the people already living in this area. The things we would like to see addressed:

1. **GREENSPACE.** We know that in lieu of providing green space, the developers compensated the City of Kitchener. How much did (or will) the developers compensate the City of Kitchener in lieu of greenspace, and how is the city of Kitchener using those funds towards our neighbourhood for that purpose? We are looking for transparency. This is a neighbourhood dense with young families and plenty of pets. The current greenspace isn't sufficient for the current residents. How is the city going to address those needs?
2. **REGULATIONS.** We are concerned about lack of height regulation for buildings on this site. There should be a regulation in line with the current construction project at King and Pine (22 stories).
3. **SAFETY.** Traffic impact studies that were done were incomplete as they didn't include any of Waterloo. The areas not covered in the traffic impact studies include Union St., the Mt. Hope U-turn intersection at King, Herbert, Mary, Roger, Bowman, Lucan, and Moore Sts. It's unfathomable that all of these streets would not have been included given the impact on them during the time of construction, and of course once construction is complete with a much more densely populated area. Traffic down Mary and Herbert Sts. has not slowed down despite the new 30km/h speed limit signs. We need traffic calming measures on these streets - narrowing the streets, and vertical reflectors.
4. **ROAD CONDITIONS.** The road condition on Herbert and Roger Sts. is abysmal and needs addressing sooner rather than later. We cannot wait 10 more years for construction to be complete. We've already endured years of heavy construction equipment taking their toll on our roads. Traffic impact studies did not include the *type* of vehicles that were using our roads during construction. When concrete was being poured (for a few months), cement trucks came down Herbert St. at a rate of 1 every 12 minutes. Monday through Saturday sees start times of 6:00 a.m. for heavy (noisy) trucks carrying steel beams and massive concrete walls.
5. **PARKING/DELIVERIES.** The proposed driveways for the new development are opening onto Pine St. Visitor parking, not to mention delivery trucks/cars, will fill Herbert and Mary Streets. We are seeking a recommendation for a new plan that would look more like Barrel Yards, where there is space for the delivery vehicles right in the complex space and not impinging on neighbouring streets. We need only look at the development on Caroline between Allen and John Sts., to see that traffic congestion is a serious issue due to deliveries.

Sincerely,
Charlotte Hancock

Eric Schneider

From: Charlotte Hancock
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2024 9:13 AM
To: Eric Schneider
Subject: 864-872 King St. W

You don't often get email from

Hi Eric,

I'm just getting in my comment on this development, having only heard details this weekend.

First can I confirm that the KCI field will be maintained and the buildings will go around the perimeter of it? I think this is the key factor in this proposal (maintaining this green space for community access and sound dampening for Mount Hope Cemetery.


Secondly, I urge your team to consider density and work to mitigate it. Usually these developers can be talked down a few storeys/units – they go in high and expect negotiation. In almost all cases of 1 to 2 bedroom towers, I tend to believe we can always reduce the number as much as we can get away with in any one location, since there are so many of these overall being built. It's the ones where we get more than 2 bedrooms that we need to recognize a higher need and thus accept more density.

Thank you,

Charlotte Hancock (she/her)

Eric Schneider

From: Kristine Dyck
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2024 10:38 AM
To: Eric Schneider
Cc: Stephanie Stretch; julie.wright@waterloo.ca; Peter Dedes
Subject: 864-872 King St. W - EXTENSION REQUEST for comments

 You don't often get email from

Good morning, Mr. Schneider,

On Wednesday, September 18, there was a public meeting (online) to inform a few residents of the upcoming development projects for 864-872 King St. W.

You then gave us a deadline of Monday, September 23, to submit any comments resulting from that meeting.

We would like an extension to the deadline as:

- 1) not all impacted residents were notified of the meeting. Residents on Mary St. and Herbert St. closer to Union were not notified. Residents of Roger, Lucan, Bowman, Union and Moore Sts. were not notified.
- 2) Many of the questions/concerns that the attending residents had were not properly addressed.
- 3) We need additional time as a community to gather ALL comments/concerns about the proposed development(s).

I would respectfully ask that you give us until Monday, October 21 to respond to the information presented at last Wednesday's meeting.

Best regards,
Kristine Dyck and Peter Dedes

Eric Schneider

From:
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2024 11:03 AM
To: Eric Schneider; Stephanie Stretch
Subject: 864 /872 King St Development - traffic patterns

Hi Eric / Stephanie. I have some additional thoughts on the impact of traffic on the neighbourhood. I live on Mary quite close to Pine so I suspect my driving habits will be similar to the users of the proposed Pine St entrance to the new development.

