

**From:** [Andrew Del Bucchia](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] FW: LOC-2019-0076 - Dec 16th meeting  
**Date:** Saturday, November 30, 2019 11:52:45 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image010.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image007.png](#)  
[image009.png](#)  
[image016.png](#)  
[image017.png](#)  
[image018.png](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below. I sent this email to my counselor and the mayor as I wasn't aware that it was to be sent to your address. I'd like to have the below added to the records for the Dec 16 meeting. Please confirm receipt.

## ≡≡≡ stridecapital

Andrew Del Bucchia | Partner

Suite 201, 3007 14<sup>th</sup> Street SW | Calgary, AB | T2T 3V6

T. 587-393-2028 | C. 403-671-6333

[andrew@stridecap.com](mailto:andrew@stridecap.com)

[www.stridecap.com](http://www.stridecap.com)



**CONFIDENTIALITY CAUTION AND DISCLAIMER:**

This message is intended only for the individual or entity to which it is addressed and contains information that is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately and delete the original message. If you are the intended recipient of this message, we remind you that electronic mail on the Internet may not be secure from both privacy and software perspectives.

---

**From:** Andrew Del Bucchia  
**Sent:** November 30, 2019 9:03 AM  
**To:** Ward 6 Office <Ward06@Calgary.ca>  
**Cc:** themayor@calgary.ca

**Subject:** LOC-2019-0076 - Dec 16th meeting

Hello,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed land use amendment noted in the subject line. This application passed the City Planning Commission on Oct 17<sup>th</sup> by a vote of 3-2 in an underwhelming attended session. Of note at this meeting was that there were 9 emails in favor of the application and 59 against, members of the community are against this at a rate of 6-1. We were not made aware of this application passing through the CPC by the City or Developer and nothing on the signage in front of the development has made mention to the application passing and the upcoming Dec 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. It's been 6 weeks since the application passed through CPC and we are two weeks from the councilors meeting and the community has not been properly notified.

I am not at all opposed to development along 17<sup>th</sup> avenue, specifically in this area and in general from Sarcee Trail through to the corner of 37 Street SW. My wife, 2 daughters and I moved into our house on 1932 Glenmount Drive in Sept 2017 and we fully anticipated that at some point development along 17<sup>th</sup> would come.

I was the treasurer and the VP of the Glenbrook Community Association for a combined 4 and half years and have been involved with working with developers in the past on projects. I'm 100% in support of properly planned, thought-out and executed community redevelopment.

I have several talking points that I will be sharing at the councilors meeting on Dec 16<sup>th</sup> so this email is just to be on the record with your office of my opposition.

Thanks,

**≡≡≡ stridecapital**

Andrew Del Bucchia | Partner

Suite 201, 3007 14<sup>th</sup> Street SW | Calgary, AB | T2T 3V6

T. 587-393-2028 | C. 403-671-6333

[andrew@stridecap.com](mailto:andrew@stridecap.com)

[www.stridecap.com](http://www.stridecap.com)



**We've Moved!** 

Please update our address to:

Suite 201, 3007 14th Street SW  
Calgary, Alberta  
T2T 3V6

**CONFIDENTIALITY CAUTION AND DISCLAIMER:**

This message is intended only for the individual or entity to which it is addressed and contains information that is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately and delete the original message. If you are the intended recipient of this message, we remind you that electronic mail on the Internet may not be secure from both privacy and software perspectives.



## Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to Public Hearing matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through [www.calgary.ca/ph](http://www.calgary.ca/ph). Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Public Hearing Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

\* I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

\* First name Shannon

\* Last name Armstrong

Email shannon.eh@gmail.com

Phone

\* Subject City Council meeting December 16, 2019 LOC2019-0076 and CPC2019-1112

\* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

I'd like to provide City Council with the attachments in preparation for the upcoming meeting on December 16, 2019. The attachments will serve as a reminder of the Transit Oriented Development Guidelines and of the findings of the West LRT Land Use Study (Summarized).  
I intend to speak at the Council meeting on December 16, 2019 regarding LOC2019-0076 and CPC2019-1112.

ISC:

1/1

Unrestricted

Dec 1, 2019

12:26:22 PM

**Transit Oriented Development** is a major policy objective of the City.

Definition: TOD is a walkable, mixed-use form of development typically focused within a 600-meter radius of a transit station. Higher density development is concentrated near the station to make transit convenient for more people and encourage ridership. This form of development utilizes existing infrastructure, optimizes use of the transit network and creates mobility options for transit riders and the local community. Successful TOD provides a mix of land uses and densities that create a convenient, interesting and vibrant community for local residents and visitors alike.

Key Policy Objectives:

1. Ensure transit-supportive land use to provide the local community with increased services, employment and **housing** options.
2. **Increase density** around transit stations to support high frequency, rapid transit service and provide a base for a **variety of housing**, employment, local services and amenities for a community.
3. Create pedestrian-oriented design for convenient, comfortable, direct and **safe pedestrian** linkages with the end goal to support a walkable station and **promote the use of transit**.
4. Make each station area a “place” that’s developed to transform what would otherwise be a utilitarian transit node into a vibrant, mixed-use hub of activity.
5. **Manage** parking, bus and **vehicular traffic**.
6. Plan in context with local communities – TOD should provide a wide range of supporting benefits for local communities, including increased uses and services, a **variety of housing**, increased transportation options, and a **more walkable environment** and community amenities.

Benefits of TOD:

Transit Oriented Development seeks to implement a more sustainable approach to urban planning and land use. Referencing the “Triple Bottom Line” approach to achieve environmental, economic and social objectives.

Social: Greater mobility choice through **improved travel options**. **Increased housing**, employment and service choices within existing communities. Promoting a greater jobs/housing balance. **Health benefits of walkable communities**.

Economic: TOD as a catalyst for economic development. Maximizing the use of transit infrastructure. **Reduced traffic congestion-related costs**. **Redevelop** vacant or **under-utilized** industrial and **commercial sites**.

Environmental: **Reduced greenhouse gas emissions** through higher ridership. **Improved air quality** through the provision of transportation alternatives. **Reduced energy consumption resulting from efficient land use and transportation connections**.

“**Smart Growth**” has become an increasingly important approach in current planning practice. It is a term to describe ways of developing more sustainable cities by **supporting economic development** initiatives, **creating healthy environments** and **strengthening communities**. Calgary City Council has endorsed “Advancing Smart Growth” as a key priority for The City of Calgary. Some of the leading Smart Growth principles that guide or promote TOD include the following:

- Create **walkable** neighbourhoods
- **Foster distinctive, attractive communities** with a strong sense of place
- **Encourage transit use**
- **Provide a variety of transportation choices**
- **Mix land uses**
- Strengthen and direct development toward existing communities
- **Create a range of housing** opportunities and choices

## West LRT Land Use Study (summarized)

### 1.0 Introduction and Background

#### 1.1-Purpose

**The purpose of the West LRT Land Use Study Summary Report is to** summarize all the analysis undertaken and the input received from the public and make it available as a resource and reference for all future planning studies for the West LRT area. This will **ensure that the valuable feedback that has been received by The City through the West LRT Land Use Study will be used in all future planning exercises in the area.** During the Land Use Study, The City held numerous public information sessions, conducted design workshops and formed a Citizen Advisory Committee. This public engagement process was an effort to seek public input on opportunities and ideas regarding future land use in the area. While this report will bring the West LRT Land Use Study to a close, planning will continue for the areas surrounding existing and future LRT stations along the West LRT line and along the 17th Avenue Corridor. The next phase of the planning work will be a Station Area Plan for the Westbrook Mall station. **This Summary Report is intended to be used and referenced in the following situations:**

1. In the development of new City plans and design guidelines;
2. **As an input to the design of private development proposals;** and
3. **As a frame of reference in the evaluation and review of new development proposals.**

#### 1.2-Background

The original purpose of the West LRT Land Use Study was to **produce a land use plan with a strong vision and implementation strategy that would direct the right kind of redevelopment in the vicinity of the future LRT stations,** while at the same time manage development pressures in other areas.

#### 1.3.3-Boundary Rationale

The boundary of the study area was determined by a number of factors:

- **600 metre walking distance from the proposed LRT stations**
- **Lands within closest proximity to proposed LRT stations**
- Community boundaries
- **Areas that do not have existing community level planning policies in place**
- Major roadways as boundaries
- **Current development activity and opportunities**

### 2.0 Public Input

#### 2.1-Questionnaire

The survey showed that residents in study area communities primarily moved there due to location, especially the close proximity to downtown. Residents also valued the various community amenities such as bars, restaurants, schools, churches, shopping, parks, and green spaces. **When asked about what they liked best about their communities, respondents again pointed out the location and community amenities, but also added that they liked the community feel they got from some of these older, more established neighbourhoods. Many respondents also said they feel safe in their community.**

#### 2.2.1-Incorporation of the Results into the Planning Process

The purpose of the West LRT Land Use Study Visioning Workshops was to:

- assist participants in the planning process to produce images that visually represented their ideas and visions
- **collect ideas and input from the public**

- understand what qualities of the built environment are valued by residents
- understand what activities are already happening or desired by residents

### 2.2.2-Recurring Themes

Thirteen major themes emerged from the 38 drawings and accompanying text produced at the Visioning Workshops.

-A number of the themes were related to land use such as:

- **Residential and Mixed Use Development;**

- Commercial Services;
- Recreation; and
- Community Services.

