

Smith, Theresa L.

From: James Trofimuk - Optimum Dental [jtrofdds@telus.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 9:36 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: BYLAWS 32P2017 AND 210D2017 at 756 101St SW
Attachments: BYLAWS 32P2017 AND 210D2017 at 756 101St SW Written Response.docx

To whom it may concern:

Included is a document my neighbour put together regarding the Land Use Bylaw Amendment #210D2017

I agree with the document and have concerns that this is the start of changes that would detract from the area as well as decrease safety for all the cyclists that use these roads. Many of whom are national athletes who train at COP / Winsport.

If you would like to contact me you can by the following methods:

Email: jtrofdds@telusplanet.net

Wk 403 685 4792

Cell 403 818 3499

Unfortunately I cannot attend the Council meeting July 3 as I am working. I would like my comments and concerns to be noted and put in the minutes if possible

Thank you
Sincerely

James Trofimuk

RECEIVED
2017 JUN 21 AM 10:00
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

**This is a written response to the following CPC application
BYLAWS 32P2017 AND 210D2017 at 756 101st SW**

I'm a nearby resident in Heritage woods, south of the proposed land use change inside Rockyview.

For the following reasons I'm opposed to the proposed changes, and would like to rebut some of the comments made by the CPC.

Comments made by Mr. Friesen: that this is a temporary change, until a larger land use planning is put in place, is a good indication that little long term consideration has been put in this decision, and this in fact is this change will likely be a catalyst to increase the area of this designation, to include other car lots. I've included an image of a planning document that came into my possession that indicates the obvious likely long-term goals of GSL and the developers for this area. **Note the GSL lot size illustrated is at least 3 times what is being proposed!**



As stated in the CPC review, the time span for the ASP for this area is years away, as is the need to move GSL from the existing lands based on the status of the NEXT project being DOA. So why the rush to make these changes?

If we were naïve enough to think GSL would move to an area where it has no guarantee of future expansion, and be

1. Limited on-site servicing
2. Based on existing land use, not have the ability to expand.
3. Limited access

Why would GSL want to move to this area where these restrictions exist.

I agree with Mr. Leighton that

I opposed this policy and land use amendment because:

- a) The lack of a coherent planning rationale justifying these amendments in the report (especially in relation to the goals of the MDP);*
- b) The "spot zoning" approach without any land use, servicing, or transportation plan in place for the surrounding area;*
- c) Circumvention of normal due process for amending an ASP, including public consultation;*
- d) Circumvention of City standards, notably fire response standards, no technical evidence was provided to demonstrate that this development can be "self-serviced"; and*
- e) Establishing a precedent (and perhaps, encouragement) for future spot zoning and ad-hoc development on orphan sites located outside the ring road.*

In addition, with respect to the comments made from Rocky view, a technocrat noted from a purely technical perspective agreeing to this change and was not made from any public engagement flies in the face of good governance. As a resident of Rockyview his comments are out of place considering that there is currently a Springbank ASP in the works, and any impacts on the border between the two municipalities with long-term impacts would require public consultation in this process.

One other shortcoming in rationale that was not noted:

1. Transportation networks TIA fails to note that the Ring Road interchange at Old Banff Coach Road only allows for traffic to and from the north to access/ egress from this site. In a long term planning access to this site is poor for commercial traffic. Traffic from the south would have to use a long stretch (2.5 km of rural road (60km\hr, single lane with no shoulders) to access the site. This will directly impact our area.

The bottom line, it is naïve to think that this area will not be considered the ultimate urban use or development of the parcel, and that this lot will go back from being a car lot to something else like a residential land use just has to look at down town Calgary where car lots still litter the landscape despite the value of the land.

No land use changes should be made until further public engagement is held in the context of more comprehensive planning, and not planning around something that is already built!

Sincerely

Alan Soukup, 335 Heritage Woods Place.

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Alan & Judi Soukup [soukupa@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 8:30 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: BYLAWS 32P2017 AND 210D2017 at 756 101St SW
Attachments: BYLAWS 32P2017 AND 210D2017 at 756 101St SW Written Response.docx

I've attached comments to the proposed bylaw changes

Regards Alan Soukup

RECEIVED
2017 JUN 21 AM 9:19
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

**This is a written response to the following CPC application
BYLAWS 32P2017 AND 210D2017 at 756 101st SW**

I'm a nearby resident in Heritage woods, south of the proposed land use change inside Rockyview.

For the following reasons I'm opposed to the proposed changes, and would like to rebut some of the comments made by the CPC.

Comments made by Mr. Friesen: that this is a temporary change, until a larger land use planning is put in place, is a good indication that little long term consideration has been put in this decision, and this in fact is this change will likely be a catalyst to increase the area of this designation, to include other car lots. I've included an image of a planning document that came into my possession that indicates the obvious likely long-term goals of GSL and the developers for this area. **Note the GSL lot size illustrated is at least 3 times what is being proposed!**

Auto Mall Site Context



As stated in the CPC review, the time span for the ASP for this area is years away, as is the need to move GSL from the existing lands based on the status of the NEXT project being DOA. So why the rush to make these changes?

If we were naïve enough to think GSL would move to an area where it has no guarantee of future expansion, and be

1. Limited on-site servicing
2. Based on existing land use, not have the ability to expand.
3. Limited access

Why would GSL want to move to this area where these restrictions exist.

I agree with Mr. Leighton that

I opposed this policy and land use amendment because:

- a) The lack of a coherent planning rationale justifying these amendments in the report (especially in relation to the goals of the MDP);*
- b) The “spot zoning” approach without any land use, servicing, or transportation plan in place for the surrounding area;*
- c) Circumvention of normal due process for amending an ASP, including public consultation;*
- d) Circumvention of City standards, notably fire response standards, no technical evidence was provided to demonstrate that this development can be “self-serviced”; and*
- e) Establishing a precedent (and perhaps, encouragement) for future spot zoning and ad-hoc development on orphan sites located outside the ring road.*

In addition, with respect to the comments made from Rocky view, a technocrat noted from a purely technical perspective agreeing to this change and was not made from any public engagement flies in the face of good governance. As a resident of Rockyview his comments are out of place considering that there is currently a Springbank ASP in the works, and any impacts on the border between the two municipalities with long-term impacts would require public consultation in this process.

One other shortcoming in rationale that was not noted:

1. Transportation networks TIA fails to note that the Ring Road interchange at Old Banff Coach Road only allows for traffic to and from the north to access/ egress from this site. In a long term planning access to this site is poor for commercial traffic. Traffic from the south would have to use a long stretch (2.5 km of rural road (60km\hr, single lane with no shoulders) to access the site. This will directly impact our area.

The bottom line, it is naïve to think that this area will not be considered the ultimate urban use or development of the parcel, and that this lot will go back from being a car lot to something else like a residential land use just has to look at down town Calgary where car lots still litter the landscape despite the value of the land.

No land use changes should be made until further public engagement is held in the context of more comprehensive planning, and not planning around something that is already built!

Sincerely

Alan Soukup, 335 Heritage Woods Place.