

## Community Association Letters



505 78<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Calgary, Alberta T2V 0T3  
Bus: 403.255.1400  
Fax: 403.255.1407  
Email:  
[admin@kingslandcommunity.ca](mailto:admin@kingslandcommunity.ca)

May 8, 2019

Stewart Gripton  
File Manager - City of Calgary  
[stuart.gripton@calgary.ca](mailto:stuart.gripton@calgary.ca)  
403.268.1097

Re: LOC2019-0046 7204 5 St SW R-C1 to R-CG Townhomes

Dear File Manager,

Kingsland opposes this application and requests support from the Development Authority and Councillor to reject for reasons outlined below.

- 1) R-CG zoning will not be contextually sensitive:
  - a. LUB 1P2007 Division 3 Purpose Statement requires existing residential development and contextually sensitive redevelopment in the form of Single Detached Dwellings in the Developed Area.
  - b. Low-Density Residential Guidelines for Established Communities (Infill Guidelines) Section 4.2 would not be respected.
  - c. R-CG spot zoning sets a significant precedence for xx single family homes to the south and to lesser extent xx single family homes across the street.
  - d. R-CG rezone of R-C1 sets a lesser but broader precedence of all of the single family homes in Kingsland.
  
- 2) Concurrent DP would be required to assess specific impacts of R-CG although contextual sensitivity may not be possible for this parcel which is surrounded by established single family bungalows and especially since this would be the first rezone in the middle of a long street and would not likely be supported by KCA and affected residents for reasons as follows:
  - a. Front Setback Relaxation expected to be well out of line with neighbouring bungalows.
  - b. Building Massing expected to be contrary to Infill Guideline Section 4.4 requirement to respect existing scale and massing of surroundings.

### Community Association Letters

- c. Building Height expected to be contrary to Infill Guideline Section 4.4.1 requirement for particular sensitivity to scale and character of neighbouring, existing bungalows.
  - d. Privacy expected to be contrary to Infill Guidelines Section 4.5 requirement for adjacent residences to be respected.
  - e. Shadowing expected to be of concern for the north adjacent parcel given the significant difference in building coverage for R-CG relative to R-C1.
  - f. Back Lane Parking expected to be problematic given the narrow, sloped dead-end lane. There is no easy turn around point or capacity for two-way traffic flow so garage and visitor parking may need significant setbacks to mitigate.
  - g. Parcel Coverage expected to be a concern and relaxations would not be supported since even contextual aspects may be considered to not respect the existing built forms.
  - h. Relaxations to front setback and other matters related to the Infill Guidelines are not expected to meet the test of MGA Section 687(3)(d)(A)(B).
  - i. Townhome built form are expected to unduly interfere with amenities of the neighbourhood, and to materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land.
- 3) KCA is supportive of redevelopment in our community and has a community plan and planning vision that if supported will achieve significant population increases:
- a. Focuses redevelopment in the densification areas north of 69th Ave instead of rezoning R-C1 parcels in the medium term to add the impediment of a new inventory of lower priced lots. This might impact our strategy to mitigate crime in certain pockets of the community that would benefit from a priority focus.
  - b. R-CG has been encouraged in other blocks within the community and particularly in areas current zoned R-C2.
  - c. Rezone with such broad impacts must be considered only after significant planning and resident consultation has been performed so the community wishes can be heard and hopefully respected.
  - d. Redevelopment of this parcel to a larger two-storey home would be considered a reasonable progression for this parcel at this time. There is no support for R-C2 infills for this parcel although we will commit to review this as part of a longer term plan provided planning studies and engagement are performed.
  - e. KCA has requested funding through our councillor for some planning with the University of Calgary architectural school to assess density concepts for Kingsland in advance of Growth Area 31 activities. We are open to change but we require a supported plan and we want our residents to know what is happening. It is not possible to engage properly on broad precedence rezones in the context of an LOC application.

## Community Association Letters

For transparency on our current position, KCA intends to:

- 4) Attend and oppose at council hearing and intends to bring residents to express concerns for R-CG, and would request first reading only if council were to approve despite our plea for rejection.
- 5) File SDAB appeal at the DP stage if the rezone is approved. The developer is unlikely to provide a contextual, sensitive and respectful design given the reasons noted above.

Please notify me when the CPC or public hearing dates are set or if the applicant has decided to reconsider townhomes since we would be please to meet to discuss further.

Best Regards,

*Darren MacDonald*

Darren MacDonald  
Planning Director  
Kingsland Community Association

## Community Association Letters

August 30, 2019

Re: Community Feedback for Rezone Application for 7204 5st SW

Dear Kingsland Residents,

Thank you for taking time to express your thoughts and position regarding this important rezoning application. As promised, the Kingsland Community Association (KCA) has collated the information and provided a summary below.

It is our understanding the applicant for 7204 5<sup>th</sup>st SW is moving forward with the rezoning application.

Please feel free to reach out to KCA and the Planning Committee regarding this matter or other community related matters.

KCA Planning Committee Contact Info: Ann Clarke – richardann@nucleus.com

Thank you again for your time & commitment to our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

*Kingsland Community Association*

*Kingsland Planning Committee*

<b>Residents <u>Directly</u> Affected:</b>
11 Opposed
2 Neutral
0 Support

<b>Residents Affected:</b>
44 Opposed
1 Neutral
7 Support

<b>Aggregate Data:</b>
55 Opposed or <b>84.6 % Opposed</b>
3 Neutral or <b>4.6 % Neutral</b>
7 support or <b>10.8 % Support</b>