-Design themes included:

- LRT Design;
- Building Design;
- Streetscape and Public Space Design;
- Open Space and Vegetation; and
- **Community Character.**

## 3.0 Vision & Guiding Principles

### 3.1-Vision

**The study area comprises well-loved and well established 1950's and 1960's communities** located on the southwest side of Calgary. The area benefits from easy access to the mountains, Downtown, the Bow River valley, Mount Royal College, Shaganappi Point Golf Course, and Optimist and Edworthy Parks. A variety of amenities are also found throughout the study area, including restaurants, shops, a library, a pool, community centres, schools, churches and the many parks. **Area neighbourhoods are cherished for their friendliness, tranquility and high quality of life by those who live there.**

*The study area will become a vibrant, accessible, and safe corridor with a variety of amenities that are valued by residents and visitors alike. It will offer a range of convenient transportation opportunities, which include walking, biking and public transit, that provide an alternative to the automobile. **New development will offer a mix of employment and housing choices in buildings that are attractive and blend into the existing communities.** The areas around each of the LRT stations will have their own unique identities where people of all ages can conveniently and comfortably work, live and play. Westbrook station will become a major destination that serves the broader area and is recognizable for its attractive architecture and village-like qualities*

### 3.2-Guiding Principles

#### 1. Increase Housing

- **Sensitively increase residential densities within the vicinity of the LRT stations and along the transportation corridors.**
- **Accommodate a wide variety of housing types/sizes/styles to meet different needs, stages of life and income levels.**

#### 3. Maintain safety in neighbourhoods and **promote a sense of community**

- **Ensure safety and accessibility for all people at LRT stations, road crossings and other public spaces.**
- **Minimize noise pollution and maintain quiet communities in areas with less activity.**
- **Require all development to provide 'eyes on the street' and natural surveillance of public spaces and parks.**

## 4.0 Community Values Summary

### 4.1. Community Values Summary

The following represents the main comments/values identified by the public through the West LRT public engagement process. These values should be used to guide the community, developers and the Development Authority in considering and developing new City plans and guidelines as well as private development proposals.

#### 45th Street Station Area

11. **45th Street Station should be a small scale, mixed-use development with the higher density development located next to the LRT station.**
12. **The mix of uses should include residential, office & main floor retail.**
13. Supported uses include a coffee shop, convenience retail (coffee, news, dry cleaning), and local businesses with community connections.
14. Redevelopment should include aesthetic upgrades to the existing commercial node.

#### 17th Avenue Corridor

18. **17 Avenue should be a mixed-use street edge that transitions to the adjacent residential development.**
19. **Residential uses should be located above the retail/commercial uses along 17 Avenue.**
20. **Commercial uses should be permitted in the existing houses along 17 Avenue in order to maintain the existing residential character.**
21. The mix of uses should include activities that run throughout the evening to encourage more eyes on the street and discourage undesirable actions.
22. Bars or late night entertainment should not be permitted.
23. Locally owned and community based small business should be encouraged.
24. Shops along 17 Avenue encourage community relationships & economic health.

### 4.1.2 Built Form and Site Design

1. Building design should include traditional styled architecture
2. Redevelopment should work towards a village like feel through use of scale and materials.
3. **The scale of development should be non-obtrusive and similar to the existing community.**
4. **The impact of development on existing communities should be minimized** (e.g. use of natural materials).
5. Upper level stepbacks on buildings should be used to bring sunlight to street.
6. Building design for the Westbrook Mall area should consider roof top gardens/green roofs.
7. Development at the Westbrook Mall area should create a sense of place and provide an identifiable centre for the surrounding neighbourhood.
8. Development at the Westbrook Mall should be scaled towards pedestrians and not automobiles.
9. Siting of buildings to frame outdoor/public spaces is encouraged at the 45th Street Station.

## 5.0 Implementation

### 5.1 Next Steps

The West LRT Land Use Study Summary Report is the first step in a series of planning projects to be undertaken along the West LRT Line. **Priority areas for planning were selected to provide a clear focus for future planning exercises. The purpose of these planning exercises is to direct the right kind of redevelopment to areas where it is most appropriate and to manage development pressures outside these priority areas so as not to diffuse planning efforts or the limited market for redevelopment.**

The priority areas were chosen based on the following factors:

- The amount and strength of the residential and commercial market for redevelopment;
- The ability to plan concurrently with the development of the West LRT;
- The availability of high potential re-development sites, both in terms of location and possible development yield (i.e. floor area or numbers of units); and

- **Locations that could accommodate development that would support the existing, stable residential communities while minimizing the creation of difficult transition edges between new and existing development.**

The planning priority areas are shown on Map 6 and are intended to be completed in sequence, as opposed to concurrently. The areas include:

1. Westbrook Village Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) – Phase 1 and the Sunalta Area Redevelopment Plan
2. Westbrook ARP – Phase 2
3. 17th Avenue Corridor
4. 26th Street Station Area and **45th Street Station Area.**

#### 5.4 17th Avenue Corridor

A planning exercise for the 17th Avenue Corridor would investigate the opportunity for redevelopment along 17th Avenue. This will include the application of new land use districts that meet the vision for a more pedestrian oriented mixed-use street. **It may include the increasing of densities at limited locations where it most appropriate and can be integrated into the fabric of the existing neighbourhoods.** This study will also include an analysis and strategy for the integration of the LRT line where it surfaces from its underground alignment to run at-grade along the corridor.

#### 5.5 26 Street Station Area & 45 Street Station Area

Analysis of the results of the West LRT Land Use Study and an assessment of the available market for redevelopment suggests that these two stations are not candidates for major transit-oriented development.

**However, there are some opportunities based on existing land use for redevelopment to higher densities. This study will evaluate the appropriateness of the current land use districts to deliver a form of development that is both economic from a development perspective and sensitive to the adjacent low density neighbourhoods.** Design guidelines will also be developed to ensure all new development adjacent to and nearby the new stations is transit-friendly in terms of interface and connectivity. No formal Station Area Plans will be developed for these areas.

#### 5.7 Development Applications Outside of Priority Areas

The establishment of priority areas for planning work does not preclude the submission of development applications for sites outside of these areas. However, the intent is to focus and concentrate major redevelopment within the priority areas identified. There are still opportunities to develop outside of these priority areas within existing approved land use designations. **In some cases however, a more appropriate land use district may be desirable. For example, a change from auto-oriented commercial to pedestrian-oriented commercial along Bow Trail may be a better form of development in the long term.** Such redesignations will be considered. The West LRT Land Use Study Summary Report will be reviewed during the consideration of such applications. **Applications that contemplate either a significant change in land use or density will not be encouraged**

**Gibb, Linda A.**

---

**From:** Barbaatar, Davaa  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 3, 2019 4:16 PM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] December 16 City Council Meeting -- Land Use Amendment in Glendale (Ward 6) at 4503, 4507, and 4511- 17 Avenue SW, LOC2019-0076, CPC2019-1112

**From:** Doug Roberts [mailto:droboterts@derlc.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 3, 2019 1:41 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXT] December 16 City Council Meeting -- Land Use Amendment in Glendale (Ward 6) at 4503, 4507, and 4511-17 Avenue SW, LOC2019-0076, CPC2019-1112

City Council

As a resident of Glendale with an interest in seeing redevelopment take place that will improve and enhance our community, I am opposed to the captioned land use amendment application (the "Application") for the following reasons:

1. The primary reason that the Application is requesting a Direct Control district is to allow future development on the parcels to include a drive-thru. A drive-thru will neither improve nor enhance our community, as it will primarily benefit those driving through our community.
2. The parcels in question are located within the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) area surrounding the 45th Street SW C-Train station, less than 1 block from the station itself. A drive-thru is an auto-oriented use that will hurt, rather than help achieve, the goal of making the area around the station as pedestrian-friendly as possible.
3. The applicant's stated purpose in making the application is to facilitate the redevelopment of the parcels into a small-scale auto-oriented retail development consisting of a drive-thru equipped Starbucks outlet and one other standalone retail bay, separated by a surface parking lot. Facilitating such a non-TOD type of development on some of the most prime parcels in this TOD area would not only be a huge missed opportunity, but would also, by taking those prime parcels "off the table" in terms of higher density mixed-use development for the foreseeable future, have a depressing impact on the eventual build-out of this TOD area.

I accordingly ask that Council follow Administration's recommendation and deny the Application. Alternatively, at the very least, any approval of the Application should include a time limit on the drive-thru use not exceeding 15 years.

Thank you.

Doug Roberts  
4127 19 AV SW

**From:** [Joe Marra](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 04, 2019 3:51:54 PM

---

Do any of you sacks of garbage on the planning commision ever listen to people?  
Quit ruining our neighborhoods!

Sent from Samsung tablet

**From:** [Norm Paarup](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 04, 2019 4:47:24 PM

---

I live in Glendale I have just arrived home and have counted 50 cars on 45<sup>th</sup> street S.W. ---- south of 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. idling waiting for the light at the 45<sup>th</sup> St. 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.W. intersection. I was unable to count the remaining 20 or so because I was trying to turn onto my street Glenmere Rd.S.W. and several had to back up or stop so I could make a left hand turn onto my street. All this aside, why would the city allow a strip mall at the corner of 45<sup>th</sup> Street S.W. and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue S.W. when the infrastructure is not capable of handling the present traffic? This proposal is featuring a drive through Starbucks with an alley access. This community has become a cut through for traffic accessing 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. We as citizen of this community do not want any more exhaust spewing vehicles clogging our main thoroughfare (45<sup>th</sup> St.) The idea of the C-Train was to cut down on traffic on city streets, well apparently that's not working however, the city planning department has given the go ahead for this unneeded unwanted strip mall which will add to the congestion. Please refuse this proposal.

