Albrecht, Linda		CPC2017-023 Attachment 3 Letter 1
From: Sent: To: Subject:	mulrains@gmail.com Tuesday, January 03, 2017 8:21 AM City Clerk Online Submission on LOC2016-0128	
January 3, 2017		T 21
Application: LOC2016-0128		RECEIVED 2017 JAN -3 PM 12: 04 THE CITY OF CALGARY CITY CLERK'S
Submitted by: Stephen Mulrain		JAN -3 PHIS CITY OF CAL
Contact Information		PH 12 PH 12
Address: 2039 34 St SW		: OL
Phone: 4032004502		
Email: <u>mulrains@</u>	<sup>⊉</sup> gmail.com	
Feedback:		
proposal. I am op proposal for 4 tov area. All of the bu of place. compare in this area. I am general I agree w neighbourhood fi neighbourhood is	re in and own the lot across the alley behind the property which posed to the proposed re-zoning for a number of reasons. Prima wn houses will result in a building that is out of character compa- uildings in the immediate vicinity are single family or duplex. A ed to the surrounding houses. It will result in less green space, w also concerned that an increase in density will diminish street pa- ith increasing density where suitable, I don't believe that increase ts with the long term development that has taken place in the are already quite dense, with many lots being subdivided for two in t level of density. However, doubling the level density by allowing	arily, I am concerned that the ared to the remainder of the a fourplex condo will be out which is already at a premium arking in the area. While in sed density in this part of our ea. This part of the nfill houses or a duplex. I am

neighbourhood is already quite dense, with many lots being subdivided for two infill houses or a duplex. I an supportive of that level of density. However, doubling the level density by allowing fourplex townhouses in the area goes beyond what would be reasonable in the circumstances. Allowing this re-zoning will set a precedent for development that will change the trajectory of Killarney's development. Part of what makes Killarney attractive to young families is its close proximity to the core while maintaining the neighbourhood feel. The drastic increase in density which would follow such a precedent will damage that community feeling.

Albrecht, Linda		CPC2017-023 Attachment 3 Letter 2
From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:	rzshelton@gmail.com Monday, January 02, 2017 8:28 PM City Clerk Online Submission on LOC2016-0128 Zoning Comments (C5891347).DOCX	
January 3, 2017		2017 THE
Application: LOC2016-0128		REC 2017 JAN - THE CITY CITY
Submitted by: Rhea Shelton		$\Omega \Omega \omega$
Contact Information		MAN 7: 53 CALGARY ERK'S
Address: 2032 35 street SW		RY 53
Phone: 587-897-5356		
Email: rzshelton	@gmail.com	

Feedback:

We are opposed to this application for rezoning from R-C2 to R-CG at 2040 35 ST SW, Calgary, Alberta. Allowing a townhouse in this area is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and would be contrary to the established pattern of the streetscape. The application does not comply with the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill. This application is contrary to the Area Redevelopment Plan for Killarney / Glengarry. The proposed rezoning is also contrary to the Municipal Development Plan. Please see our attached comments on this application. Thanks, Rhea Shelton and Samer Hammoud

# Comments on Zoning Redesignation Application in Killarney RECEIVED at 2040 35 ST SW, Calgary, Alberta

### **R-C2 to R-CG (LOC2016-0128)**

#### Introduction

2017 JAN -3 AM 7:53 THE CITY OF CALGARY CITY CLERK'S

We are opposed to this application for rezoning from R-C2 to R-CG (the "Application") at 2040 35 ST SW, Calgary, Alberta (the "Subject Lot").

#### Contrary to the Character and Configuration of the Neighborhood

Allowing a townhouse in this area is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and would be contrary to the established pattern of the streetscape. All of the lots surrounding the Subject Lot are low density residential units, consisting of bungalows, infills and duplexes, with tree-lined streets and backyard space. The Subject Lot is at the southern corner of the block, and all of the houses north of the Subject Lot, up until 19th Avenue, are all R-C2 zoned. Further all of the houses on the blocks directly to the west, east and south, are zoned as R-C2.

If the Subject Lot was recorded to R-CG, it would allow the developer to build a three story high, four unit townhouse complex, which would be out of character with the low density residential neighborhood around it, creating a sharp division between the current low density residential community and the proposed multi-residential development. The rezoning would create a dramatic contrast in the development pattern of the neighborhood.