Depending on my destination and time of day, I would estimate the distribution of my chosen routes would be approximately:

- Mary/Union – 70%
- Roger/Moore – 20%
- Pine/King – 10%

With the future changes to Union St, the only intersection with a left hand turn into the neighbourhood will be Lucan St. As a result I can see the use of Roger St. increasing. One concern – there are no sidewalks on either side of Roger between Bauman & Herbert.

The proposed Pine St entrance is my biggest issue although when talking to neighbours many were not aware of the location. The image on the postcard we received showed a large surface lot to the right of the building on King St. Many people assumed that was the entrance.

How can we dialogue with city staff responsible for traffic? If we are to be surrounded by high rises the quality of life in the residential neighbourhood requires well thought out solutions.

Jane Desbarats

Eric Schneider

From: WILMA ZONDAG <
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 4:45 PM
To: Eric Schneider
Subject: Proposed Development in my Neighbourhood

You don't often get email from v

[arn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon,

Thank you for giving residents the opportunity to voice our opinions regarding the proposed 44 story high-rise in my neighbourhood. I live on _____ and have very strong feelings on the subject.

I am completely opposed to this development proposal. As there has been the current construction of a high-rise on the corner of King and Pine St. for quite some time now, I know what it is like to live on the residential street that has been the main artery of transport truck traffic for all the building materials. It is loud, it is dusty and congested, and it is a constant assault on the senses living through the current build. What you are suggesting would be more than twice as tall as the current building under construction, so what you are proposing to everyone who lives on Herbert St. is to put up with more than twice as much construction traffic, twice as much noise etc. for more than twice as long. Do you live here, sir? I doubt it, and I also doubt you would propose such a development in your own neighbourhood.

Looking into the future once such a high-rise has been built, where is all the vehicle traffic going to go? I can tell you right now that King St. will not be the main artery for most people coming and going from the high-rise; instead, they will use Pine St. to either Mary St. or most likely Herbert St, following the same path that all the current construction traffic uses. Union St. between Park St. to Moore St. is already at capacity at morning and afternoon rush hours, and sometimes even in the off-peak hours. It is a struggle to make a left hand turn out of Herbert St. already with the current conditions, and now you are proposing to add a minimum of 261 additional vehicles to our little neighbourhood. And that number doesn't take into account delivery drivers, maintenance workers, taxis and ubers, and all the visitors coming and going from the building. Our roads and neighbourhoods were not designed for that amount of additional traffic, and you would be placing the burden of all of that on the backs of the current residents. How do you propose we deal with all the additional traffic in your new plan?

I could go on and on about my opposition to the proposal, but I think you get my point. I know that the city will get dazzled with dollar signs and the idea that you are creating more housing, which I'm sure will get you some great funding from the province. But you are putting all the burden of such a development completely on our backs, for which we will see absolutely no benefits. If you're willing to start covering our property taxes for the duration of such a monstrous project, then maybe we could come to some sort of arrangement. As that is just wishful thinking on my part, I'm going to keep my vote for this proposal as a solid NO.

Regards,
Wilma Zondag

Eric Schneider

From: Rita K. Thomas ·
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 4:17 PM
To: Eric Schneider
Cc: Stephanie Stretch; marypineneighbourassociation@gmail.com
Subject: PLS READ BEFORE TONIGHTS ZOOM MTNG RE: 44 Storey Building at King & Pine

You don't often get email from

Hi everyone,

As a resident of the Union-Pine section of Mary Street KW I am writing to express my concerns about the building of a 44 storey building at King and Pine in Kitchener. I have no idea what stage this proposed development is at. It may be that developers have already been encouraged to submit or indeed have submitted a proposal. However, whatever the situation is for '44 Storeys King & Pine' hopefully there is still an opportunity for the following points to be considered:

- 1) **PARKING:** 890-900 was approved with only 48% parking spaces provision. Worst case scenario – where will 52% of residents park? What is the expected parking provision for '44 Storeys King & Pine'?

Bicycles – provision of secure cycle storage. Whilst I am in favour of encouraging more people to take to their bikes, cyclists are extremely rare in KW. Besides which I am willing to guess that most cyclists will also have a car for grocery shopping, taking their children to school, going to appointments, the theatre, cinema, restaurants etc Not to mention that we live in Canada and cycling in the winter can be impossible.

LRT & Bus – the LRT provides a single route from Kitchener's Fairview Mall to Waterloo's Conestoga Mall, with no branches off it. It may require two or three bus routes to get you to your destination.