Lynette Paarup  
4523 Glenmere Rd. S.W.  
Calgary.  
402-242-2827

**From:** [noreply@calgary.ca](mailto:noreply@calgary.ca)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** LOC2019-0076  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 04, 2019 7:54:43 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Submission to the City Clerk's Office.pdf](#)

---

Public Submission from Wayne Moorhead



## Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to Public Hearing matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through [www.calgary.ca/ph](http://www.calgary.ca/ph). Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Public Hearing Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

\* I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

* First name	Wayne
* Last name	Moorhead
Email	waymoor@telusplanet.net
Phone	4039230744
* Subject	LOC2019-0076

\* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

I would like to speak in opposition to the proposed Direct Control application. The Direct Control zoning opens the property up to developments that are inappropriate for this site. With or without a time frame bylaw written into this DC zoning, this zoning may contradict council's current efforts in discussions around extending the "17 Ave SW Streetscape Master Plan", "Westbrook Communities Local Growth Planning" or "Land Use Study". Until current planning discussions are finalized I ask council to apply the Guiding Principles of the Transit Orientated Development (TOD) as outlined in the West LRT Land Use Study. The conceptual development as proposed contradicts most TOD Key Policies. At the Calgary Planning Commission meeting the city's senior planner Dino Civitarese, cited the TOD as one point in which he could not support the application and motioned it be rejected. The TOD encourages Pedestrian-oriented Street Retail in its Guidelines. The surrounding communities are growing and as council approves more secondary suits, R-2, M-1 and M-2 developments; the 'walkability' factor is important now. We already see pedestrian traffic increasing and scooters in our neighbourhood. The DC zoning and concept proposed is vehicle orientated, which is fully dependent on commuter traffic from outside of the community and the community will be left with the negative repercussions; increased traffic, accidents, litter and 'diverted traffic'. This Direct Control application is flawed or just misleading, in that it requests a height allowance of 11m and a contradicting FAR of 2.5(density), so Direct Control would give this development free run and undermine the Spirit of what was "promised and sold" to the community association.

ISC:

1/2

Unrestricted

Dec 4, 2019

7:57:46 PM



## Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

---

The West LRT construction required several houses be removed, including some townhouses, excess property is now being developed but still the construction resulted in a net loss of housing. The AMA office, fire station and CPS station are within 200m of the LRT station and locks out available density. This proposal takes away more density, housing and potential tax base.

**From:** [Jim W](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] 2019 0076  
**Date:** Thursday, December 05, 2019 6:58:21 AM

---

12/5/19 We have lived in this area (Glendale) since 1992, and while I have seen changes and adjusted to them, I am not pleased with the recent proposal / submission on the above matter. As I have mentioned I am not for a drive through Starbucks coming into the area, due to the fact they will only zip in and out for coffee on their way to work. Now because of a technicality the project has now evolved into a 5 high complex. If the Starbucks with their out door terrace is going ahead, and the developer wanting people to stay awhile, where are the extra residents going to park now that this project has suddenly become 5 story complex.

Jim & Agnes Wolstenholme

**From:** [mary.canning](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Thursday, December 05, 2019 4:39:21 PM

---

In regard to 3-5 Story Development in Glendale area, located at 17th Avenue and Glenmount Drive SW  
LOC-2019-0076

The vast majority of residents surveyed this past summer were strongly opposed to this new development (including this household) - yet it is still being considered?

This structure will not be consistent with anything in Glendale.

This will significantly increase vehicular traffic in the area, which is already fairly congested as 17th Avenue is a main thoroughfare into the downtown core, WITH a 50 km/hr speed limit. This will increase secondary traffic as well - cars cutting through neighbourhoods to get to the proposed Starbucks drive-through, an area in which there is a great deal of school/pedestrian traffic.

With the addition of the 45th Street LRT station, parking restrictions have increased along with the volume of vehicular traffic, creating congestion, particularly during rush hour. This proposed new development will create even more congestion.

This proposed structure does not fit into the profile of the community. This family strongly opposes this development.

Mary Canning  
1925 Grand Oaks Drive SW

**From:** [KAY HOLGATE](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Opposition to Glendale LOC2019-00761  
**Date:** Thursday, December 05, 2019 8:49:48 PM

---

# Opposition to Glendale LOC2019-00761

I am opposed to the proposed rezoning application for Glendale LOC2019-00761 for the following reasons

1. Lack of an overall plan. - Although it has been almost 10 years since the approval of the SW LRT segment there is no plan for the development of the area near the 45 St. station. In the absence of a local area plan it is important that all development be consistent with the city policies as set out in the Transit-oriented Development Plan (TOD) and the Municipal Development Plan (MDP)
2. Zoning application specific to accommodate a drive through - At the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant indicated that the proposed DC zoning was selected to permit a drive through as without a drive through the project at the height of three stories (which is the height the community would support) is not economically viable. Drive throughs are not supportive of transit use and nor are they pedestrian friendly. Hence, they are not consistent with the TOD nor the MDP. To approve a drive through as the first step in redevelopment could negatively affect interest in future development in the area.
3. Traffic impacts -There is already a lot of traffic on 17 Ave SW so possible increases in traffic are a concern. Further the proposed development is for a drive through coffee shop. There is already a drive through coffee shop between 28th and 29th streets on the south side of 17 Ave., a relatively short distance away when in a car.
4. The application is for part of a block - From a planning perspective, it would be preferable to develop an entire block face cohesively.
5. Public consultation was limited -To my knowledge, which is consistent with the three neighbours I consulted, there was no general consultation in the community. I am not aware of the basis on which the community association submitted support for the project. However the responses to the city's request for comments was 9 submissions in support and 53 in opposition suggesting that the community is not supportive of the project.

Although I appreciate the applicant's consideration of the community's desire for a gradual transition in development and his intent to limit the immediate development to three stories, I do not think it is reasonable to approve the change in zoning to allow for a drive through, which is inconsistent with municipal policies, to accommodate the short term economic interests of the applicant.

Kay Holgate  
24 Glenview Dr SW  
403-242-6119

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Ila Payette](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Land use LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Friday, December 06, 2019 12:08:23 PM

---

Please do not approve this application I live very near the place all traffic exiting this drive through will enter Glenmount, it will be a night mare. We do not want this to ruin our neighbourhood. The building does not fit current city code. There is a Tim Horton's just a couple of blocks away in a commercial development which is where coffee shops should be.

Please do not allow this developer to make money at the expense of those of us who enjoy a quiet neighbourhood.

Thanks

ILA Payette

1964 Green Ridge Road SW

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [kolowroc@telus.net](mailto:kolowroc@telus.net)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Land use application LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Friday, December 06, 2019 2:09:55 PM

---

It is difficult not to be cynical about Planning Commission approval of the said development, supporting business interest of a few against the vast majority of the current residents. Without repeating the obvious, short term and long term consequences of this development in the residential area, one can't avoid the conclusion that the apparent enthusiasm of the Commission members for commercial development in the residential area would not be presents had such development been planned next to their own, single family houses.

We strongly encourage the Council to reject this proposal and preserve the character of our neighbourhood and the quality of life of our area. We hope the Council will reject the laughable, self-serving arguments of the developer and show consideration for the current residents.

Best regards,  
A&T Kolowrocki,  
1941 Green Ridge Rd. SW.

**From:** [Dawn Lakness](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Land Use Application LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Saturday, December 07, 2019 10:10:33 AM

---

I would like to OBJECT to the proposed 3 to 5 storey development in Glendale. We have lived in Glendale for 39 years and very close to this proposed development which we strongly object to. The traffic on 17th Ave is more than enough and we do NOT need more! Nor does this development fit into the current City TOD requirements and the building height is NOT consistent with Glendale.

Please we have more than enough commercial business in Glendale on south side of 17 Ave and west side of 37th St SW. Glendale certainly does NOT need another chain coffee shop!

Dawn and Maurice Lakness  
Glendale Resident

**From:** [Paddy Constance](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] land use application #LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Saturday, December 07, 2019 7:31:36 PM

---

To whom it may concern,  
I own and live in Glendale and I wish to state and submit my objection to the development located at  
17 Ave and Glenmount Dr. SW.  
Sincerely  
Paddy Constance

**From:** [Doug Bond](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Opposition to Change in Land Use, LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 3:13:41 PM  
**Attachments:** [Opposition to R-C1s Development Dec 2019.pdf](#)

---

Please refer to the attached letter outlining very good reasons why this development should NOT proceed.

Thank you.

--

Doug Bond, P.Eng, PMP  
(403) 919-2150

Douglas and Linda Bond  
1944 Green Ridge Rd. SW.  
Calgary, Alberta T3E 4B1

File Manager IMC #8075  
Planning & Development  
PO Box 2100, Station M  
Calgary T2P 2M5

December 8, 2019

**Re: Land Use Amendment Application LOC2019-0076, from DC, R-C1 to R-C1 to C-COR2, at 4503, 4507 & 4511, 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW**

Dear Madam/Sir;

The applicant is seeking approval for a change in bylaw to allow a commercial building development, including a Strip Mall and Drive-Thru at this location. **We are writing in objection to this proposal.**

We completely disagree with letting a development like this happen at this intersection of Glenmount Drive and 17<sup>th</sup> Ave SW. This is a solid single family residential area, and not conducive to a Drive-Thru type strip mall. This is very out of place. Traffic on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue is congested and would be further hampered by cars entering into the Drive-Thru off 17<sup>th</sup> Ave, only 60 or 80 meters from 45 street, and then trying to get out on to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue again.

