

July 10, 2020

Dear Council members,

Re: Carrington (Livingston) Land Use Re-designation – LOC2018-0262

Out of respect for your time, I am submitting this letter in bullet form for simplicity.

- Page 10 indicates notification letters were sent to adjacent landowners and that no letters from the landowners were received. For full disclosure, there is no date that these letters were sent. I moved in 13 months ago and did not receive notification. This means the notification must have been done earlier, and at a time when there would have only been a few residences adjacent to this land. The area which is in very close proximity to this land is developing now, however, the properties (other than the landowners directly adjacent to the school/park land) are made up mostly of a combination of; residents, under construction, vacant, show homes, or open space. It is unrealistic to say that there were no responses when there were next to no occupants at the time these first letters went out.
- I question the need for a “Major Activity Centre” (MAC) in a small community. By demographics, in the group of 6 communities (Evanston, Sage Hill, Nolan Hill, Livingston, Carrington, and Panorama), Carrington is shown to be the second smallest community with a total build out population capacity of 17,259 residents. A Major Activity Centre has to have a negative impact through intense densification and the influx of residents from the larger communities. This statement is made after seeing the proposed uses provided on page 4 of the first proposed attachment. Development suggestions such as medium to large drinking establishment, medium to large restaurant, self-storage, conference/event facility, hotel, and post-secondary institution, are large developments in a small community.
- The Major Activity Centre is proposed with “approximately 10 storey, 4 storey and 3 storey buildings (outlined in the Executive Summary). This would completely change the landscape, and eliminate the advertised community setting; ‘with views, green spaces, parks and school’. The draw to the community was that it would be a great place to call home, to raise a family – not to be surrounded by 10 storey commercial buildings.
- There needs to be a better outline regarding the end result for the footprint of this development. It is indicated that street access is available, however there is no indication as to the available parking that will be provided for this substantial development. Where are the employees of this commercial development going to park? This can only lead to spill out into the community with potential hardship for residents.
- With future LRT and station in the plans, what is the impact on the community for parking? Could this also spill out to the community, and these commercial developments? If so, are there plans to accommodate this risk?
- The applicant’s submission (attachment 3 of the submission) states the proposal is to intensify the base development concept. Development at this scale is not “respectful of the existing context”.
- Further to the same attachment, the conclusion statement states the intention to add 483 residences through clustered townhouses, row houses and 4 to 5 storey apartments. That would equate to approximately 1449 residents (483 x 3 (average per household), a large number in one space. The possibility of 483 vehicles (up to 966 vehicles if 2 car family), there is no indication as to what that parking would be for these residents. Given these would be developed within the commercial land, again the spill out to community has the potential to be vast. There is also the possibility of residences above the commercial development – again parking?

I am not opposed to the commercial development at the small scale, that was indicated when I purchased my property, every community benefits from such developments. I am respectfully asking that this submission be set aside for a month or two so that the residents in the community, not just the adjacent residents, have the opportunity to inform themselves and provide feedback if they so choose. The 2 signs for awareness are located on the corner parcel of the undeveloped land. These signs are placed where you cannot stop your vehicle (no sidewalk either) for people to read. These are close to the 4 way stop. Drivers should be focused on the 4 way stop and other motorists...not repurposing signs. As well, there is another entrance into the community, if a resident only uses this entrance, they would never see these signs. If they did not see the signs, and did not get a mailed notice, they are unaware of this large scale development in their backyard. Time to review was 10 days, not enough time for the community given there is no community association at this time.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Karen Rudd
202 Carringvue Park NW
Calgary, AB T3P 1L1
Kmrudd3@gmail.com

Information for bullet 2 was found:

Carrington Real Estate Statistics Housing Market: Carrington is a residential neighbourhood in Nw Calgary. The highest priced Carrington real estate statistics ...

images4.loopnet.com > document ▾ PDF

[carrington commercial site - LoopNet](#)

DEMOGRAPHICS: CONCEPT RENDERINGS - SUBJECT TO CHANGE: SE CORNER OF 144TH AVENUE NW AND 14TH STREET NW, CALGARY.

Searches related to carrington demographics

From: adevokhai@gmail.com
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Subject: 14121 CENTRE ST NW - LOC2018-0262 - Comment from Development Map - Mon 7/13/2020 6:17:39 AM
Date: Monday, July 13, 2020 6:17:40 AM
Attachments: [Public Submissions.pdf](#)

Application: LOC2018-0262

Submitted by: ERIC ADEVOKHAI

Contact Information

Address: 198, Carringvue Pk Nw

Phone: 4038040419

Email: adevokhai@gmail.com

Feedback:

Please find attached a letter with my comments on the subject matter of the repurposing of the area located at 14121 Centre st NW.

198 Carringvue Park, NW
Calgary, AB
T3P 1L1.

Dear Sir,

I wish to express my dissatisfaction and objection at the proposed repurposing of the area located at 14121 Centre Street, NW.

At the time my property was purchased by my wife and I, one of the major selling points by the developer, EXCEL HOMES, was that the view behind the house would be a "green space" with very few structures or buildings.

Had it been known that area would be used for something else, we'd have explored other options which were available at that time.

We are not against the developing of the neighborhood or the provision of infrastructure, we do feel however that it should not come after the fact.

We urge that the project is reconsidered, or at least, have it scaled back in volume, so the value of our investment is not diminished.

I look forward to airing my views at the public hearing on the 20th of July.

Your truly,

Adevokhai Eric