

Constance Craig
283 Tremblant Way SW
Calgary, AB T3H 0S8

July 13th, 2020

Office of the City Clerk, The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Re: Proposed Land Use Re-designation – LOC2018-0231 – 131 St Moritz Drive SW

His Worship Mayor Naheed Nenshi and The City of Calgary Councillors,
Without Prejudice

As a directly adjacent homeowner, I am writing you to document my objection to the proposed Land Use Re-designation at 131 St Moritz Drive SW, File Number: LOC2018-0231. My objection is based on the following:

1. Lack of genuine two-way dialogue, engagement and purposeful dialogue from the applicant to the community and community members. Meetings that have occurred (3 total) seemed like one sided lectures telling the community what the applicant was planning to build and not respecting the communities comments or making any changes to address community concerns.
2. The existing Land Use accommodates S-CI for a Church and a Direct Control (based on R-1) for a Daycare. These existing uses have been in place for over 10 years. When the community was developed, when my house was built and when my house was purchased, a Church and a Daycare were to be built on this land. The proposed land use re designation consisting of a Direct Control backed by C-N1, would allow for developments, specifically commercial that are extremely different than what could take place under the existing land use.
3. Commercial land uses as is in the proposal are too general and would facilitate commercial uses that would not be a benefit to the community nor in line with the applicants stated vision. The applicant has stated that she requires commercial uses to facilitate a wellness center. If that is the case then any commercial uses should be restrictive to a wellness center only.
4. The maximum building height for the proposed change at 12 m (3 stories) is much too high and does not fit the context of the community. Yes, existing S-CI land use allows for 12 m heights, however a 12 m tall church (often the height of the steeple for example) is a much different context than a 12 m tall strip mall or townhouse wall. Additionally, a large portion of the land proposed for re designation is part of DC (for daycare) which is underwritten by R-1 residential of the 2P80 Bylaw. As such, 10 m heights are the existing maximum on that portion of the land. My home, as well as all of the homes on the south edge of the property bought or built under the pretense that 10 m would be the maximum height of a specifically sized daycare bordering their property. The proposed maximum height of 12 m is objectionable and would create privacy issues and shadow issues on bordering R-1 homes. The Proposed maximum building height (12 m, 3

stories) is not a fit with the surrounding community. This is not a building height that would allow future development buildings to keep with the scale of nearby residential.

5. The land use re-designation allows for development with rear set backs that are not significant enough. They would not allow for preservation of privacy for the existing R-1 home owners. R-1 land use requires a minimum set back of 7.5 m from a rear property line. Considering this proposed re-designation is in a residential area the proposed set back is out of place.
6. The current land use (DC63Z2007) allows only for a daycare of a very specific size, a maximum of 929 square meters and 93 square meters for accessory buildings. Additionally, the height of this would be restricted to 10 m as the DC is underwritten by bylaw 2P80 and R-1 land use. The proposed land use change has not considered any of this which is wrong.
7. The applicant has not provided in the proposed development, any connectivity, greenspace, or social gathering space within the development, and has kept this to the periphery, against the policies of the Springbank Hill ASP, and best practices of the city urban design group. The applicant has failed to show how her proposed application will benefit the community.
8. The density of the proposed land use change and subsequent development would require an amendment to the ASP. The Community and City has already spent time and valuable resources on the ASP for Springbank Hill. The ASP should not be changed to accommodate one landowner. Nor should it be changed in consideration to the existing property/home owners.
9. The ASP also states that in a Standard Suburban area (where the land in question is located), developments should accommodate single-detached and semi-detached housing. Not multi-residential or commercial as is being proposed.
10. This land use re-designation and subsequent development are against the ASP. The purpose of the ASP is as follows: "Purpose of the ASP: Land use planning is the process of shaping the physical environment to achieve an orderly, sustainable and compatible pattern of growth, and protection of sensitive ecological functions with the goal of enhancing the quality of life for the Community's residents. The purpose of an ASP is twofold. Firstly, it refines and implements The City's broad planning objectives and policies of the MDP, CTP and other policies by promoting logical, compatible, and sustainable community development. Secondly, an ASP guides and directs the specific land use, subdivision and development decisions that collectively determine the form that an area will take." This land use re-designation and proposed development is not compatible, and will not enhance the quality of life for residents as has been demonstrated by the communities objection to this proposal.
11. One of the goals and objectives of the ASP is "Increased Environmental Protection." The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would impact the environment on this piece of land. There is abundant wildlife (large mammals such as deer and numerous prey birds such as Hawks and Owls) as well as native trees (Aspens). Understanding the environmental impact of any such land use change and/or subsequent development should be investigated. Considering there is a cost to such an evaluation I would assume the land owner has already done this on their own? This is not something the City and Tax Payers should be paying for, for the benefit of the land owner.