Glenmount Drive is quite narrow and if cars are parked on both sides, as they often are, cars have to slow to a crawl and often pull over where possible to let cars coming the other way pass. Glenmount Drive would need to be widened to accommodate the increase in traffic, allowing a dedicated Left Turn lane, and accommodation for lights at the intersection of Glenmount and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue so traffic can safely turn left off Glenmount.

The city should understand what 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue will look like in a few years, maybe now is the time to widen it, to accommodate turn lanes onto Glenmount, Grand Oaks, Kellwood and Glenwood Drive. With the LRT on the north side, there isn't any room to take land in that direction, without eliminating the walking/bike path along 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue in that area.

Cars will undoubtedly shortcut through Glendale to avoid the difficulty in getting back on to 17<sup>th</sup> Ave, and our relatively narrow streets and alleys will see a lot more traffic. This poses a number of safety concerns for our community residents, especially children.

And more noise and light pollution. Cars entering the Drive-Thru will be circling 270 degrees, shining headlights on all of the neighboring houses. There would need to be a specific plan, enforced to ensure proper light abatement was instituted. Headlights into neighboring yards and continuous noise would make living in neighboring homes unbearable.

If a project like this proceeds, the City should mandate they have a parcel large enough to easily accommodate this type of development (eg: potentially incorporating the property at 4515 - 17th Ave), to avoid stranding small parcels, ensuring a sufficient land base for a development like this.

I am concerned that the alley behind these properties will end up being used to access this Drive-Thru and strip mall, creating a lot more traffic than the 6.1m (20 ft) wide alleyway was ever designed for. This will be a real nuisance for residents, who are challenged with having to park and access their off-street parking from the alleyways, as there is no parking allowed on 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. Parking is not allowed in these lanes. Already there are times in the alley south of 17 Ave when it is impassable due to cars parked there. Parking controls are rarely enforced.

Just because the developer happened to be able to purchase 3 properties in a row, doesn't mean it is the right 3 properties to accommodate this kind of development. Areas around 45 Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Ave would be a much better fit for this (consider 1903 and 1907 - 45 Street, including 4611 - 17<sup>th</sup> Ave and 1904 Georgia Street).

And further to this, the owners of these 3 properties didn't make any effort to clear the sidewalks along both 17<sup>th</sup> Ave and Glenmount of snow the winter of 2018-19, and so far this winter, making the area absolutely treacherous for pedestrians. This also encouraged a lot of jaywalking to get to the cleared walking and bike path on the north side of 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. Given they cannot upkeep 3 rental properties properly, I question their ability to follow the development requirements the city might impose, and to keep the commercial site up to the standards they are touting as selling points in their development propaganda.

Lastly, residents in Glendale have rigorously opposed multifamily development in this area, maintaining a decent, quiet and safe area for families to grow. Suddenly allowing a commercial development like this to occur, situated amongst single family residences seems absurd.

In summary, given there are existing strip malls, with good access to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue just a few blocks East and West of this location, that can better accommodate a drive through, I recommend the city deny this development until a proper review can be undertaken to address the impact of traffic on both 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Glenmount Drive. The city needs to understand, and take into consideration, the effects on the peaceable enjoyment and safety of the residents who have homes in this area. They must review the impacts that this development will have on traffic, noise and light pollution, not just at that location, but on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and increased traffic associated with people shortcutting through Glendale.

The city needs to also consider the track record of the developer, who seems to be completely unable to safely manage the properties as they are now.

Sincerely,

Doug & Linda Bond,  
Glendale Residents at:  
1944 Green Ridge Rd SW



**Public Submission**

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to Public Hearing matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through [www.calgary.ca/ph](http://www.calgary.ca/ph). Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Public Hearing Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

\* I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

\* First name: Wayne  
 \* Last name: Moorhead  
 Email: waymoor@telusplanet.net  
 Phone: 4039230744  
 \* Subject: LOC2019-0076

I would like to speak in opposition to the proposed Direct Control application. The Direct Control zoning opens the property up to developments that are inappropriate for this site. With or without a time frame bylaw written into this DC zoning, this zoning may contradict council's current efforts in discussions around extending the "17 Ave SW Streetscape Master Plan", "Westbrook Communities Local Growth Planning" or "Land Use Study". Until current planning discussions are finalized I ask council to apply the Guiding Principles of the Transit Orientated Development (TOD) as outlined in the West LRT Land Use Study. The conceptual development as proposed contradicts most TOD Key Policies. At the Calgary Planning Commission meeting the city's senior planner Dino Civitarese, cited the TOD as one point in which he could not support the application and motioned it be rejected. The TOD encourages Pedestrian-oriented Street Retail in its Guidelines. The surrounding communities are growing and as council approves more secondary suits, R-2, M-1 and M-2 developments; the 'walkability' factor is important now. We already see pedestrian traffic increasing and scooters in our neighbourhood. The DC zoning and concept proposed is vehicle orientated, which is fully dependent on commuter traffic from outside of the community and the community will be left with the negative repercussions; increased traffic, accidents, litter and 'diverted traffic'. This Direct Control application is flawed or just misleading, in that it requests a height allowance of 11m and a contradicting FAR of 2.5(density), so Direct Control would give this development free run and undermine the Spirit of what was "promised and sold" to the community association.

\* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)



## Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

---

The West LRT construction required several houses be removed, including some townhouses, excess property is now being developed but still the construction resulted in a net loss of housing. The AMA office, fire station and CPS station are within 200m of the LRT station and locks out available density. This proposal takes away more density, housing and potential tax base.

**From:** [Kenneth Ho](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] RE: LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 4:30:33 PM

---

Hello,

I am writing with regards to the LOC-2019-0076 application and I am writing as a local landowner, owner and resident at 1940 Green Ridge Rd SW, in the area to oppose this development in its current form.

The location of the proposed development is located at 17th Ave and Glenmount Drive which is less than a two minute walk from where I currently live. While there are certainly benefits of this development in its goals to offer more services to the community, the current development plans as it stands has multiple problems and flaws.

First the actual location of the development being on 17th ave at Glenmount Drive near 45th street station will create substantial congestion as the development will be less than a block from the busy 45th street and 17th avenue station. The footprint of the proposed development does not provide substantial distance from the signal light to accommodate traffic especially on the busy 17th avenue corridor near the traffic signal. This location will be a traffic hazard especially if there is a drive through in this location.

Even without a drive through, if access to parking at the location comes from 17th avenue, there will still be impact to traffic for a location that would cater to the morning rush hour additionally, with a limited footprint in that area to accommodate significant parking, there will likely be congestion and spillover to enter the parking lot onto 17th avenue that would likely impede traffic from 17th avenue in rush hour. The land parcels that are proposed by the developer does not provide a significant amount of parking which may mitigate the traffic impact on 17th avenue. If a development of the size similar to the strip mall about three blocks further east was developed that has sufficient parking to handle the traffic, this would not be an issue, however the size of the development tract is the main problem for this development.

Additionally from a safety and traffic management perspective, if access to this site were to come through Glenmount drive, it is not designed to handle traffic capacity at this volume and may still create significant backups on either 17th avenue and/or Glenmount drive as there is less than half a block of space between 17th avenue and the proposed location.

I had been mentioned before that parking is not sufficient in the proposed development to allow for a Starbucks or similar development to be built, however the proposed land use also includes a potential for additional levels to be built with a maximum floor area ratio of 2.5. In the planning meeting, there was indication that standard TOD recommendations would encourage even higher density development. My concerns are regarding the potential parking located in that area. Otherwise there will be substantial spillover onto the local street area for parking which would negatively impact the community.

In reviewing the planning documents, I have noted that the recommendation was to refuse the approval of the application as it failed to meet the TOD use plans established for locations near a LRT station, to reject support for non-vehicular oriented uses in proximity to an LRT

station, and for a drive through to be located so close to an LRT station. I would like to know why the planning commission proceeded to move forward even after a recommendation had been to reject the application as it currently stands.

I am not opposed to development as a whole, and would welcome commercial developments in the community, however I have issues with the specific site that has been chosen as well as being so close to the 17th avenue and 45th street congestion point as well as the nature of the development which would likely encourage more traffic at the busiest time, during rush hour. I would be supportive of a development of this nature if there was a larger land footprint that can mitigate congestion and parking concerns of the community, further away from that traffic hot spot which can lead to many dangerous, or where a specific creative solution that can accommodate the traffic on an exception basis which will require full development plans to be submitted prior to approval.

I would support rather than outright rejecting a development, have the development approved only after plans submitted of a final design along with a traffic study on the area that would demonstrate that there would not be a safety hazard caused by this new development on the traffic in this area with mitigation on traffic impact to 17th avenue and parking impacts on the community built into the design throughout the day, but most importantly during the morning rush hour period.

If there are any questions regarding my concerns, do not hesitate to ask.

Thank you,

Kenneth Ho

**From:** [ken beckie](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] FW: letter of objection  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 4:46:13 PM

---

## **OBJECTION TO GLENDALE LOC2019-00761**

I object to the proposed application for  
Glendale LOC2019-00761

Traffic from both East and West on 17<sup>th</sup> Ave SW is already heavy. This will make more congestion.

-This area does not need another drive through for coffee etc.

There is one on Bow Trail, Dairy Queen, 4105 Bow Trail.

There is also one, 2<sup>nd</sup> Cup, on 17th Ave and 27<sup>th</sup> St. SW.