ION, KW Agreement Requirement – this development is relevant to the 'PARTS' documentation [Planning Around Rapid Transit] as it relates to the 'Central Stations of the LRT' (in the case the Grand River Hospital station), which states a requirement of 0.9 parking spaces/unit irrespective of size i.e. assuming 420 units in a 44 storey building $0.9 \times 420 = 378$,

Not including ION's requirement of 0.1/unit for visitors i.e. $0.1 \times 420 = 42$ for a total of 420!

Car Share Vehicle Sites – whilst sharing parking spaces for a company such as Sun Life might be possible where employees work different days and different shifts, I find it hard to imagine how this could be accomplished for '44 Storeys King & Pine' whose residents will be a mixed of retirees, those working at home, part-time workers and 9-5 workers to name but a few permutations.

In the case of 890-900 King, one of the Planning Justification Reports stated: "The land can function appropriately and not create unacceptable adverse impact for adjacent properties by providing

Appropriate number of parking spaces"

I don't think 48% of the ION or building capacity requirement was considered 'appropriate' by Mary Street residents.

My point here being that we've heard the arguments for parking needs being off-set by bicycles, LRT and Bus, and even walking, but I don't think there will be much if any off-set, which should be considered when negotiating parking to be provided by the developers. After all, all they are concerned about is their bottom-line whilst we, the residents, the councillors and the planners should be concerned about 'quality of life.

- 2) **POPULATION DENSITY:**

PARTS documentation talks about increasing the population density along the LRT corridor.

It states that the minimum 'people-jobs combination per Hectare' requirement for new multi-dwelling buildings is 160 people-jobs combined/hectare.

44 Storey King & Pine will provide 3670 people-job combined/hectare. Over 20 times the minimum required in the KW-ION agreement.

[890-900 King provides 2085 people-job combined/hectare itself over 13 times the minimum requirement.]

I understand that any multi-dwelling building under 10 storeys might well fall under this requirement, but surely the deficit doesn't have to be made up in only two buildings!

- 3) **HEIGHT:**

Staff Report: Urban Design ... 'Tall Building Guidelines' as supplied to me September 2021 should ...

"create ... environment that RESPECTS, ... ENHANCES ... the City's OPEN SPACE system"

"create human-scaled pedestrian friendly streets and attractive public spaces"

Hence, it should be taken in to account that:

A tall building is defined in the Official Plan as a building 9 storeys or more. The height transition pictures is particularly telling – page 15 of the guidelines. A stepped transition is outlined i.e. not a one-step transition from 2 storey buildings on King and Mary, and one 5 storey Medical building on Pine to 25 or 44 storeys.

In addition, building height and yard provisions are interconnected i.e. there should be 7.5 metres, plus 0.33 metres for every metre above 24 metres up to a maximum of 14 metres.

The average height of a 44 storey building is over 105 metres, which without the 'maximum' in place would be 27 metres yard space.

Developers should be bound to 14 metres minimum.

- 4) **GREEN SPACE:**

Softscape and hardscape areas are often very limited in urban developments. Where will residents be able to relax outside and children play?

The nearest area identified as an 'open space' is Mount Hope Cemetery. MHC is quite relaxing for a walk or even time to sit in the fresh air, but not for play!

There is a sports field for KWC&V school, but it is not laid out for multi-generational uses – no slides, no climbing frames, no benches etc and neither should it be. It is a sports field to encourage healthy activities in our future adults.

The nearest park is 2 kilometres away - George Lippert Park.

Do these sort of environmental factors not come up in planning and committee meetings? Or is it that no one on those committees worries about such things?

5) BY-LAWS:

In 2019-2022 the by-laws governing such things as provision of parking spaces and heights of buildings were under review. Neither of these two by-laws were adhered to in the discussions around 890-900 King anyway. Hence the more than 10 storeys in height and only a 48% parking provision.

City of Kitchener documents, including the official plan and guidelines were said to be out of date even though they were provided as supporting documents for the 890-900 King development discussions.

It was also explained that "zoning regulations are set low to allow for discussion". If this is an unwritten/read between the lines understanding between councillors and planners then why are these regulations written at all?

Every effort should be made to negotiate fewer storey's and more parking provision.

The proposed development at Belmont and Glasgow is an excellent example of both.

6) TRAFFIC:

It is my understanding that vehicles from '44 Storey King & Pine' will enter and exit on to Pine. This traffic plus that from 890-900 King and the changes to Union to begin this year will certainly be impactful on Mary Street.

