

**Smith, Theresa L.**

---

**From:** Kathy <kathypidlubny@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 30, 2017 7:45 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXT] 10310 Eamon Road NW  
**Attachments:** Public Hearing 08302017.pdf; Public Hearing 208302017.pdf

Please see attached

Gary Cousineau & Kathy Pidlubny

**RECEIVED**

**2017 AUG 31 AM 8:12**

**THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERK'S**

August 29, 2017

RECEIVED

Office of the City Clerk  
The City of Calgary  
700 Macleod Trail SE  
PO BOX 2100 Sation M  
Calgary AB T2P 2M5

2017 AUG 31 AM 8:12

THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERK'S

Re: **Application to amend the Land Use Designation: BYLAW NUMBER 299D2017**

Location: 10310 Eamon Road NW

Public Hearing Date: September 11, 2017

Dear Mayor and Members of Council:

I wish to submit for your consideration the following comments in regard to the above referenced Land Use Amendment.

As a land owner immediately adjacent to the proposed development, I wish to go on record as being vehemently opposed to the amendment, as forwarded to me from the City Planning, Development and Assessment Department, for the reasons documented below.

1. The proposal does not, in my opinion, address nor conform to the policies as set out in the City of Calgary Transit Oriented Policy Guidelines document (amended December 2005). For example, page 14 of the TOD Guidelines (4.0 Policy Objective) states "it is important that auto-oriented development does not overwhelm the station area" and yet the Application Submission Statement proposes a "High Density Medium Rise (M-H2)" development with a multi-level parkade. I ask – how is this development proposal with its numerous additional parking spaces not going to overwhelm the station area? The TOD Guideline also states that it "should not be located in the immediate area where there is high pedestrian and bus traffic".
2. As stated in 5.2 TOD Guideline – Minimize the Impacts of Density: "Consideration for impacts of height on shadowing and massing should be made in determining transitions as well." The proposal as outlined at the TOD Information meeting held on March 31, 2015 appears to give NO consideration to the existing residential communities of Royal Oak and Rocky Ridge. The proposed high-rise causes significant shadowing of the existing residences and also significantly destroys the views for which we, as owners, paid a premium price when purchasing our homes. One only has to look at existing real estate sales to see the difference in the cost commanded for the purchase of a property having a view. Again, NO consideration seems to be given by the developer for existing adjacent homeowners.
3. In the Application Submission Statement I read that "similar building forms can be found all along the northwest leg of the LRT". What is missing is the observation that at the other LRT station sites a good deal of commercial and previously existing high-rise residential properties were already present. The Tuscany Station site has none of these. It is strictly limited to townhomes and single-family dwellings. Constructing a multi-story, multi-residential building on this site does in no way fit with the rest of the community.
4. With regard to item 8.1 TOD Guideline – consider reduced parking requirements, the proposal again ignores this guideline by incorporating a multi-level parkade in the design. How does this encourage residents to use the LRT?

5. As to item 9.3 TOD Guideline -- Built form should complement the local context. This guideline states that "Transitions between established residential areas and the new TOD area should provide a sensitive interface. Low-rise, medium density residential or low-profile mixed-use development may be used as an appropriate transitional use between adjacent low-density residential and the TOD area." The Application Submission Statement and the proposal which was presented at the March 31, 2015 meeting totally ignored this guideline statement. What is the use of a "Guideline" if it is to be ignored?
6. Traffic noise along Rocky Ridge Road is a continuing issue currently for those of us living adjacent to this busy thoroughfare and that will only be made much worse if this proposed development is allowed to proceed. Traffic calming measures are needed right now, let alone what could be expected with the addition of an additional 275 residential units (the number as stated in the Applicant's Submission).
7. I suggest an appropriate use of this development site would be a project consisting of townhomes of a maximum three stories. This would fit with the TOD Guidelines, would blend in and complement the existing residential communities and create no or very limited shadowing and massing issues. A redesignation of the site to M-H2 Multi-Residential -High Density Medium Rise does NOT in any way, shape or form fit within our community.