-Also, why 5 stories when earlier only 3 stories was suggested.

-Many of us who are living close to this location were not consulted as to our opinion.

-The response to the city's request for comments was 9 in support and 53 opposed.

Why would the project be approved?

Submitted by Helen and Ken Beckie

15 Glenview Dr. S.W.

Calgary AB T3E 4H4

Ph. 403 -242-3254

**From:** [Alberts, Denise](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076 application  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 5:35:19 PM

---

To whom it concerns:

We live at 10 Glenmount Cres. Sw in Glendale and I have to say that we are against the development at 17Th ave and Glenmount drive. This will significantly increase traffic on Glenmount Drive and through our community. Not to mention tying up traffic on 17 Ave. trying to get into and out of the starbuck's that is part of the plan. This development is planned for a spot only 2 blocks from the corner of 17Ave. and 45 St. a place that gets backed up regularly. There are problems at that corner that will only increase with traffic trying to enter and exit to or from this proposed site.

We were told that the developers had talked to people and that residents were in favor of having this development. We have never been in favor of this development and no one has asked. We were very surprised that the planning commission had approved it in October considering that more than 80% of residents were opposed to this development from the get-go. This speaks to that lack of community consultation in that the planning commission could have easily found out how much opposition there is to this project had they cared to find out.

This development is not wanted and not needed in our community. There are several other areas along 17Ave between Sarcee and 29th St. that are designated as commercial areas that have not been developed. Those areas are better suited for commercial development such as this proposal. There is no need to open up new land for commercial sites at this time.

We are residents of Glendale and see no need for this development and we are opposed to it. We want you to stop this development now.

Regards  
David Eady and Denise Alberts  
10 Glenmount Cres. Sw  
Glendale

**From:** [Pat Churchman](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Loc 2019-0076  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 5:37:01 PM

---

To City Council with regard to LOC 2019-0076

This letter is to summarize the objections we have to the proposed Land Use Designation of 4503, 4507, and 4511 - 17th Avenue SW.

The above noted application for land use has numerous problems as it does not conform to any policy documents applicable to the area, and it is also noted that there is no existing Area Redevelopment Plan. The application is for a C-COR 2 designation and is located adjacent to RC -1 lands. Many of the Land Use Designations are intended to be adjacent to RC-1 uses, however C-COR 2 is not one of them.

In addition, C-COR2 - Bylaw Section 796A - is supposed to apply to streets with commercial on both sides of the street... This does not apply here. Neither does - Bylaw Section 796C - Limited auto uses, nor does Bylaw Section 796G - residential uses and offices in the same building.

In the absence of a Local Area Plan, one should look to senior policies for guidance. The area is presently being considered for policy development under the study for the Westbrook area and as such, considering a land use outside the existing context is at least premature. As the site is within 100 metres of an established LRT Station, Transit Oriented Design Guidelines should be followed. Along with other guidance, uses that are considered not transit supportive include Drive Through uses. The applicant has stated that the need for the drive through is a 'showstopper' for the development. It should be noted that the City of Calgary has invested several billion dollars in LRT. Promoting auto uses with drive throughs will have far reaching ramifications undermining the LRT system. If this is allowed, many applications for drive throughs in TOD areas will result.

The developer has circulated plans and perspective drawings to the community and the area residents demonstrating the proposed development. To say the least, the developers have no intention of conforming to the rules of the land use bylaw 2P80 as there 25 violations of the land use being proposed from the preliminary design drawings. The diagrams provided contain the following failures of conformance:

1. Bylaw Section 805 - Required front yard requirements 3.0m - not provided.
2. Bylaw Section 807 - Required side yard requirements 5.0m - not provided.
3. Bylaw Section 808 - Must be soft surfaced landscaped - not provided.
4. Bylaw Section 808(1) - 1 tree and 2 shrubs for each 35 m2 of required landscaping - not provided.
5. Bylaw Section 808(2) - 1 tree for every 30 m2 - not provided.
6. Bylaw Section 808(2) - plantings must be linear - not shown.
7. Bylaw Section 808(4) - setback must be soft landscaped - not provided.
8. Bylaw Section 808(4) - Required rear yard requirements - not provided.
9. Bylaw Section 808(4) - 1 tree and 2 shrubs for each 35 m2 of required landscaping - not provided.
10. Bylaw Section 809(2) - parking rate of 2 stalls/100 m2 gross is inappropriate for the uses

sought.

11. Parking rate is for the use of Restaurant Food Service Only small or medium.
12. Parking rate is 1 stall/2.85 m<sup>2</sup> public area of restaurant.
13. Parking rate also applies to outdoor cafe at the rate of 1 stall/2.85 m<sup>2</sup> public area of patio.
14. 10% parking reduction shall be applied in TOD areas.
15. Bylaw Section 185A - Drive through use must be in conjunction with another use.
16. Bylaw Section 185B - Outdoor speakers cannot be installed for use within 23 m of a residential district.
17. Bylaw Section 185B - Outdoor speakers can be separated by an intervening building - not provided.
18. Bylaw Section 185E - No drive aisles are allowed within a required setback - not provided.
19. Bylaw Section 185I - 5 motor vehicle stalls required in queue - not provided.
20. Bylaw Section 247 - Outdoor cafe must be more than 25 m from a low density residential district - not provided.
21. Parking shown inadequate for uses sought by a substantial amount.
22. Garbage facilities not functionally shown - not provided.
23. After adjustments to meet the required bylaw setbacks, the loading zone for commercial uses will not meet standards.
24. Bylaw Section 279 c & d, if the restaurant is medium in size, prohibits operable openings (windows and doors) facing residential districts adjacent. The proposal has the order window facing residential development.
25. Bylaw Section 280 c & d, if the restaurant is small in size, prohibits operable openings (windows and doors) facing residential districts adjacent. The proposal has the order window facing residential development.

The list of difficulties with this proposed development and Land Use Application is long and complex. I would argue that the developer is not aware or does not understand the development regulations governing the C - COR 2 land use designation. A consolidation of the three properties will be required to develop the land as indicated. If the site develops a trip generation in excess of 100 peak hour trips, a Traffic Impact Assessment will be required. This may result in partial road closure of Glenmount Drive in the southerly direction to prevent overloading the local community roads with commercial traffic. This solution has been used elsewhere where commercial drive through traffic adjacent to low density residential land uses adversely affected local communities.

Through previously applied for Land Use Re-designations and Development Permits, it was directed that The City of Calgary Planning Department include the corridor in future studies on corridor development.

- this has not yet been studied
- no determination on appropriate uses has been made
- no policy has been generated to support this change
- as a result, this proposal is at least premature and at worst inappropriate.

This proposal generates safety and traffic issues which we list as follows:

- there are commercial opportunities in the community that are underdeveloped and in need of significant refurbishment.
- they exist at:
  - [45th Street](#) and 26th Avenue
  - 26th Avenue and [37th Street](#)
  - 17th Avenue and Glenside Drive

The argument that this commercial redevelopment is needed because of inadequate opportunities in already designated zones is incorrect.

There is an existing vacant site of a similar size south of 26 Avenue on [37th Street](#) that already has an approved drive through that could be converted for this use.

The argument is that this is to allow for a pedestrian focussed development is not supported when over 50% of the site is dedicated to automobiles.

A drive through is proposed which is hardly a pedestrian oriented development and is very much auto oriented.

Paragraph 3 in the overview is an argument against the development. It states what the purpose of Arterial Streets (17th Avenue) are, and it is not consistent with what is proposed.

The activities on the site are primarily auto focussed.

- 350 m<sup>2</sup> are buildings (+/-20% of the site)
- 1000 m<sup>2</sup> are parking and driveways (+/- 55% of the site)

Neither building conforms to the building setbacks as shown on the drawings. If the buildings were placed according to the setback rules, the site is too small for the use and is therefore overdeveloped.

As a result of zero proposed setbacks, all of the required standard landscaping cannot be installed. As landscaping on public right of way does not qualify for counting towards required landscaping, any such installation does not constitute an adequate solution.

All public right of way trees are missing from the drawings and are proposed to be removed???

This would be unacceptable to the community and the Parks Department.

The developer would have to pay the appraised value of all the trees removed and replace them.

Parking requirements are 35 and only 11 are provided, again suggesting overdevelopment of the site.

Headlights from the drive through lane will affect the surrounding residences.

Noise from associated uses will also interfere with the use of adjacent residential lots.

Support for the plan is overstated:

- many people I have spoken with are opposed.
- selectively representing support by the applicant is not productive and is a misrepresentation of facts.

As to the traffic analysis, the following applies:

- the proposed development would have a restriction of being a right in / right out only at the 17th Avenue entry.
- the same right in / right out exists further east at the Tim Hortons location at 38 Street and 17th Avenue the restrictions for right in / right out exist at:
  - the Esso Gas Bar
  - the east entry to the Shoppers Drug Mart
  - the west entry to the Tim Hortons

All similarly along the south side of 17th Avenue.

And the compliance to rules of the road is dismal

- on any given day, hundreds of traffic violations occur as people ignore the restriction of no left turns allowed across 17th Avenue to and from the establishment and this is at a location

where there is an all turns available on the site.

Imagine the non compliance rates where no legal access is available in the westbound direction!

- many accidents occur needlessly as laws are broken for convenience.

While redevelopment is necessary, it needs to be executed with thoughtful planning policy and as such it is both premature and not necessarily aligned with what that policy may be.

Only after thoughtful policy development with the community members and traffic analysis is undertaken, will it be appropriate to initiate development.