12. The land parcel in question only has one access point. Under the proposed land use re-designation, this access point would need to be shared by the S-CI parcel to the North (which was recently purchased by the applicant (Ilona Boyce) of the current land use change proposal), commercial buildings, daycare and the multi-residential development. The sidewalk that would be crossed for access into this land is a Regional Pathway as designated in the ASP. Such large volumes of traffic over a Regional Pathway hinders the walkability of the community and puts pedestrians and cyclists at risk. This is against the ASP. This is also against the Municipal Development Plan (MDP). Section 2.4.3 encourages that we provide "b. safe pedestrian connections ... to facilitate all travel modes." There is surely a greater conflict with pedestrians on the sidewalk with this proposed land use change and development. If more vehicles are passing over the public sidewalk, there may be greater potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. The safety of pedestrians on public sidewalks should take priority. Excessive vehicular crossing of the sidewalk disrupts pedestrian movement which is inappropriate in a residential area.
13. The applicant has recently acquired the land parcel directly North (zoned S-CI) of the parcel with the proposed land use redesignation. Many members of the CPC voiced their concerns that this land could play a significant role in creating a cohesive development. I share the concern of CPC, and feel that the development of the entire parcel should be done holistically.
14. The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would negatively impact street parking in the existing residential community. Not only will existing residents lose access to street parking, but additional parked cars do not promote a street-friendly, pedestrian-oriented appearance to the street.
15. The proposed land use re designation would allow for development that would infringe on my privacy, my tranquility and the overall enjoyment of my property.
16. The proposed land use re designation would allow for developments that would create additional noise, during all times of the day.
17. The proposed land use re-designation would de-value my property, as well as the other homeowners' properties.
18. The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would create additional traffic in the neighbourhood.
19. The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would create a safety risk in the community and surrounding area. Not only for pedestrians and motorists due to increased traffic, but the density of development on such a small piece of land could restrict access for emergency vehicles such as ambulance and fire trucks.
20. The intersection of St. Moritz Drive SW and 17 Ave SW is already a very busy intersection that is not controlled by traffic lights (currently only flashing pedestrian lights and stop signs). Increased traffic would result at this intersection from the land use re-designation and proposed development. Making the intersection more dangerous for vehicles, as well as again putting pedestrians at risk. I would assume a traffic study has been done? If not, is this something the City and Tax Payer dollars will be used for. Or will the land owner be paying for such studies?

Given the economic state of The City and rising taxes, this is exactly the thing that tax payer dollars should not be used for.

21. This land use re-designation of C-N1 and subsequent development does not fit in the community, nor is it needed in the community. The community already has a commercial neighbourhood development 400 m (or a 4 min walk) away from the proposed land use redesignation and subsequent development. In addition, there is a large scale commercial development underway directly East, between 85th St SW and 77th St SW.
22. The proposed land use re designation and development lack greenspace and soft landscaping. Such a development could cause a risk of flooding due to replacing soft landscaping with large amounts of concrete.

A few general comments to be made in addition.