Of even greater benefit would be the creation of a city park with gardens, park benches, perhaps even some picnic tables so that our community would have an area for recreation and reflection overlooking the magnificent Rocky Mountains. Now that would be something of which we all could be proud!

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Cousineau  
100 Royal Manor NW  
Calgary AB T3G 5T6  
email:cousineaugary@gmail.com  
Phone: 403-228-6916

cc: Mayor Naheed Nenshi  
Councillor Joe Magliocca  
Councillor Ward Sutherland

August 25, 2017

Office of the City Clerk  
The City of Calgary  
700 Macleod Trail SE  
PO BOX 2100 Station M  
Calgary AB T2P 2M5

CPC2017-301  
Attachment 3  
Letter 2

RECEIVED  
2017 AUG 25 PM 3:06  
THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERK'S

Re: **Application to amend the Land Use Designation: BYLAW NUMBER 299D2017**

Location: 10310 Eamon Road NW

Public Hearing Date: September 11, 2017

Dear Mayor and Members of Council:

I wish to submit for your consideration the following comments in regard to the above referenced Land Use Amendment.

As a land owner immediately adjacent to the proposed development, I wish to go on record as being vehemently opposed to the amendment, as forwarded to me from the City Planning, Development and Assessment Department, for the reasons documented below.

1. The proposal does not, in my opinion, address nor conform to the policies as set out in the City of Calgary Transit Oriented Policy Guidelines document (amended December 2005). For example, page 14 of the TOD Guidelines (4.0 Policy Objective) states "it is important that auto-oriented development does not overwhelm the station area" and yet the Application Submission Statement proposes a "High Density Medium Rise (M-H2)" development with a multi-level parkade. I ask – how is this development proposal with its numerous additional parking spaces not going to overwhelm the station area? The TOD Guideline also states that it "should not be located in the immediate area where there is high pedestrian and bus traffic".
2. As stated in 5.2 TOD Guideline – Minimize the Impacts of Density: "Consideration for impacts of height on shadowing and massing should be made in determining transitions as well." The proposal as outlined at the TOD Information meeting held on March 31, 2015 appears to give NO consideration to the existing residential communities of Royal Oak and Rocky Ridge. The proposed high-rise causes significant shadowing of the existing residences and also significantly destroys the views for which we, as owners, paid a premium price when purchasing our homes. One only has to look at existing real estate sales to see the difference in the cost commanded for the purchase of a property having a view. Again, NO consideration seems to be given by the developer for existing adjacent homeowners.
3. In the Application Submission Statement I read that "similar building forms can be found all along the northwest leg of the LRT". What is missing is the observation that at the other LRT station sites a good deal of commercial and previously existing high-rise residential properties were already present. The Tuscany Station site has none of these. It is strictly limited to townhomes and single-family dwellings. Constructing a multi-story, multi-residential building on this site does in no way fit with the rest of the community.
4. With regard to item 8.1 TOD Guideline – consider reduced parking requirements, the proposal again ignores this guideline by incorporating a multi-level parkade in the design. How does this encourage residents to use the LRT?
5. As to item 9.3 TOD Guideline – Built form should complement the local context. This guideline states that "Transitions between established residential areas and the new TOD area

should provide a sensitive interface. Low-rise, medium density residential or low-profile mixed-use development may be used as an appropriate transitional use between adjacent low-density residential and the TOD area.” The Application Submission Statement and the proposal which was presented at the March 31, 2015 meeting totally ignored this guideline statement. What is the use of a “Guideline” if it is to be ignored?