Daily traffic is backed up past Glenmount Drive in the PM westbound movement and adding additional temptation to drivers to duck across 17th Avenue illegally will cause confusion, risk accidents, and endanger pedestrians walking along the corridor.

In the section listed as "Proposed Land Use" the following comments are applicable:

- it is not commercial development both sides of the street (LRT on the north)
- The building setbacks are not respected
- It is not proposed as limited automotive uses
- no residential use is proposed
- automobile access is restricted
- no building elevations are shown but based on the layout they are likely to be blank walls.

The fact that they use the terminology "visual impression of a pedestrian friendly commercial street" while dedicating more than half of the site to cars is a conflict at best.

Until the Planning Department finds the priority to execute a policy document for the community, it is obviously too soon to start redevelopment in such a haphazard, disorganized fashion.

I look forward to providing this information with any clarifications necessary at the Council hearing.

Respectfully,  
Pat Churchman

MEDes, APPI, ACP  
Retired City of Calgary Senior Transportation Planner,  
City of Calgary Senior Transit Planner,  
City of Calgary Land Use and Policy Planner,  
Resident of Glendale.

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [hornbeam@shaw.ca](mailto:hornbeam@shaw.ca)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 7:53:29 PM

---

**RE: LOC-2019-0076**

I would like to voice my objection to proposed development LOC-2019-0076.  
Our community is R1 zoning and there is no place for commercial development, including 3 to 5 stories residential.

Ostap Haliw  
4107 Grosvenor Pl. S.W.  
403-697-4693

**From:** [Ostap Haliw](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Proposed development Application # LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 8:15:28 PM

---

I am strongly objecting proposed development, Application # LOC-2019-0076.  
It will increase traffic and crime in our community.  
This is R1 zoning after all!!!

Sincerely,  
Eugenia Haliw  
4107 Grosvenor Pl. S.W.  
402 249-9298

**From:** [hornbeam@shaw.ca](mailto:hornbeam@shaw.ca)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 8:29:52 PM

---

**RE: Proposed development. Application # LOC-2019-0076**

I would like to voice my strong objection to proposed development under application # **LOC-2019-0076**.

This is peaceful community with R1 zoning with lots of senior citizens.

We do not need increased traffic, crime and noise that will come with this proposed development.

Madge Clarke  
4115 Grosvenor Pl. S.W.  
403 249-2110

**From:** [Celeste Harrison](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 8:06:48 AM

---

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to you to express my objection to the application of a commercial development (application #LOC-2019-0076). We do not need more commercial development in our small community. There are multiple Starbucks nearby (Westbrook Mall, WestHills as well as the Chapters at Signal Hill and in the Safeway at WestHills and Glamorgan). The premise that the coffee shop would create community is ridiculous, when you consider that it's being billed as a Drive-thru. The purpose of the Drive-thru is convenience, not Community Building.

Since the construction of the LRT crime rates have increased in this area due to more transients. This particular corner is congested already with increase traffic for the LRT, and to bypass North/South lights on 45<sup>th</sup> Street. (North bound 45<sup>th</sup> Street does not have a left hand turn signal, so many people are traveling along Glenmount to circumnavigate this.

The height of the structure will negatively impact the community of Glendale.

I was also dismayed at the lack of communication that I received. The posting of the Development went up during the summer while many of my neighbours were on holidays (myself included) and we missed the deadline to express our concerns. When I wrote to my City Councilor (Jeff Davison and the President of Glendale/Glendale Meadows Chris Welner) to express my concern that residents were not adequately advised of proposed changes, I heard nothing back for either men. Interestingly the primary party concerned with the construction of the commercial property is related to a member on the Glendale/Glendale Meadows BofG.

Thank you for affording me the opportunity to express my objection to this proposal.

Celeste Harrison

**From:** [Liz Pirnie](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#); [Liz Pirnie](#); [Rob Green](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] December 16 Council Meeting : LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 9:16:48 AM

---

To whom it may concern,

I would like to request an opportunity to speak at the upcoming December 16 council meeting regarding LOC-2019-0076. My husband Robert Green would also like to be added to the docket.

Therefore, please reserve a five-minute place for myself, Liz Pirnie, and another 5 minutes for Robert Green for this date.

Thank you,

Liz Pirnie

403-861-4301

**From:** [DAVE AND SUE ROTHWELL](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Land use application LOC-2019-0076  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 10:12:10 AM

---

**We Strongly Protest the above application # LOC-2019-0076 for following reasons:**

1. We bought into the Glendale neighborhood for a certain lifestyle, single family homes with stable neighbors, to change this without community approval is not fair.
2. Increased traffic flow through neighborhood, particularly down Glenmount Drive in both directions, we already are experiencing significant traffic flow with people avoiding traffic jams on 17th Avenue SW and 45 Street SW, adding a drive through will only exacerbate this problem.
3. Traffic will back up on 17th Avenue during morning commute to work as cars will be entering drive through.
4. The noise from the speakers at proposed Starbucks at drive through will make sitting in our back yard uncomfortable.
5. Parking may become overcrowded as overflow cars from the proposed complex seek parking.
6. Headlight brightness from cars coming out of and into drive through in winter time will be a source of uncomfortable light in winter time.
7. The open areas in the proposed complex will become a hangout for homeless during off business hours jeopardizing safety of ourselves and our grandson. These areas often end up with all sorts of garbage and used needles.
8. Proposed building height not consistent with Glendale community
9. Possible decrease in property values as long term single family residents move out of area seeking a quieter single family lifestyle elsewhere.

Please consider all these negative consequences and not grant this application.

**From:** [Ron Panchuk](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Proposed Land Use Designation of 4503, 4507, and 4511 - 17th Avenue SW - LOC 2019-0076  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 11:09:50 AM  
**Attachments:** [List of Concerns to Planning Department..docx](#)

---

To City Council with regard to LOC 2019-0076

This letter is to summarize the objections we have to the proposed Land Use Designation of 4503, 4507, and 4511 - 17th Avenue SW. I live on Glenmount Drive in Glendale and thus have a direct interest in this Application.

Attached is a list of concerns submitted to the City Of Calgary Planning that were sent to Lindsay in the City's Planning Department. The main areas of concern were the lack meaningful and genuine community engagement, effects of traffic from the proposed drive thru on local community, and the fact the proposal was "half baked" and not in compliance with a plethora of existing City planning criteria and bylaws.

We understand the City of Calgary Planning Department did **NOT** endorse the proposed Land Use designation but it was approved at the Planning Commission level notwithstanding.

While not completely familiar with the planning business – our family has just built a custom house in Glendale and through our architects went through rigorous permitting and planning approvals in order to comply with City codes, policies and planning requirements – so we have had a taste of it. Whilst we grumbled- we were happy to bear the expense and time to work with the City to get the result. We believe good planning is important to keep Calgary as an attractive modern city. We were not able to do everything we wanted but as citizens we understood "rules are rules". Moreover my wife is a commercial designer who regularly deals with the city administration on planning and construction issues. Our experience is the City is "tough" but "fair". **"Fair" means equal application of the rules – no special treatment for those with access.**

I have had the benefit of reading my neighbor, Pat Churchman's submission to Council in this regard. Pat is an expert in this area. I was taken aback by the length of the list of areas where this Application is deficient. This leads to the core concern with this Application and the process. While the rest of us seemingly need to follow all the rules – the Developer has seemingly had a "**free pass**" to get what it wants notwithstanding a superficial process, vigorous community opposition and objection from the Planning Department. In Mr. Churchman's - view the application is flawed and not consistent with the City's stated objectives for development of community friendly commercial areas near the LRT.

In the end it seems apparent this is all about **this Developer** wanting a property with a very lucrative "**Starbucks Drive Thru**" tenant on a busy through fare (17<sup>th</sup> Ave). This is the antithesis of a pedestrian friendly commercial "town centre" based on the nearby LRT. We, and our neighbors, are at a loss to understand why this Developer is on fast track to a development that is contrary to the City's own stated objectives for the area, contrary to the advice of the City's own Planning Department, and contrary to the interests of the local residents most clearly affected by it.

Yours truly,

Ron Panchuk  
*Executive Vice President*



Cell: 1.403.703.5694  
Main: 1.403.454.7564  
[ron@mahaenergy.ca](mailto:ron@mahaenergy.ca)  
[www.mahaenergy.ca](http://www.mahaenergy.ca)

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.

## List of Concerns

### **1. Community Support**

The Application suggests there is a ground swell of community support for the project. This is a bit **disingenuous**. The first I became aware of the project was in relation to a community sponsored Stampede Breakfast (the “Breakfast”) which we attended earlier this month. The Applicants had sponsored a booth that provided coffee and were there to answer questions. Some brochures were available but certainly not enough (i.e. they were not being offered as takeaways) and no real time to study the proposal. Many people in the neighborhood were there – but by far not all- and all that I spoke with were seeing this proposal for the first time. There was a huge crowd mostly because this was an advertised “free” breakfast – they were NOT mostly residents.

I can confirm prior to this (and since) as far as we are aware:

- There were no fliers/brochures delivered to our door explaining the project and inviting meaningful feed back.
- No apparent door to door discussion with those immediately impacted
- No general separate meeting called (with proper notice to all) to hear a detailed presentation
- No survey conducted
- No indication the school /parent group of the school on Glenmount Dr was consulted

I did have a discussion with one of the co-owners. I advised them that we are not against development per se but that it was important to garner community support – and that that had not been done. I did advise them clearly the “elephant in the room” would be “traffic”. I made a number of clear suggestions to him on “traffic” issues (discussed below). I indicated my and (I suspected) community support would only come if these issues were adequately addressed. I provided my email address and offered to provide more detailed feedback if they were interested. Moreover, there was a sticker board at this event – I read the stickers as they stood at about 11:00 AM. I counted at least 20 that talked of concerns over traffic and numerous others raising a plethora of concerns. I was also able to overhear many other people express grave concerns – particularly on traffic.