- I value fair process. I do NOT believe this process has been fair to date, with the applicant ignoring community concerns, using threats and bully tactics to get their way, being deceptive, presenting “half truths”, and lacking transparency. Most concerning is the fact that the applicant has stated at previous meetings with the community that “they knew people at the City” and that they would get their way regardless. Myself and fellow community members heard these words spoken. All I want is a fair process and hope that this applicant was speaking out of turn.
- I also have concerns over the fact that the applicant just prior to requesting/proposing this land use change purchased the S-CI land on the south portion of the parcel, and now has purchased even more S-CI land on the north portion of the parcel. Why is an applicant purchasing land with uses they don’t want? What are their true motives?
- Additionally, I was one of three community members invited to a Zoom call with the applicant Ilona Boyce and Sue Patton on June 30, 2020. I believe the applicant intends to present this call as community engagement. I want to state that I do not consider this community engagement, it is unfair to think that I, or the two other community members at the meeting speak for the entire community. It is also extremely unfair and bad practice in my opinion of the applicant to be asking a few select community members on a Zoom call 3 weeks before the application is before Council for amendments. I also want to state that no amendments were provided to the applicant. After learning that Ilona had purchased the S-CI parcel of land to the North, I did suggest that she pull her application and go back to the drawing board to consider a holistic, cohesive development of the entire parcel which could be a benefit to all stakeholders. This suggestion was shot down, just like any other previous suggestions. I truly feel the applicant is just box checking when it comes to so called engagement and that there has been zero purposeful dialogue.
- I support development in our community when it is in compliance with the Area Structure Plan and addresses the concerns and wishes of all stakeholders’.

I trust that my concerns will be documented and taken into account by both the City and the applicant going forward.

Sincerely,

Constance Craig



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

✓ * I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

* First name Ross

* Last name Murray

Email ross@ross-murray.com

Phone 4032006058

* Subject File Number: LOC2018-0231 response

* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)
please see attached letter

7th July 2020

File Number: LOC2018-0231

His Worship Mayor Naheed Nenshi and The City of Calgary Councillors,

I Ross & Laura Murray, homeowner in Montreaux at the following address: 117 Tremblant Heights SW, am AGAINST the proposed land use redesignation at 131 ST MORITZ DR SW, File Number: LOC2018-0231, which will be before council via public hearing July 20, 2020, for the following reasons:

1. Lack of genuine two-way dialogue, engagement and purposeful dialogue from the applicant to the community and community members. Meetings that have occurred (3 total) seemed like one sided lectures telling the community what the applicant was planning to build and not respecting the communities comments or making any changes to address community concerns.
2. Commercial land uses as is in the proposal are too general and would facilitate commercial uses that would not be a benefit to the community nor in line with the applicants stated vision. The applicant has stated that she requires commercial uses to facilitate a wellness center. If that is the case then any commercial uses should be restrictive to a wellness center only.
3. Proposed maximum building height (12 m, 3 stories) not a fit with surrounding community. This is not a building height that would allow future development buildings to keep with the scale of nearby residential.
4. The applicant has not provided in the proposed development, any connectivity, greenspace, or social gathering space within the development, and has kept this to the periphery, against the policies of the Springbank Hill ASP, and best practices of the city urban design group. The applicant has failed to show how her proposed application will benefit the community.
5. The applicant has recently acquired the land parcel directly North (zoned S-CI) of the parcel with the proposed land use redesignation. Many members of the CPC voiced their concerns that this land could play a significant role in creating a cohesive development. I share the concern of CPC, and feel that the development of the entire parcel should be done holistically.

To be clear, I support development in our community when it is in compliance with the Area Structure Plan and addresses the concerns and wishes of all stakeholders’.

Respectfully,

Ross Murray

**Public Submission**

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

✓ * I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

* First name	Paul
* Last name	Morrell, CD
Email	paulmorrell@shaw.ca
Phone	403-801-7886
* Subject	Land Use Re-designation Proposal - 131 St Moritz Drive SW, Personal Letter Against
* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	Please accept my personal letter against Land Use Re-designation Proposal - 131 St Moritz Drive SW, Thank you Paul Morrell

Paul Morrell
285 Tremblant Way SW
Calgary, AB T3H 0S8

July 13th, 2020

Office of the City Clerk, The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Re: Proposed Land Use Re-designation – LOC2018-0231 – 131 St Moritz Drive SW

