

Community Association Letter

2020 July 21 – confirmed no changes to the comments received 2019 December 1



Community Association Feedback Form

By providing feedback on the proposed development that is enclosed in this package, you are providing your community association's perspective as the "eyes of the community." This helps City staff better understand what is important to your community as we work with the applicant who has proposed this development, and it enables us to make an informed decision about whether to issue this development permit. In the course of this development permit evaluation, the planning department will review all relevant statutory plans including the Municipal Development Plan, Area Redevelopment or Area Structure Plans as well as the Land Use Bylaw.

File Number: LOC2019-0084/DP2019-5035

Name of Planning Representative/s who completed this form: Wayne Howse

Community Association: Banff Trail

Date returned: December 1, 2019

I commit to the Planning System core values: innovation, collaboration, transparency, accountability, trust, and responsibility.

Yes No

Questions

Please provide your Community Association perspective and respond to the following questions.:

1. What are the strengths and challenges of the proposed development?
2. Are there changes that could be made to the proposed development to make it more compatible or beneficial to the area?
3. Provide comments on the following. You may wish to consider height, privacy, parking, vehicle or pedestrian access and landscaping as you respond to these questions.
 - a. The use (if identified – not applicable for single-detached houses, semi-detached dwellings or duplexes)
 - b. The site design
 - c. The building design
4. Has the applicant discussed the development permit application with the Community Association? If yes, what information was provided?
5. Please provide any additional comments or concerns regarding the proposed development.

Take as much space as you need to answer the questions. If mailing, use separate paper.
Please number your responses to correspond to the question being asked

Community Association Letter

Community Association Feedback Form

By providing feedback on the proposed development that is enclosed in this package, you are providing your community association's perspective as the "eyes of the community." This helps City staff better understand what is important to your community as we work with the applicant who has proposed this development, and it enables us to make an informed decision about whether to issue this development permit. In the course of this development permit evaluation, the planning department will review all relevant statutory plans including the Municipal Development Plan, Area Redevelopment or Area Structure Plans as well as the Land Use Bylaw.

File Numbers: **LOC 2019-0084 / DP2019-5035**

Parcel Address: **2240 24 AV NW, 2504 22 ST NW**

Name of Planning Representative/s who completed this form: **Wayne Howse**

Community Association: **Banff Trail**

Date returned: **December 1, 2019**

I commit to the Planning System core values: innovation, collaboration, transparency, accountability, trust, and responsibility. **Yes**

Please provide your perspective and respond to the following questions

The Banff Trail Community Association provides the comments below based on a collation of community resident input as provided by email correspondence, or through direct engagement at recent community information sharing and engagement events.

1. What are the strengths and challenges of the proposed development?
 - The proposed offers an interesting approach to minimize massing, scale and related impacts with the set back of upper levels as well as the use of material differentiation.
 - The at-grade articulation along both street front elevations helps supply some contrast relief, increase visual interest, and provides well for pedestrian use and direct to residence access and egress.
 - That said, there are several concerns of note related to the scale and density of the proposed. These include (land use comments are provided considering direct control element of the proposed):
 - Notwithstanding the policy goals of the ARP for increased development / density at this location and the applicants statement that the proposed development will be compatible with the existing neighbourhood context, provides certainty to the public regarding the development's built form, respects and enhances the street face, and accentuates the site's location, members of the community consistently noted that the application provides for a development which will be significantly out of context and inconsistent with the surrounding pattern of development.