In the end – to suggest meaningful community support has been garnered – and to use the word “overwhelming”- is inaccurate and exaggerated. Does that mean we are necessarily “against” the project -no. As you read this email you will understand the concerns and conditions necessary for it to be supported.

### **2. Nature of the Glendale Community**

The Glendale community is a tight knit community made up of primarily young families and people at or near retirement age. It is “very” residential and those who have chosen to live here do so for the walkability, parks, sense of community, safety, local schools, and low traffic. This is NOT a busy urban hub where people have made a life style choice to sacrifice the above qualities for access to commercial services (such as drive thru Starbucks).

### 3. Traffic

In our view the first and foremost obvious issue arising from the Development is the impact on traffic throughout the Glendale community and especially Glenmount Drive. This is obvious to **everyone** yet nothing in the Application (except for a vague reference to traffic consultants as part of the development team) or the proposed plan touches on the issue. To suggest there is “overwhelming” community support without having tackled this issue beggars belief.

At the Breakfast we had a detailed conversation with one the co-owners (Chris Jones). He was a polite man who appeared willing to listen to concerns. He indicated he was in building industry previously but had no development experience. I indicated in no uncertain terms they did not have our (and I suspect any of the community’s support) for the project if it meant increased traffic in the community and in particular along Glenmount Drive. We jointly reviewed the design and noted the exit was spilling on to Glenmount. Even if a “no right” turn sign was erected- this owner acknowledged- traffic would be funneled down Glenmount Drive. This is especially so if there is a **drive thru**.

It was explained Glenmount was a walking street full of seniors and young kids walking and riding bikes in a residential environment. Moreover, there was an elementary school and a very busy community club on the street. We suggested a solution - namely what had been done in Kensington, Peters Drive Inn and Scarborough. Blocking off access to right turn and funneling traffic on to 17<sup>th</sup> Ave which is designed as a traffic thoroughfare. This co-owner said he was not aware of what had been done in these communities and thought it was an excellent idea. We discussed creating a community sponsored park/seating area where the road was blocked with garden etc.

In fairness, I did receive an email after your notice the text of which I am including below:

**From:** Chris Jones <[chris@cnjdevelopments.com](mailto:chris@cnjdevelopments.com)>  
**Date:** July 22, 2019 at 12:43:20 PM MDT  
**To:** [ron@mahaenergy.ca](mailto:ron@mahaenergy.ca)  
**Subject:** Contact Information

Hi Ron,

*I hope that your Stampede finished up well and that you are having a great summer. Lee and I wanted to thank your wife and you for coming out to the Stampede breakfast and the feedback on our development.*

*We are continuing to work on our design, putting together all of the engagement feedback and will have a plan for left turns out of the drive through to feed traffic back onto 17th.*

*Is there anything that you wanted to chat about in the meantime? And once we are further along let me know and we would be happy to meet. You have some great experience on "buy in" and working with people. Especially doing it internationally with cultural challenges etc. Is there a book that you recommend as I am looking to work on this skill?*

Thanks again for your feedback and support. Below in my signature is my contact information.

Regards,

Chris

<CNJ\_logo\_SIGNATURE\_rev06.png>

As earlier stated in this letter and in my conversation at the Breakfast, I am not against a development (i.e. nimbyism) if done properly but that this Development is not needed and would be opposed if there was increased traffic resulting. I indicated to Chris then and do now I would be happy to assist in making sure the process is handled correctly with proper design and support. I believe many of neighbors feel the same way.

That said I do feel compelled to make the position clear in this letter because the "Overview" is silent on this very important issue and we did not want the City to have the wrong impression at this stage. I am hopeful the Applicant is true to their word (the above email) and the concern is addressed properly. Chris seemed genuine and intelligent- thus our hope.

#### **4. Drive Thru Starbucks and other Tenants**

The Applicant disclosed the lead tenant would be a Starbucks Drive Thru coffee shop. Drive Thrus are always controversial. There is already a Tim Horton's coffee shop five blocks away. There is a drive thru Starbucks in the Sarcee mall five minutes by car. So- it is clear the neighborhood is well serviced for local coffee shops drive thru or not. If the Applicant were to be frank it would acknowledge the location of this drive thru Starbucks is ideal to capture the traffic down 17 Ave- a major thoroughfare. The vast majority of the prospective customers do **NOT live in the community**. So, the benefits the community would enjoy from the anchor tenant are questionable (yes, a walk for an occasional coffee).

As to other potential tenants – there are a plethora of other strip malls within a 2.5 kilometer radius that provide to the community most commercial services including: dry cleaners, take outs, restaurants, liquor stores, pubs, vacuum shop, bakeries, liquor stores, pharmacy, corner stores, pizza, ethnic foods, dentists, doctors, automobile repair, gas stations, wine stores, etc. If you expand that to four kilometres you have major retailers like Coop, Canadian Tire, Good Life, Save-On etc. So -it is hard to imagine what the community is missing in terms of commercial services.

*We think everyone needs to be honest on this point. This is a good opportunity for the Developer (Applicant) to attract premium rents because it will have drive thru on main traffic artery and a new attractive development. Further the tenants will have good businesses because of the location on a high traffic thoroughfare. **The level of marginal benefit to the nearby residents is low – the***

*benefits are primarily for others. In our and our neighbors view- if the Application is to proceed – all concerns of the community need to be adequately addressed. The status quo is better than the Development proposed so far. The Overview fails to recognise this imperative. It suggests the community's concerns need to be balanced because of the benefits it receives- not so.*

## **5. Nature, Design and Size of the Project**

There remains a lack of clarity on the size and nature of the project. On one hand the Overview touts the project as pedestrian friendly (no doubt to garner community support) but proposes a drive thru which is NOT pedestrian friendly. Is the project only one floor? If it is two-three floors that changes the look, scope and nature of the intended and unintended consequences on the Community. The Community has the right to know exactly what is proposed from the outset. The Overview is vague and premature.

How many cars will come ago? What will be the hours of business? What kind of tenants? Office? How much retail? How many offices? What is the intention? There is no clear explanation?

As to design - it appears the Development is built to the street without set back for landscaping? What will this look like? Is it consistent with the community design? Will everyone just see walls? How high? Will that affect light?

In our view the Application is premature. There are too many unknowns and no meaningful opportunity to provide meaningful feedback until the unknowns are more well known.

## **6. Parking**

Related to the above is the issue of parking. The drawings attached to the Overview appear to show parking for 11 cars? How can this be adequate? We and the Community deserve the opportunity to thoroughly understand the more complete package and understand the impact on parking. The community has legitimate interest in ensuring it is not used as spill over for a development with insufficient parking. First, we need all the answers to questions raised in #5 above.

## **7. Need for Project**

As set forth above – there is **no clear** need for the project and at best marginal benefit to the Community. The drive thru will primarily service those that use 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue who will not be from the Community. The point here is there is **no overwhelming imperative** for the Development. No need to hurry. If it is to proceed it should be only once the full scale and proposed design for the land use is disclosed to the community, all the issues are thoroughly vetted and managed to a level of general satisfaction and the traffic issues are adequately minimized.

What is being asked is the approval of a land use change based on a barely baked proposal. It is clear much more work needs to be done before this can proceed. The Application is premature.

## **8. Planning before Land Use Change**

Whilst not a planning expert I do know from discussion with neighbors who are – the cart appears to be before the horse in terms of recommended best planning practices. We would request the City only consider this application in the context of a full Area Redevelopment Plan given the issues such a development raise. We have read and are at one with other submissions made by neighbors on issue concerning the process and development requirements.

## **9. Way Forward**

**It is our submission this Application is grossly premature and should be dismissed - if not voluntarily withdrawn by the Developer. The direction to the Applicant should be to further develop the Application keeping in mind the concerns raised and revert with a more detailed proposal. At that time specific community input should be welcomed. We are confident if the Applicant is willing to engage on this basis a better proposed Development and Land Use changed will be successful with proper community support.**

I would be happy to answer any questions from your office and or attend meeting with our without the Developer to explain the position. I can be reached on my cell 403 703 5694 or [ron@mahaenergy.ca](mailto:ron@mahaenergy.ca).

Best Regards

Ron Panchuk

**From:** [Leslee Simmons](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] LOC -2019-0076 - Glendale - Development Concerns  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 11:20:57 AM

---

Hello,

I am sending this message to advocate AGAINST 3 to 5 storey development in my community of Glendale.

At the time the city came to meet with our community there was no one present that was in favor of the proposed changes and the attendance was the highest the city had seen.

The reason we moved to Glendale because we loved the community as it is, houses were spaced well, no houses were tall enough to be peering into your back yard and there was a level of privacy that we truly value.

We moved away from Cougar Ridge as we found the surrounding areas density was to be increasing and we were not interested in living in that environment

We are not opposed to 2 story structures in Glendale at all, in fact we appreciate the newer build that are bringing new life to the community.

We are also very concerned that the current water, electricity, parking and increase traffic volume will negatively impact the quality of our community.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter , I hope that it is actually being heard and that the process isn't what it appears to be, asking for feedback but moving forward with disregard for the community tax payers wishes.

