

From: boutind1@telus.net
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Subject: [EXT] June 15 2020 Public Hearing Item #8 Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment in Greenbriar (Ward 1) at 222 Greenbriar Place NW, LOC2019-0101, CPC2020-0489 Bylaws 26P2020 and 77D2020
Date: Friday, June 05, 2020 2:16:15 PM
Attachments: [Proposed bylaw amendment LOC 2019-0101, June 4 2020.docx](#)

To whom it may concern,

Attached is a letter to be submitted to the Public Hearing on Public Matters at the Calgary City Council meeting on the June 15, 2020 concerning the proposed policy and land use amendments in Greenbriar, Ward 1. (Item #8 on the agenda----Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment in Greenbriar (Ward 1) at 222 Greenbriar Place NW, LOC2019-0101, CPC2020-0489 Bylaws 26P2020 and 77D2020).

Sincerely,

Dan & Tonette Boutin

June 4, 2020

City of Calgary

Circulation Control
Planning Department
P.O. Box 2100 Station M
Calgary AB T2P 2M5

Attention File Manager,

RE: LOC 2019-0101 222 Greenbriar Pl. NW, CPC 2020-0489

To whom it may concern,

As owners of a new townhouse (808 Greenbriar Common) immediately adjacent to the land being addressed for a proposed change of its land use bylaws on June 15, 2020 (Item # 8 on the proposed City of Calgary Planning meeting agenda); we opposed the changes to the existing by-laws being brought forward.

As new owners, we purchased in good faith based on the existing by-laws immediately adjacent to our new home. We have concerns with the proposed development of the 9-10 storey building, as the proposed development will:

1. Create shadows for owners like us living next door, completely eliminating our light in the daytime as well as completely obstructing our view of the city skyline to the southeast of us from our balcony.
2. It will increase the traffic flow in our area, making access more difficult more difficult. Also, with the proposed development which will create additional issues with parking spillover will further decrease as parking availability is already limited. Congestion will be another issue.
3. As owners, we have great concerns in regards to the environmental impact in the area which goes against what the community and the City of Calgary is trying to preserve. Below are the comments sent by the Bowness Community Association in a letter to the Calgary Planning and Development department on March 5, 2020.

3. Of major concern is the future of the Bowness escarpment as it is eroded with development not in keeping with the policies outlined in the Bowness ARP including Point 18 "The escarpment should be preserved in its natural state. As well, Point 20 "The City of Calgary will work with developers in Greenbrier to cooperatively protect a contiguous natural habitat." Section 3 Environmental Policies point 1 states "Major natural areas...and adjacent escarpments within the community should be protected, rehabilitated or re-established to support the natural landscape and ecosystem."

This is not a good proposal for the reasons outlined above. We are opposed to the proposed development and do not support it as it will impact our way of life negatively and is not in the best interest of the home owners.

Sincerely,

Dan & Tonette Boutin
808 Greenbriar Common
Calgary, AB

Hailey C. Boutin
808 Greenbriar Common NW
Calgary, Alberta
T3B 6J2

June 5, 2020

Office of the City Clerk

The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M'
T2P 2M5

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

RE: BYLAW 77D2020

Please accept this letter as my formal submission to oppose Bylaw 77D2020.

My name is Hailey Boutin and I am an owner of a townhome in Greenwich. My property is directly adjacent to the property that is the subject of the proposed amendment to the Land Use Designation contemplated by bylaw 77D2020. I vehemently oppose the amendment to the Land Use Designation for the reasons set out in this letter.

First, the redesignation from Multi-Residential - Contextual Medium Profile to DC Direct Control District (the "**Redesignation**") will drastically detract from the character of the neighborhood. I purchased my townhome in July of 2018 because, among other things, I was attracted to the type of neighborhood Greenwich was going to be - low rise buildings and townhomes. The Redesignation would allow for a building to tower over the development and detract from the charm of a low-rise development by obstructing views, casting shadows, negating privacy and causing congestion, points which I will discuss below. The community of Greenwich is not an inner city development where high rises are expected. If Greenwich had been designated as a DC Direct Control District from the start, I would not have purchased in the area.

Second, the Redesignation will completely block out all natural sunlight for the whole block of Artis townhomes thereby drastically reducing the quality of life for those residents. Greenwich is already a high-density development and the close proximity of the townhomes reduces the amount of sunlight that my townhome receives. I am very protective over the few hours of direct sunlight a day that I receive in my townhome. Given the direction that my townhome is facing, the construction of an 8-10 storey building will completely block out all natural sunlight. Living in the climate that we do, sunlight is precious. The blocked sunlight will impact my ability to continue growing certain plants and to enjoy my outdoor living space. The complete block of sunlight will drastically reduce the quality of life that I currently have in my townhome and curtail the use and enjoyment of my property. As a human being, sunlight is critical to our health and wellbeing. I would never purchase a home that did not receive direct sunlight because I would be unhappy. It is absolutely critical that I am able to enjoy the few hours of sunlight that my deck and living spaces receive throughout the day. The Redesignation is not suited for this neighborhood, and the residents who live in Greenwich should not be forced to live in the shadows of a building that was never contemplated when we purchased our homes.

Third, the Redesignation is not supported by the current road infrastructure and will cause inordinate and intolerable congestion, traffic and concentrated emissions. As noted above, Greenwich is a high-density development. Since there is only one road that services the Greenwich community, the Redesignation will dramatically increase the amount of traffic that will be using the road. During busy commute times, the added traffic will make exiting the community a logistical nightmare. Furthermore, the increased traffic caused by the Redesignation will significantly increase the amount of toxic emissions in the area. The Greenwich development is close to the Trans Canada Highway, so there are already increased levels of

emissions. The increase in toxic emissions from the Redesignation will have unhealthy consequences for the residents in Greenwich.

Finally, The Applicant's Outreach Report (the "**Report**") does not consider the voices of the residents who actually reside in Greenwich, nor does it consider the impact on the residents of Greenwood Village. As a resident of Greenwich, the Report completely neglects the impact that the Redesignation will have on the residents residing just feet away from a proposed 8-10 storey building. For example, on page 6 of the Report, the privacy considerations are in respect of the properties below the escarpment. However, from another angle the towering Redesignation will completely viscerate the privacy of those living directly next door. I will no longer feel comfortable sitting on my patio, in the shadow of an 8-10 storey building, knowing that there are people staring down at me. Furthermore, the Report does not consider the impact on property values for certain townhomes in the Greenwich community. Now, I am not an expert in real estate; however, I would argue that my townhome's value will decrease if an 8-10 storey building is erected just feet away, placing my townhome in the direct shadow. As a home buyer, I would not buy a home that was completely shadowed by a towering building, keeping in mind the additional points above that could also impact re-sale.

In summary, it is unacceptable to proceed with the Resignation when the negative impacts are as far-reaching as they are. The Applicant has failed to consider the adverse and inordinate impact that the Redesignation will have on the residents of Greenwich, which residents live just feet away from the Redesignation site. The Redesignation would allow for my townhome to be completely overshadowed by a building that was never contemplated when I purchased. My townhome would receive no sunlight due to its positioning if an 8-10 story building is constructed on the proposed Redesignation site. Moreover, if such a structure is erected pursuant to the Redesignation, the increased congestion and toxic emissions will dramatically increase. On the whole, the Redesignation has only adverse impacts on the area, such impacts that will adversely affect the health and the quality of life of surrounding residents. As an Alberta homeowner, I am entitled to the use and enjoyment of my property. I specifically chose to purchase in the area because it suited my needs. If the Redesignation is passed, the use and enjoyment of my property will be negated due to the adverse impacts of a proposed 8-10 storey building. As such, the application for the Redesignation must be rejected.

Thank you.



Hailey Boutin



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to 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. 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 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 Elizabeth

* Last name Gabel

Email dbgabel@telus.net

Phone 403 813-8800

* Subject 222 Greenbriar Place NW - LOC2019-0101

Good Day:

I attached my submission regarding the above noted subject. In addition to those submissions I would like to reiterate that the main issue with the approval of this amendment is the gain in density and the building height being 10 stories. Bowness is a unique area and it is not appropriate to put what is essentially a high rise tower in the vicinity.

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

I am also surprised and dismayed that Calgary Planning and Development staff and members would recommend and approve this amendment when the surrounding residents are so very much against it to the point of being almost unanimously against it. Melcor/CivicWorks has also not held a public consultation on their amendment and the residents were also not given an opportunity to comment on the amendment. At the community meeting in September 2019 many residents attended as well as Ralph Smith, Councilor Sutherland's Chief of Staff the general consensus of those attending was that we did not want this high rise density in our neighbourhood and this amendment should be overturned.

The community is fine with Melcor's existing approval of max height of 4 stories and they should proceed with that plan.

ISC:

1/2

Unrestricted

Jun 6, 2020

11:48:06 AM



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Kindly overturn this application.

Comments on File Number LOC2019-0101

222 Greenbriar Place NW

June 5, 2020

It would appear that CiviWorks has resubmitted their application for a Land Use Redesignation. I note that in this version of their submissions they make reference to the minimum dwelling units, whereas I believe in the last submission they state a maximum dwelling units. Now there is only reference made to a minimum dwelling units which does not indicate what the maximum dwelling units would be.

Aside from that, their application is still seeking High Density Low Rise-Multi-residential and as such our previous comments submitted September 10, 2019 stand.

About This Application

This application proposes to change the designation of this property to allow for:

- multi-residential buildings (apartment buildings)
- a maximum building height of approximately 32 metres at the south (an increase from the current maximum of 16 metres) approx. 9-10 storeys
- a minimum of 156 dwelling units (an increase from the current maximum of 43 dwelling units), based on a density of 150 dwelling units per hectare, approx. 20,900 square metre
- the uses listed in the proposed M-H1 designation.

Submissions dated: September 10, 2019

Currently this property is zoned as M-C2 – Contextual Medium Profile. Multi-residential designation is primarily for 3 to 5 story apartment buildings. CivicWorks has made application to amend the zoning to be M-H1 – High Density Low Rise – Multi-residential designation that is primarily for 4 to 8 story apartment buildings. It would appear from the application that, if approved, the density of the property would increase from a maximum of 43 dwelling units to a maximum of 196 dwelling units quadrupling the amount of density currently allowed on that parcel.

The property in question butts up to the escarpment as evidenced on Map 3 of the Bowness Area Redevelopment Plan “Bowness ARP”, entitled Low Density Policy Sub Areas and as such should maintain a low density. As the Bowness ARP currently reads, all of Bowness is considered to be a low-density community with some of Greenbriar being medium-high density. The medium to high density areas of Greenbriar could remain closer to 16th avenue where they are better suited. The site in question also has historic value that should be taken into consideration when dealing with land use as well as development. According to the Bowness ARP Summary of

Policies, attention should be drawn to potential heritage structures and their surrounding landscapes. Even though the Bowness Golf Course Clubhouse (Romeo & Juliet Inn) was lost to fire perhaps something of a nostalgic value could be incorporated into any future development.

In closing I would like to state that we are opposed to this land use change and would like to add that if this change is approved there is nothing to stop others from building High Density building along the remaining escarpment and that would likely ruin the natural value of the escarpment itself. As indicated in the Bowness ARP, 3.3(1) “Major natural areas, including the banks of the Bow River and adjacent escarpments within the community should be protected, rehabilitated or reestablished to support the natural landscape and ecosystem.”

Therefore, this application should be denied.

Elizabeth & David Gabel
8911 – 33 Avenue NW
Calgary, AB T3B 1M2
Tele: 403 813-8800
Email: dbgable@telus.net

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

Email: PublicSubmissions@calgary.ca

We purchased a townhome in Greenwich from Artis in November 2018 that is directly offsetting the proposed Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment. At the time that we purchased, the height restriction was a maximum of 16 metres and the density was 42 units per hectare. If we had been informed by the developer that a 9 to 10 storey High Density building would be built directly to the east we would never have purchased the townhome. The proposed height is two times and the density is over 3.5 times what we were told was approved for the area. This is a dramatic change to a very new area that was advertised as a planned and well thought out multi residential community.

We strenuously object to such a drastic change in land use as it will change the character, aesthetics and appearance of the Greenwich community. We did not buy in Greenwich with the expectation we would be next door to the tallest building in the entire Bowness community.

Outreach to affected parties

We only found out about the proposed changes on May 30, 2020 when we noticed a large sign at the end of Greenbriar PI NW. We never noticed any signage prior to this.

Although the application was submitted on June 27, 2019 and there was a stakeholder outreach that concluded on Feb 12, 2020, we were never contacted and our builder was never contacted to provide our contact information to Melcor Developments. It is unacceptable that little effort was made by Melcor to contact offsetting owners in Greenwich who are the most directly affected by the proposed change. How can an outreach pass scrutiny if parties directly offsetting are never contacted? Melcor cites Canada Post Admail delivery route restrictions preventing the delivery of neighbour notification postcards in Greenwich Village, yet through their regular dialogue with the builders certainly Melcor could have reached out through these builders to all Greenwich purchasers.

Revised Land Use Proposal resulting from outreach

After listening to the parties on the north and east sides of the area, one of the key changes to the plan was to slope the building to reduce the visual impact and shading impact on the north and east sides of the property.

The parties directly offsetting the western edge of the lands had no input into the outreach process. The proposal is to locate the largest mass of the building (with the largest density) and increase the building height to 32 m on the west side of the property. The maximum height and density impact has been shifted to directly offset parties that were never consulted.

In the applicant's submission it is stated that their new plan would "achieve a balance of building height, mass and viable unit densities across the subject site". The new plan creates an imbalance of all of these factors and concentrates height, mass and density directly offsetting the south and western property boundary. It will have a huge impact on our property directly west of DC Site 2.

Shadow Impacts

The development intends to “minimize shadow impacts on park lands and surrounding residential neighborhoods through the strategic location of buildings and careful distribution of density and height”. Yet, on the south side offsetting a park, the building can be 32 m high within 6 m of the property line and on the west side offsetting townhomes, the building can be 32 m high within 16 m of the property line. The shadow impact of a 9 to 10 storey tall building so close to the property line will not be minimized, it will be significant.

The original plan as shown on attachment 4 of the Applicants Outreach Report illustrates a height of 26 m for each building. The revised plan for DC Site 1 based on MC2 has reduced shadow impacts from the original plan and the height has been reduced to 16 m, consistent with the height restriction that was in place when we purchased our property. However, the revised plan for DC Site 2 based on M-H1 has greatly increased the shadow impacts as the height has been increased to 32 m from 26m and a new 9 to 10 storey building will overpower the western neighbours and the southern park area. Some issues were addressed on DC Site 1 but those issues were merely transferred and are now increased and magnified on DC Site 2 directly offsetting us.

Local Traffic on Greenbriar

With a density increase of more than 3.5 times on the subject lands, the road usage offsetting our unit and the playground/park area will be increased greatly. We deliberately purchased a unit near the end of the street so that local traffic would be reduced.

We strenuously object to the proposed Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment for all of the above reasons. In our opinion the proposal is incongruous with a well planned multi residential area that clearly promoted a 16m height restriction. The character and appearance of the Greenwich community will be negatively impacted forever.

Yours truly,

Laura Gigg

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

Email: PublicSubmissions@calgary.ca

Objection to Land Use Designation: Greenbriar Bylaw 77D2020

We purchased a townhome in Greenwich from Artis in November 2018 that is directly offsetting the proposed Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment. Our address is 803 Greenbriar CN NW. At the time that we purchased our unit, the height restriction was a maximum of 16 metres and the density was 42 units per hectare. If we had been informed by the developer that a 9 to 10 storey high density building would be built directly to the east we would never have purchased the townhome. The proposed height is two times and the density is over 3.5 times what we were told was approved for the area at the time of purchase. This is a dramatic change to a very new area that was advertised as a planned and well thought out multi-residential contextual medium profile community.

We strenuously object to such a drastic change in land use as it will change the character, aesthetics and appearance of the Greenwich community. We did not buy in Greenwich with the expectation we would be right next door to the tallest building in the entire Bowness community.

Outreach to affected parties

We only found out about the proposed changes on May 30, 2020 when we noticed a large sign at the end of Greenbriar PI NW. We never noticed any signage prior to this.

Although the application was submitted on June 27, 2019 and there was a stakeholder outreach that concluded on Feb 12, 2020, we were never contacted and our builder was never contacted to provide our contact information to Melcor Developments. It is unacceptable that little effort was made by Melcor to contact offsetting owners in Greenwich who are the most directly affected by the proposed change. How can an outreach pass scrutiny if parties directly offsetting are never contacted? Melcor cites Canada Post Admail delivery route restrictions preventing the delivery of neighbour notification postcards in Greenwich Village, yet through their regular dialogue with the builders certainly Melcor could have reached out through these builders to all Greenwich purchasers.

Revised Land Use Proposal resulting from outreach

After listening to the parties on the north and east sides of the area, one of the key changes to the plan was to slope the building to reduce the visual impact and shading impact on the north and east sides of the property.

The parties directly offsetting the western edge of the lands had no input into the outreach process. The proposal is to locate the largest mass of the building (with the largest density) and increase the building height to 32 m on the west side of the property. The maximum height and density impact has been shifted to directly offset parties that were never consulted.

In the applicant's submission it is stated that their new plan would "achieve a balance of building height, mass and viable unit densities across the subject site". In fact, the new plan creates an imbalance of all of these factors and concentrates height, mass and density directly

offsetting the south and western property boundary. It will have a huge impact on our property directly west of DC Site 2.

Shadow Impacts

The development intends to “minimize shadow impacts on park lands and surrounding residential neighborhoods through the strategic location of buildings and careful distribution of density and height”. Yet, on the south side offsetting a park, the building can be 32 m high within 6 m of the property line and on the west side offsetting townhomes, the building can be 32 m high within 16 m of the property line. The shadow impact of a 9 to 10 storey tall building so close to the property line will not be minimized, it will be significant.

The original plan, as shown on attachment 4 of the Applicants Outreach Report, illustrates a height of 26 m for each building compared to the currently approved height of 16 m. The revised plan for DC Site 1 based on MC2 has reduced shadow impacts from the original plan and the height has been reduced to 16 m, consistent with the height restriction that was in place when we purchased our property. However, the revised plan for DC Site 2 based on M-H1 has greatly increased the shadow impacts as the height has been increased to 32 m from 26m and a new 9 to 10 storey building will overpower the western neighbours and the southern park area. Some issues were addressed on DC Site 1 but those issues were merely transferred and are now increased and magnified on DC Site 2 directly offsetting us.

Local Traffic on Greenbriar

With a density increase of more than 3.5 times on the subject lands, the road usage offsetting our unit and the playground/park area will be increased greatly. We deliberately purchased a unit near the end of the street so that local traffic would be reduced.

We strenuously object to the proposed Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment for all of the above reasons. In our opinion the proposal is incongruous with a well planned multi-residential area that clearly promoted a 16m height restriction. The character and appearance of the planned Greenwich community will be negatively impacted forever.

Yours truly,

Bruce and Rosanne Gigg



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to 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. 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 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 Kevin

* Last name Doyle

Email kevdog@shaw.ca

Phone 403-830-7211

* Subject Opposed to LOC2019-0101 - and proposed bylaw 77-D2020 - my comments for June 15th Public Hearing.

I am strongly opposed to the latest proposed amendment to the Greenbriar site LOC2019-0101. I am not alone, and I speak both for myself and I believe for all the members of several groups of Bowness property owners and taxpayers that have met over the past year or so regarding this development and its progression.

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

Most of the attached comments and concerns have been well documented in prior meetings between Bowness residents and Melcor design team. The rest may be termed as my Open Letter to the City of Calgary and is pertinent.

If I am unable to attend Chambers for the hearing on Jun 15th, I am requesting that the attached letter is at least read out loud during the session.

Thank you,

To Calgary City Council:

I am strongly opposed to the latest proposed amendment to the Greenbriar site LOC2019-0101. I am not alone, and I speak both for myself and I believe for all the members of several groups of Bowness property owners and taxpayers that have met over the past year or so regarding this development and its progression.

Most of the below comments and concerns have been well documented in prior meetings between Bowness residents and Melcor design team.

The rest may be termed as my Open Letter to the City of Calgary and is pertinent.

If I am unable to attend Chambers for the hearing on Jun 15th, I am requesting that this letter is at least read out loud during the session.

Site and escarpment stability are both very real concerns. The city is currently having to pay out approximately \$28 million to fix an unstable and crumbling slope which threatens homes in Douglasdale and McKenzie Lake. I have heard reports of City Councillors questioning out loud how to prevent the past from repeating itself. Given the foregoing, it seems ill-thought, even ludicrous to me that 9-10 storey concrete high-rises are even being considered this close to the edge of this particular escarpment. It was a local dump at one point in fairly recent memory, as we all know. The City may also want to check with Cochrane and those developers on what occurred in the hillside developments out there in terms of slope settlement and subsequent mitigation and related costs. Those were much lighter, smaller buildings.

Neighbourhood Character - There is a blatant lack of respect being shown by both the City and Melcor for the existing character and low-density nature of Bowness and neighbouring communities. This is after their mutually professed (evidently false) concern to "maintain the special character of Bowness" which was put forward at the beginning of the process and actually written into the ARP. No effort is actually being made by either the City or Melcor to honor the so-called "special" low-density character of Bowness, the existing Bowness ARP, nor the very vocally expressed wishes of the local residents. The existing Bowness ARP, arrived at after a lengthy process, is simply being totally ignored, and changed at will (and now via new by-law) by the City to accommodate Mayor Nenshi and most the rest of council's relentless push for densification in Calgary. If this change is allowed to proceed, it will forever alter this once-special community, and we have had conversations almost ad nauseum with both City officials and Melcor design team. It is evident that both the development team and City officials absolutely do not care, are not listening, and are ignoring all input from rightfully concerned residents to these proposed long-term planning changes which will negatively impact existing long-term tax-paying residents, both adjacent to the site and in the community as a whole. Shame on you all for even thinking of pushing ahead with this after all the comments and objections you already have from voices throughout the community. I will add that city-wide sentiment against the Council and especially certain unbridled spending elements within Calgary City Council is growing city-wide, and I recommend that this is born in mind by all of us.

Building Height - Proposed Amendment is not even close to in line with the general Bowness ARP policies. Currently land use rules throughout the site are for low rise buildings M-C2 with

a maximum building height of 4 to 5 storeys. If amendments to Melcor's already approved plans of maximum building heights of 4 to 5 storeys are approved, there will very obviously be a precedent set with high-rises dotting the escarpment and throughout the community. But I guess you will just make a new bylaw for that . (Oh yes, sorry, already done) The captioned 77-D2020 as proposed, I believe.

Proper notice of the proposed amendments has not been given. Melcor has not done proper due diligence in notifying residents. That goes right back to the beginning of the process. Signage has been tipped down in the mud after a few days in most cases, only replaced after we as a community group noted the situation to Melcor and the City. Hard-copy notifications have gone out in a decidedly spotty fashion on every occasion to only a small handful of the larger group of high-impact, close-in properties. Most recently, there was a March 16th meeting that was canceled but site signage for the proposed amendments has not been updated nor has there been notification of proposed land-use amendments sent out. With families trying to cope with the lock-down and other restrictions assigned to Covid, and with the main voice which runs counter to this proposal fragmented by this situation, this is not the right nor fair time to approve an amendment that will negatively affect our community and our city. The signage on Bowfort road showed up in the past week only. Seriously? This looks a lot like it is being pushed through on the back of the Covid situation.

The City's approach to this area is uniquely and transparently one-sided, with zero real regard for the actual wishes of the vast majority of local long-time tax-paying residents. It has for some time now been incrementally re-designated as a "special area", (the latest label is apparently Direct Control District) precisely in order to push through the agenda of densification and apartment buildings. The group at City Hall is preparing to take what they want from the community, using new official labeling and bylaw creation. The Bowness community as a whole does in fact have both eyes pointing in one direction, just so you are all aware. We see it clearly. If your previous word to Bowness in the ARP meant nothing in terms of sticking to what you said then, then what does this current process even mean? At this point we do not feel we are able to trust the City, or the process.

The comment below is from one of our Bowness group, which I am citing here for context. Note the comments regarding Trinity and University condo developments.

"There is overbuilding of condos in the Northwest area of the city especially given the economic climate. Trinity has already scaled back their development; the University area sales are not anywhere what they had hoped for; there is a new development proposed for the Sunnyside Greenhouse site; and...located in the same area as Greenwich there is a new Development Permit DP2019-6460, Madison Avenue Group, under review. Its also a multi-residential development (6 buildings – 6 phases).and now Melcor wants to turn a medium-density area into a high-density area with high-rises. "

Enough is enough. We are asking City Council to at least do the right thing in this one area which will affect large surrounding areas of unique and special community, by keeping the development consistent with the wishes of the local residents, and by honoring the existing approved and accepted ARP. Don't just keep on making up new rules as you go along. The way

CPC2020-0489

Attachment 8

Letter 6a

in which the City creeps these changes through is very obvious, and very simply put, not fair to any of us, especially the next generation who will lose all that will be lost (the uniqueness of this community, which uniqueness and value to residents is largely predicated on its existing low density and character) by building a bunch of tall concrete apartment buildings to line developers' pockets and increase efficiency of tax collection and resultant cash flow for the City. We don't want them, and our children will be better off without them.

This is not Mississauga. This is Bowness, Calgary, Alberta. And we care about it, even if you do not. This letter may be seen by some as slightly combative in tone, that is only because that is how the vast majority of Bowness feels right now about this development, and about the City in general, and this needs to be conveyed to you clearly. This comes from the heart, and is an honest request. This is all of us asking you, not just me. Some things are worth protecting. Please help us protect Bowness.

Sincerely,
Kevin Doyle



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to 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. 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 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 Roger

* Last name Jackson

Email rogerjackson@telus.net

Phone

* Subject Greenwich land proposal (melcor)

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

I strongly object to Melcors application to amend the original permit to now be allowed to build high rise higher density buildings . The traffic situation on 83 St NW and in the 2 traffic circles on Bowfort Rd NW has increased dramatically in the past few years and allowing more units to be built would only exacerbate the issue. Please only allow Melcor to build what was originally permitted.

Thank you.