#### **Contrary to the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill**

The Application does not comply with the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill:

- The Application conflicts with Location Criteria 4, as it is not located on a collector or • higher standard roadway. The Subject Lot is located at the corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 21<sup>st</sup> Street, which are both local, narrow, residential streets and are not designed to handle higher traffic levels.
- The Application does not comply with Location Criteria 5, as the Subject Lot is not adjacent to existing or planned non-residential development or multi-unit development. All of the lots surrounding the Subject Lot are low density residential developments. The Subject Lot is not adjacent to, or even close to, to any townhouse or commercial developments or proposed developments. Allowing the Application would result in inconsistent height and massing transitions in this neighborhood.
- The Application is not compliant with Location Criteria 6, as the Subject Lot is not adjacent to or across from an existing or planned open space, park or community amenity. There is low density residential development surrounding the Subject Lot to the north, south, east and west.

• The Application is not compliant with Location Criteria 7, as it is not along or in close proximity to an existing or planned corridor or activity center. As indicated above, the Subject Lot is surrounded by residential housing and residential streets. As a result, it does not constitute planned and coordinated development and would not accommodate an appropriate height and massing transition.

### Conflicting with the Area Redevelopment Plan for Killarney / Glengarry

This Application is contrary to the Area Redevelopment Plan for Killarney / Glengarry (the "**ARP**"). Map 2 on page 7 of the ARP (which is updated as of April 2016) does not show any plan for higher-density development in this area of Killarney. The ARP indicates that this area is for "conservation/infill". Further, Policy 2.1.3.2 of the ARP states "a low density single and two-family dwelling policy for development will continue to be applied to the areas presently designated R-2." If this Application is approved, it would constitute scattered rezoning in the middle of a "conservation/infill" community, directly contrary to the ARP.

## **Conflicting with the Municipal Development Plan**

The proposed rezoning is also contrary to the Municipal Development Plan ("MDP"):

- Pursuant to the MDP, Killarney is considered an "Inner City Area". At Section 3.5.2, the MDP states "The Inner City Area has undergone redevelopment in recent years. Much of this intensification has taken place along busier roads and as low density infilling within lower density areas. Intensification and change will continue to occur within the Inner City Area; however, it is important to maintain stable family neighborhoods." The Subject Lot is not located along a busy road. Allowing rezoning on the Subject Lot will not maintain a stable family neighborhood given the sharp increase in density relative to the homes around it.
- The MDP states at Section 3.5.2, "sites within the Inner City Area may intensify ... if the intensification is consistent and compatible with the existing character of the neighborhood." As stated above, this Application is inconsistent with the existing character of the neighborhood (due to the significant height, mass and density increase relative to the surrounding houses) and, therefore, inconsistent with the MDP.
- Pursuant to Section 2.3.2 of the MDP, appropriate planning and development requires that city council "ensure an appropriate transition of development intensity, uses and built form between low-density residential areas and more intensive multi-residential or commercial areas" and "ensure infill development complements the established character of the area and does not create dramatic contrasts in the physical development pattern." The present Application is inconsistent with the above policies, as there would be no transition between the Subject Lot and the low density residential homes surrounding it, resulting in a dramatic contrast in the development pattern of the neighborhood.

# Other Areas are Better Suited to Multi-Residential Developments

Development and densification in Killarney should be planned and should be focused on areas where densification has already started to take place and where multi-residential developments would fit in with the surrounding streetscape.

There are certain areas within Killarney which are better suited for higher density multiresidential developments, such as along 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 29<sup>th</sup> Street, 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 37<sup>th</sup> Street. Development in these areas is already contemplated in the ARP. Further, these areas comply with the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill, as the lots are located on larger and busier roadways, there is already some multi-residential and commercial developments, and the lots are close to existing or planned corridors or activity centers. These areas should be the focus of rezoning and densification efforts, rather than random, scattered densification in the middle of an established residential neighborhood, as is the case with the present Application.

There are also plans in motion to develop the vacant land directly north of 17th Avenue from Killarney (Westbrook) to build apartment buildings. These plans will provide extensive density in the area and provide substantial affordable housing. As a result, there is no need to rezone in an otherwise low density residential neighborhood in Killarney in order to achieve density and affordable housing in this area. The development at Westbrook represents planned, comprehensive development, whereas this Application does not.

