

Community Association Response

March 8, 2021

RE: Land Use Amendment Application LOC2019-0162

Dear Joseph,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for Land Use Amendment application LOC2019-0162. I am responding as President of the Springbank Hill Community Association, on behalf of our Board of Directors, our Planning Committee, members of our community association and residents of our community at large.

Over the past 18 months we have had the opportunity to meet with the planning group, the developer and their representatives in various settings to listen, review proposals and provide feedback.

The community is unable to support the land use application that was presented to us on Friday March 5th.

Through this process, the community has been presented with 4 "visions" of development along with 4 land use applications.

While the latest "vision" from the developer appears to address the majority of the community's concerns, the latest land use application is the least restrictive of the 4 and provides the developer the greatest flexibility, and very limited accountability to deliver the proposed vision.

How can the community comment or support a proposal, when there is NO guarantee of what will be built?

To summarize our understanding of the applicant's response to our concerns, which we have summarized below:

- At this time the application area has been reduced from the original intention of 900 units down to 465 units, with the removal of the Mahood Lands. The new concept plan results in a density of 88 uph 136 low density townhome units and 329 apartment style units.
- The build form has been revised to demonstrate 8-14 units townhome buildings on the lower half of the Ambrose site with higher density apartments along the northern edge, closer to 17th Avenue. A proposed setback of 8.5 metres, similar to a low-density land use district has been proposed. Most balconies/amenity space are planned along the west facades. All building entrances will be from the west.

We have attached the proposed vision document from the applicant, for reference purposes.

In reading the applicant's cover letter and reviewing the vision document, we initially felt that we had been heard, and meaningful changes had been made to this application.

However, based on our detailed review of the land use application from Friday March 5th, it is now our understanding that densities, build forms, heights, and setbacks are all open to relaxation, and allow for a wider range of design at future steps in the process.

We understand the grades of this particular parcel are challenging. This is not unusual in our community, and the applicant has had over 18 months to review the topology, plan and refine their design.

As a resolution the community proposes simple prescriptive restrictions to be added to the land use application that are not open to relaxation, providing the community with confidence that the developer will deliver on their vision within clearly state parameters. We propose the following:

M-2 and M-G zones:

- a) A demarcation line between the m-2 and M-G zone more in line with the vision document presented to us.
- b) Density of 88 uph - 136 to include low density townhome units and 329 apartment style units, with a variance of 10% to allow for issues at development permit stage.

M-G zone:

- a) Balconies/amenity space only permitted along the west facades.
- b) All building entrances only permitted along the west side of the buildings.
- c) Each unit must have a separate and direct pedestrian access to grade.
- d) The minimum building setback from a parcel designated as a low density residential district to be 8.5 metres.
- e) A restriction that ensures the building height measured from the top of grade of each building is no more than 8.5 metres, (or 2.5 storeys). Our reason for this request is that the M-G standard of 13 metres is not measured from top of grade. Since we are asking for definitive heights, we are recommending 2.5 storeys from the highest point of grade to match the surrounding residential area.

We are community residents and volunteers; we are not city planners and our group members do not have a formal background in planning. However, we are simply asking for restrictions to be put in place to hold the developer accountable at the DP stage to the vision presented to the community during the Land Use stage. We feel this is a reasonable and actionable request and we are prepared to fully support this application with the above noted restrictions.

At this time the community is unable to support this application as presented, and we request CPC to reject the land use application in its current form without the addition of the restrictions requested above.

Sincerely,



Elio Cozzi
President, Springbank Hill Community Association

Cc: Circulation Control, Planning & Development, City of Calgary
Jeff Davison, Councilor Ward 6
Members of the Board of Directors, Springbank Hill Community Association
Members of the Planning Committee, Springbank Hill Community Association
Michael Hoffman, President, Springborough Residents Association
Frank Pogubila, Springbank Hill Resident