

Date: November 7, 2017

To: Office of the City Clerk | cityclerk@calgary.ca
cc: Evan Woolley | evan.woolley@calgary.ca
Bankview Community Association Development Committee | development@bankview.org

File Reference: LOC2017-0126 (2102-2018 17A ST SW)

Dear Council,

My name is Sean Kimak. I live across the street from the development proposed at 2102-2108 17A ST SW and write this letter on behalf of myself, my partner and the neighbours I have spoken with.

I was initially hesitant to write a letter of opposition to this land use re-designation as I am not opposed in principle to increased density on our street, but I recently saw the associated Development Permit Application included in the CPC Agenda and felt it necessary to express my opposition to the project and associated rezoning based on these factors:

1) Lack of public engagement

As far as I am aware, there was no attempt by the applicant to notify neighbours directly or engage in any sort of constructive dialog prior to their applications. As noted in the letter from the Bankview Community Association development committee, “the development committee was not afforded an opportunity to review this proposal before it was submitted to the City of Calgary”. While this is not formally required, I would hope that a change in zoning to a lot facing a public park would warrant this level of engagement.

2) Misinterpretation of the Bankview Community Association Development Committee (BCADC) Letter at CPC Hearing

During the CPC hearing it was mentioned that the Community Association was in support of the rezoning to MC-G. This, I believe, is a misrepresentation of the communities response.

To quote the the letter submitted by the BCADC, dated May 31, 2017:

“...the proposed land use designation and intensification of this site (6 units) poses some issues, *which are unacceptable to the Bankview Community*”

“we still fully feel that the RC-2 designation is most appropriate for this site”

The BCADC letter later states that MC-G would be preferable over the MC-2 designation that was being proposed at that time, but never that MC-G was acceptable or preferred over the current RC-2 zoning.

3) Shading of the park / Lack of Shadow Study

In their letter, the BCADC requested a Shadow study to be done to determine the effect the development would have on the historic park space directly to the North. So far, I have not seen a shadow study showing the effects of the shading on the park. I can think of no reason why the applicant would not provide one with their initial DP application, given the sensitive context of the site. I believe that any development that is approved on this site should step down towards the North to address this issue.

5) Potential Bylaw infractions

Although I have not seen the full drawing set, from the drawings attached to the CPC agenda I am concerned that even under MC-G zoning the proposed development could require various relaxations, in which case MC-G would be an inappropriate land-use.

Specifically, from the elevation, it doesn't look like the development fits within the height-limit and chamfers of MC-G bylaw. I was initially assured by the planner that the development stepped down in relation to grade, whereas in the provided elevation the height increases towards the North.

Furthermore, the plans provided do not show the space allocations of the ground floor. Land Use Bylaw 1P2007 6;2;581(1) requires that 50% of the area at grade be uses other than private garage, but from the plans provided I cannot determine whether that requirement is being met.

6) Urban design

The entire first level is comprised of garage doors and stairs. Most of the area in front is therefore paving or hardscape with almost no landscaping provided in the front. I find this disappointing, especially considering the number of mature trees that they are proposing to remove with the associated development.

I appreciate and echo Councillor Carra's requests and the recommendations of the CPC that:

- 1) driveway access be reduced to one point;
- 2) 17A ST SW be addressed with a pedestrian ground oriented interface; and,
- 3) Nimmons park be addressed with a ground-oriented interface prior to the DP or land-use redesignation being approved.

7) Lack of planning document justification

The ARP does not support this land use, and although it is an old document, it is the only document that makes specific reference to the zoning of this site. The Main Streets study has not yet been extended to provide zoning guidelines for this area and until such time I don't believe it should be referenced to either support or oppose this application.

I am not opposed to density or height increases in cases where the proposed project respects basic urban planning and architectural design principals and gives back to the to urban realm in some way. There have been many recent projects in Bankview that fit this description, but I do not believe this project is one of them based on the reasons above. Furthermore, in every case I am aware of where a density increase has been supported by the community, the applicant at least attempted to engage the public. I am disappointed this was not the case in this situation and don't believe that this is the highest and best use of such a prominent site. I understand that the land use application and development permit application are evaluated separately, but I cannot support this proposed land-use when I have little confidence that the future development will benefit the street or community, nor satisfy the intent of the proposed zoning or existing ARP.