## **Current Zoning Achieves Appropriate Densification**

The current R-C2 zoning of the Subject Lot already allows the developer to build two infills or a duplex, thereby doubling its current density. The current zoning designation strikes the right balance, allowing for re-development and densification to occur in the neighborhood, while maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

### The Community is opposed to this Application

The Killarney Glengarry Community Association (the "**Community Association**") opposes this Application. The Community Association represents the residents of Killarney as a whole and the community as a whole does not support this Application. We have also spoken with numerous neighbors in the area who are concerned about this Application and its impact on the neighborhood. All of the neighbors we have spoken with agree that a townhouse in this location would not fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

### **Conclusion**

We purchased our home in Killarney in 2015, with the intention of raising a family in an established low-density residential neighborhood. Killarney is full of other families who moved here for similar reasons. The proposed rezoning to R-CG is not consistent with the community environment, which is highly valued by current residents, and would create a dramatic contrast in height, size and density between the Subject Lot and the surrounding homes.

For the above reasons, we request that City Council reject this Application. Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

Rhea Shelton and Samer Hammoud

2032 35 Street SW Calgary, Alberta T3E 2X6 587-897-5356 rzshelton@gmail.com

## Albrecht, Linda

From: Sent:	Magdalena.tchalakova@gmail.com Thursday, January 05, 2017 9:15 AM	
То:	City Clerk	
Subject:	Online Submission on LOC2016-0128	

January 5, 2017

Application: LOC2016-0128

Submitted by: Magdalena Tchalakova

Contact Information

Address: 2034 35 Street SW

Phone: 4039754616

Email: Magdalena.tchalakova@gmail.com

Feedback:

Please note that as the resident next to the proposed re-zoning at 2040 35 Street SW I am opposed to the construction of this type of building. I have recently moved into the Killarney area where I was looking forward to living on a street with single family homes/duplexes and where I can enjoy my property, including backyard. Additional reasons for opposition: - The proposed structure would greatly impact my property in that it will overshadow it and would affect the enjoyment of my backyard - the structure is not contextual to it's neighbors i.e., duplexes and infills - it will impact the character of the homes on this street Thank you for your consideration in the rezoning of this location. I hope to see a structure more contextual to the rest of the properties on the street in the future. Thank you, Magdalena Tchalakova

RECEIVED 2017 JAN -5 AM 9: 49 THE CITY OF CALGARY CITY CLERK'S

#### Albrecht, Linda

2017 JAN -5 AM 7:

S

m

CEIVED

From: Sent: To: Subject: cody.bilben@gmail.com Wednesday, January 04, 2017 5:34 PM City Clerk Online Submission on LOC2016-0128

January 5, 2017

Application: LOC2016-0128

Submitted by: Cody Bilben

Contact Information

Address: 2036 35th Street SW

Phone: 4038709749

Email: cody.bilben@gmail.com

#### Feedback:

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed re-zoning of 2040 35th Street SW (LOC2016-0128) for the following reasons... - As the direct adjacent neighbour the maximum building size under the proposed zoning would overshadow my home and backyard significantly. It would also extend the footprint of the building past the rest of the street making it inconsistent. The maximum building size under R-CG does not fit in this lot. - The proposed building style is inconsistent with the rest of the street. The entire street is full of single family homes, duplexes and infills. If a large building was to maximize the zoning specifications of R-CG it would look out of character and completely inconsistent with the rest of the street. - The current zoning already allows for a doubling of density which should be sufficient to achieve increased density goals. Right now a single family dwelling is located here for the potential of a duplex or infill. This should be sufficient to achieve any desired densification goals. - The community is opposed to this rezoning. At a development committee meeting the vast majority of attendees were opposed to this re-zoning application. I moved here to keep away from large apartment-like structures. A three story, four unit building was not the neighbour I planned on living beside. - This application is not consistent with the area redevelopment plan for Killarney. This area is designated for quot; conservation/infillquot;. This proposed re-zoning allows for a higher density and runs counter to this plan. - The redevelopment plan north of 17th Ave in Westbrook will provide a massive increase in density when ground breaks. - Killarney already has many areas that are more suitable for this type of development. There are many lots in Killarney that are not meeting their potential zoning densities. Focus should be put on maximizing our existing zoning. In conclusion these are the reasons I am opposed to this rezoning application. As the direct adjacent neighbour this significantly effects me with overshadowing and the sheer size of building that could be built under R-CG. But more importantly the community is opposed to this application as it is inconsistent with it's vision for Killarney. We are the residents that already live in the community and would be the ones living beside any re-development on this lot. Maintaining the current zoning status ensures the street will maintain a consistency that is desired in Killarney. For these reasons I encourage City Council to reject this application for re-development. Thank you for your consideration. Regards, -Cody Bilben 2036 35th Street SW Calgary AB T3E 2X6