Community Association Letter

- Of particular concern is the application for an amendment to the ARP to allow for increased building height at this location.
 - The ARP allows for a maximum 12m building height at this location.
 - A previous application (see circulation package dated August 1, 2019) noted a maximum building height of 20m (an increase of 66% over the maximum outlined by ARP at this location).
 - This most recent amendment cites that the applicant requires development controls allowing for up to 26m of maximum building height (the maximum building height stipulated in Land Use Bylaw 1P2007 under the M-H1 land use district) while the Senior Planner notes that “the DP plans shows a building height of 6 storeys only and, once approved by Council, the building cannot exceed the maximum of 6 storeys (*approximately 23 metres*)”.
 - Either way this additional increase amounts to a 92% - 117% increase over maximum outlined by ARP at this location.
 - Apart from the primary concern that this application diverges significantly from the guidelines and maximums provided for by the ARP at this location there is the related concern that the implications of allowing such deviations sets a tantalizing precedent for subsequent land use and development proposals to proceed in a similar manor with further applications for additional accretive nonconformity and deviation from the guidelines, stipulations, and maximums provided for by the ARP.
- Relatedly concerns were also shared about the height of the proposed with the resulting overlooking / onlooking / privacy concerns for adjacent residents.
 - Additionally, the material affects of the proposed in its overall scale on adjacent properties and residents, including the potential loss of enjoyment of use or privacy by adjacent residents, as well as loss of value - either through resale or redevelopment potential of the impacted properties – were noted concerns.
 - Other concerns include:
 - Increased local traffic congestion and parking concerns - the TOD stall credit notwithstanding, it was reiterated that the provided parking allotment ratios would be insufficient relative to both residential and commercial uses. These concerns are informed by area residents direct evidence and experience with the parking and congestion impacts of recent area developments which although significantly more modest in scale than the proposed allowed for the same policy based influences and credit and allotment schemes which have not played out in the reality of material effect.
 - Related concerns about the crosswalk at the intersection of 24th Avenue 20th Street include the difficulty of navigating this busy intersection both as a driver and as a pedestrian. The concern is that the increased density and use at this intersection

Community Association Letter

through the influence of both the proposed and the other current application directly across 24th Avenue will only degrade this situation further.

- The area Transportation Impact Study while considering the proposed along with all other current applications along 24th Avenue does not consider or model the predicted cumulative effect of the proposed within the fully realized context of either how the applicant envisions redevelopment will proceed throughout the community, nor that which the Banff Trail ARP also identifies as a goal. This should be rectified and provided to the community.
 - Concerns of increased noise as an associated compound by-product of increases in density and traffic.
 - Concerns related to the potential loss of the on-site mature trees under this application and the resulting negative impact to the urban forest with its social and environmental benefit were also noted by area residents. The area councillor is on record as being an advocate for the social and environmental benefits of a flourishing urban forest as well as the compromising impacts of urban redevelopment projects on its viability through overuse of land and minimal or sub-par tree replacement programs (“shrubs are not trees”).
 - Relatedly community members cited the loss of viable permeable surfaces for localized runoff management associated with this application. The result here is that local run-off from the proposed will potentially be re-directed into the stormwater system having downstream ecological impacts by increasing deleterious environmental influence on the river systems.
 - Also noted with the proposed is the absence of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design or similar such Green Build environmental standards, use of materials etc. and renewables integration. It was further suggested that such applications include such standards and practices as a matter of course or bylaw expectation, leveraging the most advanced technology and innovative design standards available, in particular in relation to the opportunity presented by such community redevelopment scenarios, both to the benefit of the local community and the greater public good.
 - Concerns and conjectures were raised that term tenancy needs of the University are being downloaded on the community with the contention that such residency needs are better addressed through on-campus and not with off-campus schemes which do not align with the spirit and intent of either the ARP or the residential nature of the community.
2. Are there changes that could be made to the proposed development to make it more compatible or beneficial to the area?

Community feedback here includes:

- Better integration and harmonization with surrounding context and pattern of development through design amendments and improvements including changes to scale and massing resulting in a more discreet and less-conspicuous multiplex design

Community Association Letter

that still achieve the ARP policy goals of modest increase in density and diverse housing options.

- Install improved infrastructure on 24th Avenue to mitigate traffic and pedestrian concerns.
 - Increase available onsite parking.
3. Provide comments on the following. You may wish to consider height, privacy, parking, vehicle or pedestrian access and landscaping as you respond to these questions.
- a. The use (if identified – not applicable for single-detached houses, semi-detached dwellings or duplexes):
 - b. The site design:
 - c. The building design:

Questions 3a, 3b, and 3c have been addressed above with answers provided for Questions 1 and 2.

4. Please provide any additional comments or concerns regarding the proposed development:

Community comments and concerns include the recognition that this application is but one of several applications currently under consideration which diverge significantly from the statutory planning policy provided for by the ARP. Along with the concern that the implications of allowing such deviations sets a tantalizing precedent for subsequent land use and development proposals to proceed in a similar manor with further applications for additional accretive nonconformity and deviation from the planning policies, stipulations, and maximums provided for in the ARP, proceeding in this way engenders cynicism and a lack of trust and respect for statutory policy and the engagement process on the part of the community towards the city, the developers and their perceived practices, and as such is potentially corrosive to the promotion of collaborative outcomes and “great communities”.