

## Palaschuk, Jordan

---

**From:** Dong, May C. on behalf of City Clerk  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 3:49 PM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] Ref. DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054 - Council Meeting Date Dec.14 2020  
**Attachments:** Letter to Council regarding LOC2020-0054 & DP2020-5446 - JW.docx

---

**From:** jwimberty@gmail.com [mailto:jwimberty@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 3:33 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXT] Ref. DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054 - Council Meeting Date Dec.14 2020

Dear Calgary Council Members,

Please accept this **letter of opposition** to the current drastic change in land use bylaw from R-C2 to M-C1 of the Development at 801 8 Ave NE, DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054. I believe that densification is the right approach for the city and is necessary to increase the tax base, however, the expectation is for it to be done in a sensitive and appropriate way considering the surrounding area. **I hope that the council members will send this back to administration and the developer for better engagement with the neighbors and a more appropriate level of densification.** Please distribute the attached specific points of opposition in the December 14<sup>th</sup> council meeting for your consideration.

Regards,

Jorg Wimberty

**RE: LOC2020-0054 & DP202-5446 (801 8 Ave NE)**

Dear Mayor Nenshi and Members of Council,

Please accept this **letter of opposition** to the current drastic change in land use bylaw from R-C2 to M-C1 of the Development at 801 8 Ave NE, DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054. We believe that densification is the right approach for the city and is necessary to increase the tax base, however, the expectation is for it to be done in a sensitive and appropriate way considering the surrounding area. **We hope that the council will send this back to administration and the developer for better engagement with the neighbors and a more appropriate level of densification.** Please find the specific points of our opposition below;

- The parcel does not match the scale of the development. This is a single lot that is proposed to hold an 11 unit multi-residential apartment complex with solely family homes on the streetscape.
- A multi-relaxation step from R-C2 (Residential – Contextual One/Two Dwelling District) to M-C1 (Multi-Residential) is not appropriate for this time and this neighbourhood that has not seen any M-C1 before. Densification needs to be first done in the row-house, duplex, fourplex concept (R-CG)
- A requested shadow study was not provided by the developer
- The developer refused to prepare a requested temperature depression study, which is necessary to show the extreme impact on the single family home next door.
- This development will be in direct violation with the city's land use bylaw for individuals to be able to grow their own food, something I am proud to say that my City(Calgary) wants to encourage more and more. This first time extreme relaxation will allow the building to span along the whole west side (~30 meters long) at a height of 14 meters. No west sun will reach the neighboring yard or parts of the adjacent yard making growing your own food nearly impossible in this short growing season.
- This build form and landscape will impact this neighbourhood for 40+ years and needs to be well thought out.
- Only awareness raising was provided through a postcard (even directly adjacent neighbours) and a sign on the development property, which is insufficient and not in line with the city requirements. This development classifies as a comprehensive approach under the outreach assessment tool due to multiple bylaw relaxations to multi residential.
- A total of 6 off-street parking spots for 11 units (6 3-bedroom and 5 1-bedroom) is insufficient. Applying R-CG bylaw parking relaxations to M-C1, where this relaxation bylaw does not exist, is unlawful mixing and matching of bylaw relaxations. In addition I have read through the parking studies in detail and they do not support a relaxation to 0 parking spots for all 5 micro units and additionally are not directly applicable to Calgary. These studies were done in Vancouver with a very different climate, density & public transit structure.

If approved, we intend to appeal since as neighbours we do not feel we have been properly engaged. **We are happy to sit down with the developer to find a reasonable more appropriate solution for the densification.** Again we support change and densification and think there are many examples in Renfrew of reasonable alternatives such as some of the duplexes or fourplexes that have recently been developed in the neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

*Jorg Wimbert*

**From:** [geraldsieb@shaw.ca](mailto:geraldsieb@shaw.ca)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] Ref. DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054 - Council Meeting Date Dec.14 2020  
**Date:** Monday, December 7, 2020 12:26:19 PM  
**Attachments:** [Letter to Council regarding LOC2020-0054 DP2020-5446 - JW.docx](#)