His Worship Mayor Naheed Nenshi and The City of Calgary Councillors,
Without Prejudice

As a homeowner directly adjacent and greatly impacted by the property at 131 St Moritz, I submit in writing you to document my objection to the proposed "Land Use Re-designation at 131 St Moritz Drive SW, File Number: LOC2018-0231". My objection is based on the following:

1. Lack of genuine two-way dialogue, engagement and purposeful dialogue from the applicant to the community and community members. Community Meetings that have occurred (3 total) seemed like one sided lectures telling the community what the Applicant was planning to build (in theory as nothing was presented to represent the actual intention of the applicant) and not respecting the communities comments or making any changes to address community concerns. The applicant has commutated back to residents that they have given into some of the communities concerns such as limiting the size of "non wellness center focused uses". It should be noted that these size restrictions are exactly what is written in the regular CN-1 land use bylaw which is what the proposed DC is predicated on. Also excluding uses such as cannabis and liquor store are also not a "give" as the applicant could not even have these uses due to the lands proximity to a park where our children play.
2. The existing Land Use accommodates S-CI for a Church and a Direct Control (based on R-1) for a Daycare. These existing uses have been in place for over 10 years. When the community was developed, when my house was built and when my house was purchased, a Church and a Daycare were to be built on this land. The proposed land use re designation consisting of a Direct Control backed by C-N1, would allow for developments, specifically commercial that are extremely different than the neighbourhood node that was planned and what could take place under the existing land use.
3. Commercial land uses as is in the proposal are too general and would facilitate commercial uses that would not be a benefit to the community nor in line with the applicants stated vision. The applicant has stated that she requires commercial uses to facilitate a wellness center. If that is the case then any commercial uses should be restrictive to a wellness center only. A wellness center would benefit the community and I am in favor of such.

4. The maximum building height for the proposed change at 12 m (3 stories) is much too high and does not fit the context of the community. Yes, existing S-CI land use allows for 12 m heights, however a 12 m tall church (often the height of the steeple for example) is a much different context than a 12 m tall strip mall or townhouse wall. Additionally, a large portion of the land proposed for re designation is part of DC (for daycare) which is underwritten by R-1 residential of the 2P80 Bylaw. As such, 10 m heights are the existing maximum on that portion of the land. My home, as well as all of the homes on the south edge of the property bought or built under the pretense that 10 m would be the maximum height of a specifically sized daycare bordering their property. The proposed maximum height of 12 m is objectionable and would create privacy issues and shadow issues on bordering R-1 homes. The Proposed maximum building height (12 m, 3 stories) is not a fit with the surrounding community. This is not a building height that would allow future development buildings to keep with the scale of nearby residential.
5. The land use re-designation allows for development with rear set backs that are not significant enough. They would not allow for preservation of privacy for the existing R-1 home owners. R-1 land use requires a minimum set back of 7.5 m from a rear property line. Considering this proposed re-designation is in a residential area the proposed set back is out of place.
6. The current land use (DC63Z2007) allows only for a daycare of a very specific size, a maximum of 929 square meters and 93 square meters for accessory buildings. Additionally, the height of this would be restricted to 10 m as the DC is underwritten by bylaw 2P80 and R-1 land use. The proposed land use change has not considered any of this - which is wrong.
7. The applicant has not provided in the proposed development, any connectivity, greenspace, or social gathering space within the development, and has kept this to the periphery, against the policies of the Springbank Hill ASP, and best practices of the city urban design group. The applicant has failed to show how her proposed application will benefit the community. Greenspace is very important to the wildlife as well that is enjoyed every day will cease to exist.
8. The density of the proposed land use change and subsequent development would require an amendment to the ASP. The Community and City has already spent over 8 years and valuable resources on the ASP for Springbank Hill. The ASP should not be changed to accommodate one landowner. Nor should it be changed in consideration to the existing property/home owners.
9. The ASP also states that in a Standard Suburban area (where the land in question is located), developments should accommodate single-detached and semi-detached housing which I am in support of. I do not support multi-residential or commercial as is being proposed.
10. This land use re-designation and subsequent development are against the ASP. The purpose of the ASP is as follows: "Purpose of the ASP: Land use planning is the process of shaping the physical environment to achieve an orderly, sustainable and compatible pattern of growth, and protection of sensitive ecological functions with the goal of enhancing the quality of life for the Community's residents. The purpose of an ASP is twofold. Firstly, it refines and implements The City's broad planning objectives and policies of the MDP, CTP and other policies by promoting logical, compatible, and sustainable community development. Secondly, an ASP guides and directs the specific land use, subdivision and development decisions that collectively determine the form that an area will take." This land use re-designation and proposed development is not compatible, and

