

Community Association Letters



INGLEWOOD COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
1740 24TH AVE SE
CALGARY, ALBERTA
T2G 1P9
PHONE: 403-264-3835
EMAIL: info@icacalgary.com

May 9, 2018

Development Circulation Controller
Development and Building Approvals #8201
Box 2100, Station M
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 2M5

Dear Calvin Chan:

Re: LOC2019-0038, 915 9 Avenue SE

The Planning Committee (PC) has reviewed the application regarding Rezoning from C-COR2f2.8h12 I-C to DC/MU-2f4.4h38 at the above location. We have met with the applicant over several months, at our regular meetings and the forum it hosted. The PC made several suggestions to the applicant but is sorry to see that our primary concerns, being the overwhelming height and the impact on a gateway location, have been ignored. I attach for your review the comments made following the initial PC meeting and subsequent response to the open house form. I also include a specific list of the pivotal concerns that we would like to see addressed.

It is fair to say that we have been disappointed by not only Hungerford's unwillingness hitherto to negotiate on the profile of the building but the fact that the community was left out of discussions until its plans were essentially agreed upon with the City. The site is an important one: we fully expect the site to develop and think that the specs can be modified to sensitively integrate with the heritage neighborhood while meeting the goals of the developer.

We feel that it has been unfortunate that both the City and the applicant chose to proceed based on draft height guidelines that are still being negotiated. Any suggestion that TOD density would supersede the commitment made to both Inglewood and Ramsay (with the initial Greenline charrette) that these regulations would not be imposed on our heritage communities is deeply disappointing. With very few details in the DC to restrict the envelope, we could not support the application - that motion was made and passed at the May 6 general meeting. We do hope to continue discussions with all parties, particularly on the DC wording, since the zoning does not sufficiently limit what can be done until a DP is filed, which we understand will not be for some time.

I would appreciate receiving a written copy of the formal decision on the permit. If you have any questions, please call me at 403-263-4896.

Yours very truly,

INGLEWOOD COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
Planning Committee



L.J. Robertson, Chair

Community Association Letters

From: ljrobertson@shaw.ca [mailto:ljrobertson@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 11:36 AM
To: Chan, Calvin C. <Calvin.Chan2@calgary.ca>
Cc: Erin Standen <idi@icacalgary.com>; Harder, Breanne <Breanne.Harder@calgary.ca>; Froese, Kevin <Kevin.Froese@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] Comments on the Hungerford DC bylaw

Calvin, as noted at our Planning Committee meeting regarding the presentation of the “draft” final Direct Control bylaw, we find that there is more emphasis on “final” than “draft” and there was no attention paid to our community concerns, as follows:

- Stepping straight up to the west from 22 m. =>30 m. =>38 m. has the effect of dwarfing the three affected heritage buildings in proximity being Alexandra School, McGill Block and Deane House
- More importantly, the historical traverse through the Elbow/Bow River confluence and Ramsay escarpment has existed for thousands of years, as reinforced by the recent archaeological work in Jack Long Park. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada Guideline 15 says that “Designing a new feature when required by a new use that respects the historic visual relationships in the cultural landscape.” Specifically not recommended is “Introducing a new feature that alters or obscures the visual relationships in the cultural landscape such as constructing a new building as a focal point when a character defining vista was traditionally terminated by the sky.” This an inappropriate violation.
- It does not respect the 31 m. ceiling in the draft B&A re-engagement process on the ARP, nor the 20 m. set back proposed within it and respected (somewhat) by the draft Landstar application.
- It creates a 125’ wall as our “gateway” to Inglewood. If you are heading east, this is neither “iconic” nor a welcome to our neighborhood. If you are heading west, all it says is “downtown, that away”. Either way, it erases any demarcation of the community edge or, truthfully, existence.
- The applicant is allowed to step up FAR from 2.8 to 4.4 (a 60% increase) by “bonussing” activities of heritage designation of the Apothecary, having 5% accessible units and 1615 sq. ft. public/private space facing 9 Ave and 8 St. The admission that the bonussing was just based on making the best of a bad situation, i.e. knowing that Council will pass the DC regardless (rather than any formula or discussion with the ICA) is a sad state of affairs and makes one wonder if the “Planning” process has become redundant.
- The absence of reference to any guidance from the Ninth Avenue Master Plan, relying instead on the generosity of the developer, is both disappointing and unnecessarily generous.
- Even with the “Grid”, which was a low point in community/developer relations, we were allowed three meetings to “negotiate” the details of bonussing. In our response letter, we specifically requested a partnership in the negotiation which was patently ignored.

In all, the result of this exercise has been extremely disappointing and the community feels robbed of any opportunity to provide any input/feedback at all. We feel there needs to be a concerted and substantial effort to alter how communities are engaged in the future. Many CA’s are starting to consider their limited volunteer resources may be better focused where their efforts are more valued and respected.

Regards, LJ.

L.J. (Leslie) Robertson
Planning Chair
Inglewood Community Association
(403)263-4896