---

Dear Calgary Council Members,

Note we have read and agree with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act of Alberta (FOIP) as requested

Please accept this **letter of opposition** to the current drastic change in land use bylaw from R-C2 to M-C1 of the Development at 801 8 Ave NE, DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054. I believe that some densification is the right approach for the city and is necessary to increase the tax base, however, the expectation is for it to be done in a sensitive and appropriate way considering the surrounding area. **I hope that the council members will send this back to administration and the developer for better engagement with the neighbors and a more appropriate level of densification.** Please distribute the attached specific points of opposition in the December 14<sup>th</sup> council meeting for your consideration. We understand that we will have 5 minutes of explanation.

Regards,

Gerald and Heather Sieb

**RE: LOC2020-0054 & DP202-5446 (801 8 Ave NE)**

Dear Mayor Nenshi and Members of Council,

Please accept this **letter of opposition** to the current drastic change in land use bylaw from R-C2 to M-C1 of the Development at 801 8 Ave NE, DP2020-5446 and land use redesignation LOC2020-0054. May we emphasize that we live adjacent to the adjacent home on the west side of the development across 7th Street NE. We believe that some densification is the right approach for the city and is necessary to increase the tax base, however, the expectation is for it to be done in a sensitive and appropriate way considering the surrounding area. **We hope that the council will send this back to administration and the developer for better engagement with the neighbors and a more appropriate level of densification.** Please find the specific points of our opposition below;

- The parcel does not match the scale of the development. This is a single lot that is proposed to hold an 11 unit multi-residential apartment complex with solely family homes on the streetscape.
- A multi-relaxation step from R-C2 (Residential – Contextual One/Two Dwelling District) to M-C1 (Multi-Residential) is not appropriate for this time and this neighbourhood that has not seen any M-C1 before. Densification needs to be first done in the row-house, duplex, fourplex concept (R-CG)
- A requested shadow study was not provided by the developer
- The developer refused to prepare a requested temperature depression study, which is necessary to show the extreme impact on the single family home next door.
- This development will be in direct violation with the city's land use bylaw for individuals to be able to grow their own food, something I am proud to say that my City(Calgary) wants to encourage more and more. This first time extreme relaxation will allow the building to span along the whole west side (~30 meters long) at a height of 14 meters. No west sun will reach the neighboring yard or parts of the adjacent yard making growing your own food nearly impossible in this short growing season.
- This build form and landscape will impact this neighbourhood for 40+ years and needs to be well thought out.
- Only awareness raising was provided through a postcard (even directly adjacent neighbours) and a sign on the development property, which is insufficient and not in line with the city requirements. This development classifies as a comprehensive approach under the outreach assessment tool due to multiple bylaw relaxations to multi residential.
- A total of 6 off-street parking spots for 11 units (6 3-bedroom and 5 1-bedroom) is insufficient. Applying R-CG bylaw parking relaxations to M-C1, where this relaxation bylaw does not exist, is unlawful mixing and matching of bylaw relaxations. In addition I have read through the parking studies in detail and they do not support a relaxation to 0 parking spots for all 5 micro units. I surmise that most families do not stop at only one vehicle per unit leading to excess vehicles parking on 8 Avenue and competing with parents picking up and dropping off children at school several times a day. Not to mention clearing the vehicles from the street to do a proper snow removal during a snow event on the snow route. It is great that each unit has bicycle parking but so do we, and we still have two vehicles which are NOT on the street. I calculate there would be 23 beds or upwards to 46 people which could spawn 46 vehicles not counting visitors, 40 of which would spill out on the street. And then there is the problem of self distancing regarding Covid 19.

If approved, we intend to appeal since as neighbours we do not feel we have been properly engaged. **We are happy to sit down with the developer to find a reasonable more appropriate solution for the densification.** Again we support change and some densification and think there are many examples in Renfrew of reasonable alternatives such as some of the duplexes or fourplexes that have recently been developed in the neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

*Gerald and Heather Sieb*