Thank you.

*Leslee Simmons*

403-389-3538

**From:** [Ron Panchuk](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] RE: Proposed Land Use Designation of 4503, 4507, and 4511 - 17th Avenue SW - LOC 2019-0076  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 11:28:06 AM

---

Hello again

I do plan to speak on December 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of council. Please add me to the docket.

Ron Panchuk  
*Executive Vice President*



Cell: 1.403.703.5694  
Main: 1.403.454.7564  
[ron@mahaenergy.ca](mailto:ron@mahaenergy.ca)  
[www.mahaenergy.ca](http://www.mahaenergy.ca)

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.

---

**From:** Ron Panchuk  
**Sent:** December 9, 2019 11:05 AM  
**To:** 'publicsubmissions@calgary.ca' <publicsubmissions@calgary.ca>  
**Subject:** Proposed Land Use Designation of 4503, 4507, and 4511 - 17th Avenue SW - LOC 2019-0076

To City Council with regard to LOC 2019-0076

This letter is to summarize the objections we have to the proposed Land Use Designation of 4503, 4507, and 4511 - 17th Avenue SW. I live on Glenmount Drive in Glendale and thus have a direct interest in this Application.

Attached is a list of concerns submitted to the City Of Calgary Planning that were sent to Lindsay in the City's Planning Department. The main areas of concern were the lack meaningful and genuine community engagement, effects of traffic from the proposed drive thru on local community, and the fact the proposal was "half baked" and not in compliance with a plethora of existing City planning criteria and bylaws.

We understand the City of Calgary Planning Department did **NOT** endorse the proposed Land Use designation but it was approved at the Planning Commission level notwithstanding.

While not completely familiar with the planning business – our family has just built a custom house in Glendale and through our architects went through rigorous permitting and planning approvals in order to comply with City codes, policies and planning requirements – so we have had a taste of it. Whilst we grumbled- we were happy to bear the expense and time to work with the City to get the result. We believe good planning is important to keep Calgary as an attractive modern city. We were not able to do everything we wanted but as citizens we understood “rules are rules”. Moreover my wife is a commercial designer who regularly deals with the city administration on planning and construction issues. Our experience is the City is “tough” but “fair”. **“Fair” means equal application of the rules – no special treatment for those with access.**

I have had the benefit of reading my neighbor, Pat Churchman’s submission to Council in this regard. Pat is an expert in this area. I was taken aback by the length of the list of areas where this Application is deficient. This leads to the core concern with this Application and the process. While the rest of us seemingly need to follow all the rules – the Developer has seemingly had a **“free pass”** to get what it wants notwithstanding a superficial process, vigorous community opposition and objection from the Planning Department. In Mr. Churchman’s - view the application is flawed and not consistent with the City’s stated objectives for development of community friendly commercial areas near the LRT.

In the end it seems apparent this is all about **this Developer** wanting a property with a very lucrative **“Starbucks Drive Thru”** tenant on a busy through fare (17<sup>th</sup> Ave). This is the antithesis of a pedestrian friendly commercial “town centre” based on the nearby LRT. We, and our neighbors, are at a loss to understand why this Developer is on fast track to a development that is contrary to the City’s own stated objectives for the area, contrary to the advice of the City’s own Planning Department, and contrary to the interests of the local residents most clearly affected by it.

Yours truly,

Ron Panchuk  
*Executive Vice President*



Cell: 1.403.703.5694  
Main: 1.403.454.7564  
[ron@mahaenergy.ca](mailto:ron@mahaenergy.ca)  
[www.mahaenergy.ca](http://www.mahaenergy.ca)

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.



**From:** [Liz Pirnie](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] To City Council: #LOC2019-0076  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 11:29:19 AM  
**Attachments:** [#LOC2019-0076- December.docx](#)

---

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached a letter providing feedback in regards to #LOC2019-0076.

Thank you,

Liz Pirnie

December 7, 2019

Liz Pirnie, PhD  
1908 Glenmount Dr. SW  
Calgary, Alberta  
T3E 4B5

Office of the City Clerk  
800 Macleod Trail SE  
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station "M"  
Calgary, AB  
T2P 2M5

Subject: #LOC2019-0076

Dear City Councillors,

Please accept this, my third letter of submission since August 2019, in **opposition** to the Land Use Amendment application, #LOC2019-0076. I am speaking on behalf of my household adjacent to the proposed development (1908 Glenmount Dr. SW) and by proxy for our neighbour Patricia Reimer (1908 Greenridge Rd.).

To begin, please note that we are not flatly opposed to development at the proposed site along 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW as we recognize the city's mandate for high density development along LRT stations. Our opposition has been, and remains, focused on two significant concerns: **First**, there has been an **absence of formal consultation** between the developers, our community association (the board upon which one of the developers sits), and the community at large who it appears have been kept strategically uninformed, and for those who have spoken against the development, astonishingly unheard; **Second**, the development's current design relies explicitly on the inclusion of a **drive-through** Starbucks that exits onto Glenmount Dr. SW. Not only does this central design feature focus primarily on a "traffic-oriented" rather than "pedestrian-oriented" commercial enterprise - despite unsubstantiated claims to the contrary - it also presents a number of logistical issues relating to the density of traffic flow along 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW and the inevitable increase in traffic down Glenmount Dr. SW and through our community.

### **1. Consultation**

Our home is located at 1908 Glenmount Dr. SW and is one of four adjacent properties to the proposed development. Although the proposal claims that this development "is something community members have been saying the community is in need for some time", there is no evidence of any formal consultation with the community before the June 28, 2019 submission date.

As one of the homeowners that will be most impacted by this development, we can tell you that insufficient efforts have been made to contact us by the developers – we have not spoken to any representative nor has there been a community association town hall meeting on the proposed development - a fact that we find frustrating and rather bewildering, particularly in light of claims to the contrary. The development proposal claims that through their consultation with the community, "There were comments as well about the parking, noise from the order board and whether residential could be on the second floor. Understanding that not all projects will deliver all elements the general feedback is supportive..." While these comments appear to reflect reasonable concerns that one might expect of

homeowners close to the proposed property, they have not come from those homeowners because, again, those closest to the proposed development were not consulted before this proposal was submitted in June 2019.

Having ourselves canvassed the neighbourhoods between 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW and 26<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW, we have found that there has been no formal consultation within the immediate development vicinity and the broader community. A fact that has left many of us opposed to the development. This broad opposition is further evidenced by the overwhelming number of letters, 53, that were sent to the planning commission in opposition to the development, while only 9 were sent in support.

## 2. Drive-through

Our concerns and opposition to the proposed plan and its inclusion of a commercial drive-through at this location have been previously submitted, and later mirrored and more proficiently articulated in the Planning and Development Report to the Calgary Planning Commission by Senior Planner, Lindsay Ganczar, on October 17, 2019. If council will not adhere to the explicit and repeated recommendations of **REFUSAL** presented in this report, we feel that our words in this regard are likely of little consideration. The only thing of consequence that we can offer that may still resonate with the council is the following:

As the proposed drive-through has limited internal space to accommodate what would be a very busy destination for those driving down 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW, primarily from Aspen Woods, it is likely that the drive-through line-up will spill onto 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW. As the proposed entrance to the drive-through is within a block of the 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. and 45<sup>th</sup> St. intersection, a line-up of cars along 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW would certainly cause disruptions to both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

As a home owner adjacent to the proposed development, we can speak to the traffic logistics of the immediate area. During regular high-traffic periods (morning, lunch, late afternoon, and after-work rushes) it is typical for a driver to wait for extended periods (i.e. the full duration of a green light ) before being able to exit onto 17 Ave. SW from Glenmount Dr. SW travelling East. These waits can be substantially longer when drivers are traveling West. Subsequently, it is not uncommon to have 2 or 3 cars lined up on Glenmount Dr. SW waiting to exit onto 17<sup>th</sup> Ave SW. As the demands of a drive-through necessitate that cars are able to exit promptly, we anticipate that during these frequent high-traffic periods, customers of the drive-through will head South down Glenmount Dr. SW and into our community in order to avoid the frustrations of waiting to get onto 17<sup>th</sup> Ave SW.

In addition to the above mentioned concerns, it worth nothing that the development proposal itself clearly states that the inclusion of a drive-through “historically does not enhance the public realm”, but offers no argument to claim that their proposed project is different. The drive-through is clearly a “**traffic-oriented**” commercial enterprise that does not add value to our community. To the contrary, its introduction threatens the idyllic character of our neighbourhood.

Thank you council members for your attention to this matter. We look forward to future consultations with you on December 16<sup>th</sup> at the Public Hearing.

Sincerely,

Liz Pirnie, PhD, Robert Green and Pat Reimer

CPC2019-1112

Attach 8

Letter 32

1908 Glenmount Dr. SW and 1908 Greenridge Rd.  
Calgary, AB T3E 4B5  
403-861-4301

Bylaw

23102019



Mrs. Ila Payette  
1964 Green Ridge Rd SW  
Calgary, AB T3E 4B1

Please do not allow this plan to go ahead. Starbucks is not family friendly - so it will draw people who are on their way to somewhere else with no concern for our "family neighborhood".

The 45 & 17 intersection is a very busy place. If people eastbound on 17 are slow to enter this business ever more accidents will happen.

Please do not allow this plan.



December 2/19

I live at 1964 Green Ridge Road Southwest. The plan for this new development is a "terrible" plan. The intersection where customers would exit is a busy place that would be very dangerous to both customers and those of us who live near by. It has to navigate