

Banff Trail Community Association Comments

October 21, 2019

Community Association Feedback Form

By providing feedback on the proposed development that is enclosed in this package, you are providing your community association's perspective as the "eyes of the community." This helps City staff better understand what is important to your community as we work with the applicant who has proposed this development, and it enables us to make an informed decision about whether to issue this development permit. In the course of this development permit evaluation, the planning department will review all relevant statutory plans including the Municipal Development Plan, Area Redevelopment or Area Structure Plans as well as the Land Use Bylaw.

File Numbers: **LOC 2019-0081 / DP2019-4101**

Parcel Address: **2103, 2107 24 Avenue NW**

Name of Planning Representative/s who completed this form: **Wayne Howse**

Community Association: **Banff Trail**

Date returned: **October 21, 2019**

I commit to the Planning System core values: innovation, collaboration, transparency, accountability, trust, and responsibility. **Yes**

Please provide your perspective and respond to the following questions

The Banff Trail Community Association provides the comments below based on a collation of community resident input as provided by email correspondence, or through direct engagement at recent community information sharing and engagement events.

1. What are the strengths and challenges of the proposed development?
 - The proposed offers a significant degree of articulation and through this and the use of material differentiation attempts to minimize massing and related impacts as well as establishes some distinction between the residential and commercial elements.
 - The at-grade articulation along both street front elevations help supply contrast relief, increase visual interest, and provides well for pedestrian use.
 - There are several concerns of note related to the scale and density of the proposed. These include:
 - Increased local traffic congestion and parking concerns - the TOD stall credit notwithstanding, it was reiterated that the provided parking allotment ratios would be insufficient relative to both residential and commercial uses. Moreover, it has been postulated by some that commercial / retail viability at this location would entail a net influx of traffic further exacerbating the matter. These concerns are informed by area residents direct evidence and experience with the parking and congestion impacts of recent area developments which although significantly more modest in scale than the

Banff Trail Community Association Comments

- proposed allowed for the same policy based influences and credit and allotment schemes which have not played out in the reality of material effect.
- Related concerns about the crosswalk at the intersection of 24th Avenue 20th Street include the difficulty of navigating this busy intersection both as a driver and as a pedestrian. The concern is that the increased density and use at this intersection through the influence of both the proposed and the other current application directly across 24th Avenue will only degrade this situation further.
 - The provided Transportation Impact Study while considering the proposed along with all other current applications along 24th Avenue does not consider or model the predicted cumulative effect of the proposed within the fully realized context of either how the applicant envisions redevelopment will proceed throughout the community, nor that which the Banff Trail ARP also identifies as a goal. This should be rectified and provided to the community.
 - Concerns of increased noise as an associated compound by-product of increases in density, traffic, and commercial use.
 - The policy goals of the ARP notwithstanding it was consistently noted that the proposed is significantly out of context and inconsistent with the surrounding pattern of development. Of note is the application for amendment to the ARP to allow for commercial development at this location.
 - Concerns were also shared about the height of the proposed with the resulting overlooking / onlooking / privacy concerns for adjacent residents.
 - Additionally, the material affects of the proposed (in its overall scale and the commercial / retail aspects) on adjacent properties and residents, including the potential loss of enjoyment of use or privacy by adjacent residents, as well as loss of value - either through resale or redevelopment potential of the impacted properties – were noted concerns.
- Concerns related to the loss of mature trees under this application and the resulting negative impact to the urban forest with its social and environmental benefit were also noted by area residents. The area councillor is on record as being an advocate for the beneficial social and environmental benefits of a flourishing urban forest as well as the compromising impacts of urban redevelopment projects on its viability through overuse of land and minimal or sub-par tree replacement programs (“shrubs are not trees”).
 - Relatedly community members cited the loss of viable permeable surfaces for localized runoff management associated with this application. The result here is that local run-off from the proposed will potentially be re-directed into the stormwater system having downstream ecological impacts by increasing deleterious environmental influence on the river systems.
 - Also noted with the proposed is the absence of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design or similar such Green Build environmental standards, use of materials etc. and renewables integration. It was further suggested that such applications include such standards and practices as a matter of course or bylaw expectation, leveraging the most advanced technology and innovative design standards available, in particular in relation to the opportunity presented by

Banff Trail Community Association Comments

such community redevelopment scenarios, both to the benefit of the local community and the greater public good.

- Concerns and conjectures were raised that term tenancy needs of the University are being downloaded on the community with the contention that such residency needs are better addressed through on-campus and not with off-campus schemes which do not align with the spirit and intent of either the ARP or the residential nature of the community.
2. Are there changes that could be made to the proposed development to make it more compatible or beneficial to the area?

Community feedback here includes:

- Better integration and harmonization with surrounding context and pattern of development through design amendments and improvements including changes scale and massing resulting in a more discreet and less-conspicuous multiplex design that still achieve the ARP policy goals of modest increase in density and diverse housing options.
 - Consider the removal of commercial / retail component and the associated policy amendments of the application.
 - Install improved infrastructure on 24th Avenue to mitigate traffic and pedestrian concerns.
 - Increase available onsite parking.
3. Provide comments on the following. You may wish to consider height, privacy, parking, vehicle or pedestrian access and landscaping as you respond to these questions.
- a. The use (if identified – not applicable for single-detached houses, semi-detached dwellings or duplexes):
 - b. The site design:
 - c. The building design:

Questions 3a, 3b, and 3c have been addressed above with answers provided for Questions 1 and 2.

4. Please provide any additional comments or concerns regarding the proposed development:

Community comments included legal considerations and influences of the Restrictive Covenant for this application at this location. Respecting the City's more recent amendment to the ARP acknowledging the misalignment of the ARP policy with the Covenant, for area residents the noted concern was that any advancement of City Land Use policy in direct contravention of an enforceable legal contractual instrument backed by civil case law has the appearance of misdirection potentially placing redevelopment applicants in a double bind resulting in wasted effort and cost. Further to this we note the corollary advanced by some residents that the policy goals of the ARP for modest increase in density can be achieved differently than the proposed at this location, while the specific goals of this application can be realized elsewhere.