It is already difficult to exit from Mary on to Union. With the triple threat still to come I wonder if anyone can tell me what provisions are being made to control traffic from '44 Storey King & Pine' and '890-900 King', and from Mary Street on to Union?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to being included in future communications around these concerns.

Regards. Rita Thomas

Eric Schneider

From: simon nuk
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 11:34 PM
To: Eric Schneider
Subject: Comments on 864-876 King Street West

You don't often get email from

Hello Eric,

I am a local resident and have some comments on the proposed development at 864-876 King Street West.

1. The building height of 44 storeys seems unnecessarily tall and does not fit with the surrounding neighborhood. The in progress development across Pine street of 20+ storeys will already be a drastic increase, and this proposal will almost double that height. I am in favour of adding density, especially around the ION stations, but surely we can design for shorter and squatter buildings that fit in with the neighbourhood and still provide the same number of dwelling units. The listed floor space ratio of 7.3 supports that a much shorter building can be built on this site, while offering the same number of units.
2. What is the plan to preserve the mature trees on this property that line Pine street? I did not notice any tree protection plan within the proposal.
3. It is difficult to understand what the streetscape will look like, as the King and Pine corner is part of a future phase 2. Can the developer provide preliminary drawings of the final streetscape, including both phases?
4. I am concerned about the empty area on King between phase 1 and 2. It seems like wasted space that breaks up the streetscape along King and prove unfriendly to pedestrians. Would it not be better utilized as street (or courtyard) -facing shops, similar to the Vincenzo's development? The render just shows grass, and I can't imagine a functional or safe greenspace right against busy King street.
5. Aesthetically, the building design is lacking. I think we need to expect a bit more from these architects if we are to build buildings that will be visible for decades. The development tracker website urbantoronto.ca describes this building's facade as "reminiscent of modern incarceration facilities"!
6. What are the plans to move the added traffic off of the quiet residential streets and onto King street. Currently, you are unable to make a left turn from Pine onto King, so traffic will be forced onto the residential streets.

Thanks,
Simon Nuk

Eric Schneider

From: Alice Raynard
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 3:48 PM
To: Eric Schneider; Stephanie Stretch
Subject: Feedback on the 864-875 King Street West Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from .

it

Hello,

We reside at _____ are now facing the construction of two tall towers in front of our house, the new one mentioned above (44 storeys) and the one currently going up (25 storeys) at the corner of Pine and King streets. We understand the need for densification, but we have concerns about safety once the access from and to King and Pine Streets will be restored.

Mary, Pine and Roger streets have seen in the last decade a net increase of young families.

Although both buildings are meant to have only a portion of parking spaces relative to the total number of units, there are to be, according to those two projects, another +350 cars using King, Mary, Pine and Roger streets.

When we moved here in 2013, we knew King street before the Ion was built and the traffic restrictions were put in place, which restrictions now mean cars need to make detours in order to either turn on Union (coming from the North on King), cars meaning to turn onto Pine street (again, coming from the North on King), others trying to circumvent any of those streets, to name a few actual scenarios.

As such, we have observed the following: (1) people driving cars who are lost and in a hurry currently speed on Mary, Pine and Roger streets as they figure there is no way they can get onto King street and (2) people sped on those same streets when access to and from King street was possible - thus, it will happen again.

We did notice there have been car counting devices installed on those streets from time to time. However, we are positive that, with the increase of cars and the return to access to and from King street, Roger, Pine and Mary streets will become speedways given our lived experience in this area, as described above. This is of great concern to us, considering the number of children in this area.

As such, we formally request that both (1) a lower speed limitation be enforced) and (2) speed bumps be added on Mary and Pine streets.

Kind regards,
Alice Raynard

Eric Schneider

From: DARREN LONGPRE
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 8:44 AM
To: Eric Schneider; Stephanie Stretch
Cc: darren Longpre; info@gpo.ca
Subject: Proposed Development 864-876 King Street West
Attachments: IMG_7075.mov

[You don't often get email from <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Mr. Schneider and Ms. Stretch,

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

The proposed development at 864-876 King Street West Kitchener, will only continue the on-going nightmare myself and my neighbours have endured over the past year. This is a result of the current apartment tower being built at King and Pine Street.

Our neighbourhood has turned into a complete disaster of a never-ending construction zone.

My wife and I live at [redacted] Kitchener, v [redacted] street (refer to attached photo's). In other words, we are located at ground zero. All the heavy construction equipment comes up Herbert Street from Union. These trucks then pull forward into the dead end of Pine Street, then they back up Pine Street all the way to King Street, with the annoying and very loud backup beeping. Our upstairs bedroom window faces the dead end of Pine Street (refer to attached photo's and video of heavy equipment truck idling outside our sun porch - sometimes idling for 15-20 minutes). The truck and trailer lengths of this equipment makes it almost impossible to negotiate their turns at Herbert and Pine, which has resulted in some of our tree branches being broken.