6. Traffic noise along Rocky Ridge Road is a continuing issue currently for those of us living adjacent to this busy thoroughfare and that will only be made much worse if this proposed development is allowed to proceed. Traffic calming measures are needed right now, let alone what could be expected with the addition of an additional 275 residential units (the number as stated in the Applicant’s Submission).
7. I suggest an appropriate use of this development site would be a project consisting of townhomes of a maximum three stories. This would fit with the TOD Guidelines, would blend in and complement the existing residential communities and create no or very limited shadowing and massing issues. A redesignation of the site to M-H2 Multi-Residential -High Density Medium Rise does NOT in any way, shape or form fit within our community.

Of even greater benefit would be the creation of a city park with gardens, park benches, perhaps even some picnic tables so that our community would have an area for recreation and reflection overlooking the magnificent Rocky Mountains. Now that would be something of which we all could be proud!

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel B. Petch  
102 Royal Manor NW  
Calgary AB T3G 5T6  
email: [djpetch@shaw.ca](mailto:djpetch@shaw.ca)  
Phone: 403-547-3501

cc: Mayor Naheed Nenshi  
Councillor Joe Magliocca  
Councillor Ward Sutherland

**Smith, Theresa L.**

---

**From:** Daniel Petch <djpetch@shaw.ca>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 25, 2017 1:16 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Cc:** Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2  
**Subject:** [EXT] Notice of Public Hearing on Planning Matters: BYLAW NUMBER 299D2017  
**Attachments:** Land Bylaw 299D2017 Comments -Submission.pdf

Ms. Susan Gray:

As requested in the notification letter from the City of Calgary; attached please find my comments submitted for consideration at the Public Hearing of the application to amend the Land Use Designation at 10310 Eamon Road NW. I would appreciate it if my comments would be given serious consideration as the city council discusses the application for land use amendment.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Petch,

102 Royal Manor NW Calgary AB T3G 5T6

403-547-3501

RECEIVED  
2017 AUG 25 PM 3:06  
THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERK'S

**Smith, Theresa L.**

---

**From:** Kelly Body <kellybody@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 29, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Cc:** info@wardsutherland.com  
**Subject:** [EXT] RR bylaw # 299D2017

Having gone down and reviewed the application for zone change, I find original questions still exist, plus more. We are a low density area in the suburbs. Highest is 4 stories. Everyone has cars as we need them, if only to grocery shop.

- 1) why 10 storeys, 275 units???
- 2) 500+ people and cars.... where is there parking for the users of the ctrain?
- 3) who's going to monitor the parking at the train station? Extra cars from the new residents would find it easy to use, as will their guests etc?
- 4) the weekday users are already circling around the neighbourhood looking for parking and that was at 7:30am this past Monday, when it is still considered summer holiday time

Very sad to hear of this re-zoning  
Kelly Body  
Bill Brunette  
86 Rocky Vista Terrace NW  
kellybody@hotmail.com

RECEIVED  
2017 AUG 29 PM 1:54  
THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERKS

**Smith, Theresa L.**

---

**From:** Tony Eddy <steady3567@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 29, 2017 1:13 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXT] Rezoning 10310 Eamon Rd. Item CP C2017-301 for council meeting sept 11'2017

The following are some of my concerns with respect the above rezoning application

1. There are currently 75 LRT parking spaces on this property. What is the plan to replace them? This station has very few spaces as it is.
2. Lowering the parking requirements for this development will cause more problems for the community and the LRT as street parking will disappear. There are three condo buildings in out neighbourhood with more assigned parking than .9 space per unit and the streets are blocked around them.
3. How do you propose stoping the new condo owners from parking at the LRT and taking away spaces from the transit users? Charge for all parking is not an acceptable solution.
4. I live on Rocky Vista terrace and there are 6 condo associations as part of our Home owners Association with over 600 units. We are not part it the Rocky Ridge Royal Oak association so when you say you communicated with the RROCA indicating you were in consultation with the owners this is incorrect. You missed the 600 units closest to the development.

Regards  
Tony Eddy

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

RECEIVED  
2017 AUG 29 PM 1:26  
THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERKS