

Boris and Ben, the below was written by me before Chris discovered the slope slippage and collapse 2 evenings ago and I learned of it yesterday morning. That event in itself should give pause to all of us, and **cause a full halt to these bylaw and ARP change proceedings, delaying the hearing until that very critical public safety issue is firmly resolved.** There are varying valid concerns among the resident stakeholder group. Chris's stem obviously from his own property location. I share those concerns, especially the slope stability issue. In addition, my concerns extend as you well know to density-change precedent and the methods the City uses to get what they want in the face of obvious strong disagreement and opposition from existing residents to these changes in their own longstanding communities. In this case Bowness, because we all live here and have for many many years. I am leaving the text below unchanged, because it captures what I need to say to all of you.

June 10

Ben thank you for your prompt reply. My comments and tone were not directed predominantly at yourself, however you responded first. I have issues with the way things are being done overall, by the entire group at City Hall. I do not hold any of the group running the process in very high regard. Nor do the vast, vast majority of long term Bowness residents, so again, I am not alone.

That needs to be understood by all. Perhaps recognizing this fact and the sheer number of people who strongly disagree with what you are proposing may yet lead to positive change, as is my hope.

Regarding your own response below, I must say I can only marvel at the use of "stringent yet reasonable direct control rules" when discussing an overall mandate change to 10-storey apartment buildings in the same sentence as "this prominent and historic site". That mating of concepts does not even make sense, it is oxymoronic, as once you have multiple concrete high-rises built, the entire area will absolutely remain "prominent" due to the height and nature of the concrete structures, but in a distinctly different sense, because the "historic" (lower density) element of both this and the surrounding established areas will be destroyed, gone forever. As we have said many times before. Additionally, the fact that a major change in the existing ARP is then absolutely required to somehow "support" all this, tells the actual story. You are making it up as you go. Why not simply say: "We are going to do what we want, no matter that it is exactly what the local residents have overwhelmingly said they do not want, and in fact are actively opposed to. If there is no other way, we will simply legislate it through with new bylaw and then change the ARP to match, and then, voila, because this is what we want, and we really don't care what you want." That would at least be more transparent on the City's part.

I have one separate question for yourself, please.

What are the new implications and functional changes which we should expect going forward, which will come out of of the area becoming a Direct Control area? What does that term imply?

That I need to understand better. Regarding the Feb 4th meeting, my father passed away in January as you all are aware by now and I was dealing with this and as executor for the family. I am sorry for missing that meeting, however it could not be helped at the time. I do have Boris's email from Feb 05, so thank you Boris for that. I will call you today if possible to go over the details of the changes to the R&J site. I have spoken with Chris, and the appearance and massing there is not the issue. Those changes help. The footprint of that size and weight of structure placed that close to the slope edge is still of huge

concern relative to slope stability at R&J site itself, for the safety of those living below.

HOWEVER:

At this point the main issue for me is the blanket changes in the new bylaw which wipe out any hope for the survival of medium-low density conditions going forward, and allow for less attractive and tall concrete apartments everywhere in the subject areas. This is being pushed through on the back of this small subject site to set precedence in the entire area, and in a blanket fashion going forward. Thus my comments below, and No, I do not have any respect for this kind of creeping, insidious approval process in order to get what you want and override the wishes on the vast majority of all local residents. This goes for the new apartment building down at Mary's Corner Store in downtown Bowness area as well. That was opposed by all adjacent stakeholders, met upon just like we have done, and then rammed through by City. You are all, City and developers, force feeding us high density in an existing area where it does not belong and is not wanted. In the case of the subject site alone, over 400% increase from the original approval based on the ARP. The process is absolutely flawed, intentionally creeping and deceitful in my opinion and again, almost of all Bownesians' opinions as well. As well as the vast majority of established Calgary communities.

Take a look at the unmitigated disaster that is the kischy, cluttered, ugly, and forever-changed area in 9th Avenue SE in Inglewood as an example of what will happen. That area is ruined and I do not even go there any more except occasionally to the old Garry Theatre building to attend Calgary Mountain Club meetings. If you like the mess on main-street 9th Avenue Inglewood from a design perspective or urban planning point of view, then you simply lack capacity to understand good urban design. We as Bownesians want no part of that kind of development, we do not want it in our community and are telling you this clearly.

I also would like details from anyone on how a hearing of this scope will be satisfactorily run to maintain adequate, fair and even input from all participants, using a remote video link setup. I am skeptical of how well that will work. This entire hearing really should be put off until it can be addressed properly in one room, in open session.

Thank you,  
Kevin Doyle

On 6/9/2020 10:13 AM, Ang, Benedict wrote:  
Good Morning Chris and Kevin,

I do apologize for not getting back earlier.

I understand the confusion whether it is a new application or as it is presented an amended application. The amended application was accepted based on how it responds to what was heard in the applicants outreach process. The applicant is responsible for the outreach process. City administration reviewed and accepted the outreach report submitted, and have included it

in the report to council. To the questions below related to the outreach methods, signage, meetings and information distribution, I will defer those to the applicant to answer.

As to the process timing whether this should be slowed or delayed as you requested below, administration did take time in considering the amended proposed land use change and how it addressed the issues heard in the outreach process. The proposed Direct Control District and the associated site specific policy went through rigorous and thoughtful analyses. At the end of the review process which took almost two months, administration agreed to proceed to CPC and Council. One may disagree on how the proposed DC and site specific policy responded to the issues, however the proposed change do provide a stringent yet reasonable direct control rules on this prominent and historic site. One thing you may agree is that further outreach will not change the outcome.

If you have further questions, please call me at 403-268-3209.

Regards,  
Ben Ang

(LEED Green Assoc.)

Planner | Centre West | Community Planning  
Planning and Development

The City of Calgary | Mail code: #8075

T 403.268.3209 | F 403.268.2941 | [benedict.ang@calgary.ca](mailto:benedict.ang@calgary.ca)

P.O. Box 2100, Station M, Calgary, AB Canada T2P 2M5