The constant parade of construction vehicles over the past year, has decimated our street and completely ruined our peaceful neighbourhood. The noise of heavy construction vehicles is extremely annoying and unsettling to say the least. The congestion of the construction vehicles has created a dust and dirt storm on occasions that makes it unbearable to enjoy our outside deck for dining and relaxation. My bright red mulch went to a brown colour. This is coupled with the fact that the congo line of heavy equipment trucks start as early as 6 a.m., and on one occasion, as early as 4:30 a.m. on a Saturday morning! By-law will have this complaint on record as we were fraudulently misinformed by a supervisor that they had a by-law exemption. This proved to be false.

The proposed 44 storey tower can never be approved. I do, however, have a clear understanding of how this works. The builder has no intentions of building 44 storeys. They will hope for a 30-35 storey building to be approved. This then enables everyone involved to say "well we sought out and listened to the neighbourhood feedback and reached this compromise after consultation". Really? This is an insult to one's intelligence.

Aesthetically, this proposed tower, will further diminish our once beautiful neighbourhood. The current tower under construction has already accomplished this. This includes the blockage of the sunshine.

When I made enquiries about Herbert Street's deteriorating condition and need for repair, I was informed it is due and scheduled in 2026?

In summary, I am aware that community input on project's like this has very little weight or serve any useful purpose in

the big scheme of things (clearly with the current tower being built), however I must bring to your attention my immediate concerns:

1. What route will all the heavy construction vehicles take if this tower is approved? Herbert Street and Pine Street again? Clearly, this cannot happen again!
2. How is the traffic congestion of new vehicular traffic being addressed? Clearly Pine Street, Mary Street and more so Herbert Street, will be endless traffic now.
3. What is the exact time frame for Herbert Street to be repaired and re-paved? It cannot be changed as it is overdue now.
4. Has any financial compensation been considered for affected residents in regards to the current tower under construction or for the proposed additional tower? - the legal term would be "interfering with the lawful enjoyment of one's property".

We have lived at _____ August 1999. Please consider denying this application in its entirety.

Ms. Clancy: You are well informed of our situation in this neighbourhood. I trust your current platform of "legalizing gentle density" has merit to it.

I look forward to hearing back from everyone.

Thank you,

Darren Longpre





















Eric Schneider

From:
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2024 3:41 PM
To: Eric Schneider
Subject: Comments re 44 Storey building on CKCO site (864 /872 King St)

You don't often get email from

[y this is important](#)

Hello Eric. I live on Mary Steet and have concerns about the proposed building. There is already a 25 storey building under construction on the opposite corner of Pine St so a total of 69 storeys (and potentially more to come). The resulting traffic will have an impact on the small residential streets in the Mary/Pine neighbourhood.

VEHICLE ENTRANCE ON PINE ST.

- Why is the entrance on Pine St? The other neighbourhood high-rises (900 King under construction & The Bright 741 King) have their vehicle entrances on King St. Why can't this building follow suit?
- Have you considered the proposed changes to Union Street to add bike lanes? The Waterloo plan is to remove the left hand turn onto Mary. I can envision left hand turns onto Mary becoming a choke point for Union St traffic.
- Any consideration to allow left hand turns from Pine St to King to improve access?
- With the vehicle entrance on Pine, the route of choice will be straight down Mary Street to avoid all the lights. It's a very long block and prone to speeders today. Will traffic calming measures be considered?

PARKING (for both buildings that will flank Pine St):

- a) Where will visitors park? Currently the only street parking is on one side of Mary & Herbert (evenings & weekends). What prevents Mary Street from becoming one massive parking lot?
- b) Where will drop-offs occur (ie food deliveries)? Pine street is too small to accommodate both waiting vehicles and traffic.

Bottomline, I don't feel enough consideration has been given to the impact of traffic on the existing residential streets.

Eric Schneider

From: Charlotte Burnstine
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2024 4:20 PM
To: Eric Schneider
Subject: Hi rise proposed near GRH

[You don't often get email from <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]
earn why this is important at

Hello Eric,

I noticed your name as one of the planners of the hi-rise proposed opposite GRH.

Prior to the public meeting in September, where is it possible to obtain more online details about the building being suggested?

I would like to know the number of bedrooms being proposed, added amenities included that will be offered, and how the building will be designed to fit in with the surroundings.

Thank you.
CB