I hope that council will also oppose this land-use redesignation until an appropriate design solution has been proposed. Thank you for your consideration,

Sean Kimak

Resident, 2105 17A ST SW

Kate Ellis
2107-17a St SW
Calgary, AB T2T 4R9
403-850-7490
kate.ellis.14@gmail.com

November 6, 2017

Office of the City Clerk
City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100 Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Dear Council,

RE: BYLAW 352D2017

Subject Address: 2102 & 2108 17a ST SW

My name is Kate Ellis. I live across the street from the proposed development change at 2102 & 2108 17a ST SW.

These properties have witnessed high renter turnover in the past couple of years and the property located at 2102 has become quite problematic with several neighbours witnessing drug activity. The Calgary Police Service makes frequent visits to this house. Obviously, a redevelopment of these properties would be preferential to the current state, however, I have a number of concerns with this proposed development. They are as follows:

- Lack of public engagement: On Nov 2, 2017, I saw Notice of Proposed Bylaw Amendment signs posted on the aforementioned properties and on Nov 6, 2017, I received a letter from the city notifying me of a public hearing. I otherwise was not engaged in this process. Given the location of this property adjacent to a public park I would have thought there would be a higher level of community engagement.
- Bankview Community Association letter dated May 31, 2017: The letter sent by the Bankview Community Association clearly stated that "The BCADC has no objection in principle to development of the subject site, but the proposed land use designation and

the intensification of the development on this site (6 units) poses some issues, which are unacceptable to the Bankview Community.”

They further stated: “we still feel that the R-C2 is most appropriate for this site and do not fully understand why the applicant cannot make the M-CG designation work.”

It is my understanding that this opposition has not been properly communicated to council. There is no broad community support for this development plan.

- Shadow Study and Loss of Trees – I have a young child who uses the Nimmons park and playground. A development of the proposed nature would surely affect this historic space (increased shade, loss of mature trees). To my knowledge, no such study has been completed.

It is my belief and understanding that a maintenance of the existing R-C2 zoning and a four-dwelling development in lieu of the proposed six would be more beneficial for the Bankview Community while still supporting increased densification.

Sincerely,



Kate Ellis

Cc: Rayner D’Souza, Rayner.dsouza@calgary.ca
Cllr. Evan Wooley, evan.Wooley@calgary.ca

Rowe, Timothy S.

From: Smith, Theresa L.
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2017 8:05 AM
To: LaClerk
Subject: FW: [EXT] Re-Zoning of 239 Deer Run Cres SE

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Sue Beaulieu [mailto:theresasusanb@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2017 7:51 AM
To: Wasser, Ezra T. ; City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] Re-Zoning of 239 Deer Run Cres SE

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in response to Change of Zoning Request (from R-C1 to R-C1s) at 239 Deer Run Cres SE, Calgary.

I am against to having this change of zone granted at 239 Deer Run Cres.

This is a single family home neighborhood and do not want the value of our house/property to decrease due to transient tenants. (There has already been multiple turn over of tenants on premises.)

Another concern is the property will not be properly maintained if tenants do not own equipment to keep up premises i.e. lawn mower for up keep of lawn etc., tenants leaving items on lawn (front or back) that do not belong there.

This is a quiet neighborhood with small children and should there be transient tenants there is a greater possibility of party noise and/or increase in theft etc. in area.

I hope you will take this into consideration when decision making.

With thanks for your attention to this matter.

From: [Smith, Theresa L.](#)
To: [LaClerk](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] rezoning of 2102 & 2108 17a street sw Bankview
Date: Friday, November 03, 2017 8:56:37 AM

From: Cheryl & Mike Sewell [mailto:cmsewell@shaw.ca]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2017 7:50 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] rezoning of 2102 & 2108 17a street sw Bankview

Hello:

Regarding the application to rezone the above properties from RC-2 to M-cgd60. I am against this.

1. I understand that the above properties only meet 3 of 5 criteria for rezoning- barely a pass.
2. The above properties (as opposed to most inner city properties) have no lane access for garages which will push more parking and traffic issues onto the main street
3. There is no reason that 4 units allowed under current R-C2 would not be best in the context of the neighborhood

That being said, I believe if a rezoning is issued I believe **R-CG** with a tied development plan for a maximum 6 units would allow for the row housing but be more in context with the neighborhood.

Regards,

Mike Sewell
2109 17a street sw