### Albrecht, Linda

From:nbilben@yahoo.caSent:Thursday, January 05, 2017 3:30 AMTo:City ClerkSubject:Online Submission on LOC2016-0128

January 5, 2017

Application: LOC2016-0128

Submitted by: Norma Bilben

**Contact Information** 

Address: Site 4 Box 7 RR1 Airdrie AB

Phone: 4038707391

Email: nbilben@yahoo.ca

Feedback:

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed re-zoning of 2040 35th Street SW (LOC2016-0128). As property owners on this street we rent our house to our son who lives adjacent to the property (2036). I support his reasons for opposition and echo the sentiment. I urge council to deny this application. Regards, - Norma

THE	2017	
VII)		REC
23	ப்	гп
ESS-	AM	< n
So	1:	0
1	5	

Albrecht, Linda		CPC2017-023 Attachment 3 Letter 6
From: Sent: To: Subject:	nbilben@yahoo.ca Thursday, January 05, 2017 3:31 AM City Clerk Online Submission on LOC2016-0128	
January 5, 2017		7 2
Application: LOC2016-0128		REC 2017 JAN THE CIT
Submitted by: Robert Bilben		JAN -5 AM
Contact Information		
Address: Site 4 Box 7 RR1 Airdrie AB		D 7:56
Phone: 403680	7391	
Email: nbilben	@yahoo.ca	

Feedback:

I Bob Bilben would like to express my opposition to the proposed re-zoning of 2040 35th Street SW (LOC2016-0128). As a property owner on this street we rent our house to our son Cody who lives adjacent to the property (2036). I support his reasons for opposition and echo the sentiment. I urge council to deny this application. Regards, -Norma

Albrecht, Linda		CPC2017-023 Attachment 3 Letter 7	
From: Sent: To: Subject:	terry.melton@shaw.ca Wednesday, January 04, 2017 3:29 PM City Clerk Online Submission on LOC2016-0128		
January 4, 2017			
Application: LOC2016-0128		T 20	
Submitted by: Terry Melton		REC 2017 JAN THE CIT	
Contact Information		JAN -4 PH	
Address: 2232-35 St.S.W		PH 4: PH 4: LERK'S	
Phone: 403-686-0420		VED PH 4: 10 CALCARY ERK'S	

Email: terry.melton@shaw.ca

#### Feedback:

I have lived one block south of the subject property for over 20 years and have watch the area develop over that time. For the most part all have added something to the community and have been a positive addition. I can't say the same for the above application. I feel that it will have a negative effect on the value of the adjacent properties. Most certainly on the home directly to the north. This project will cast a shadow over the entire property, front and back yard included. I don't believe the city's desire to increase density should be at the expense of recently built surrounding properties. This lot is about a block away from the higher density zoning that is on the periphery of Killarney where this type of development already exists. If council was to approve this type of "cherry picking" or "spot zoning" it would put a target on every 50 ft. corner lot in the area. This would lead to a type of ghettoization of Killarney not unlike the areas of Bankview and Rosscarrock. Where the mix of single family homes, town homes, and apartment buildings have been constructed with no sense of continuity. There are plenty of under developed lots in areas where this type of development would be allowed. The applicant should focus their efforts on those. This application has been approved by the planning commission and already there is now a second application for a similar lot in the same block. I can only imagine what kind of checker board neighborhood will develop if this is the planning process council promotes. Should this project be approved it will be the only one in the R-2C areas making it atypical to what exits on the street, disrupting the line of site from yard to yard. Any character or balance on the street would be altered for the worse. I was under the assumption the land use and zoning guidelines were put in place to add a level of security to home owners when purchasing a property. If all it takes is an application, that may or may not get approved by the council of the day...that most certainly will erode any sense of protection home owners thought they had.