will not enhance the quality of life for residents as has been demonstrated by the communities objection to this proposal.

11. One of the goals and objectives of the ASP is “Increased Environmental Protection.” The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would impact the environment on this piece of land. There is abundant wildlife (large mammals such as deer and numerous prey birds such as Hawks and Owls) as well as native trees (Aspens). Understanding the environmental impact of any such land use change and/or subsequent development should be investigated. Considering there is a cost to such an evaluation I would assume the land owner has already done this on their own? This is not something the City and Tax Payers should be paying for, for the benefit of the land owner.
12. The land parcel in question only has one access point. Under the proposed land use re-designation, this access point would need to be shared by the S-CI parcel to the North (which was recently purchased by the applicant (Ilona Boyce) of the current land use change proposal), commercial buildings, daycare and the multi-residential development. The sidewalk that would be crossed for access into this land is a Regional Pathway as designated in the ASP. Such large volumes of traffic over a Regional Pathway hinders the walkability of the community and puts pedestrians and cyclists at risk. This is against the ASP. This is also against the Municipal Development Plan (MDP). Section 2.4.3 encourages that we provide “b. safe pedestrian connections ... to facilitate all travel modes.” There is surely a greater conflict with pedestrians on the sidewalk with this proposed land use change and development. If more vehicles are passing over the public sidewalk, there may be greater potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. The safety of pedestrians on public sidewalks should take priority. Excessive vehicular crossing of the sidewalk disrupts pedestrian movement which is inappropriate in a residential area.
13. The applicant has recently acquired the land parcel directly North (zoned S-CI) of the parcel with the proposed land use redesignation. Many members of the Calgary Planning Commission voiced their concerns that this land could play a significant role in creating a cohesive development. I share the concern of CPC, and feel that the development of the entire parcel should be done holistically. Once again due to this note I requested that the applicant pull the application and resubmit as one cohesive development that the applicant and the community could work on together resulting in a positive solution for everyone.
14. The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would negatively impact street parking in the existing residential community. Not only will existing residents lose access to street parking, but additional parked cars do not promote a street-friendly, pedestrian-oriented appearance to the street.
15. The proposed land use re designation would allow for development that would infringe on my privacy, my tranquility and the overall enjoyment of my property. These are three factors that determined my decision to purchase my land for my family and which we have enjoyed since September 2012.
16. The proposed land use re designation would allow for developments that would create additional noise, during all times of the day.

17. The proposed land use re-designation would de-value my property, as well as the other homeowners' properties.
18. The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would create additional traffic in the neighbourhood. This additional traffic will increase maintenance required on our roads over time. It will also require more municipal support traffic for garbage & recycling pickup and snow removal.
19. The proposed land use re-designation and subsequent development would create a safety risk in the community and surrounding area. Not only for pedestrians and motorists due to increased traffic, but the density of development on such a small piece of land could restrict access for emergency vehicles such as ambulance and fire trucks.
20. The intersection of St. Moritz Drive SW and 17 Ave SW is already a very busy intersection that is not controlled by traffic lights (currently only flashing pedestrian lights and stop signs). Increased traffic would result at this intersection from the land use re-designation and proposed development. Making the intersection more dangerous for vehicles, as well as again putting pedestrians at risk. I would assume a traffic study has been done? If not, is this something the City and Tax Payer dollars will be used for. Or will the land owner be paying for such studies? Given the economic state of The City and rising taxes, this is exactly the thing that tax payer dollars should not be used for.
21. This land use re-designation of C-N1 and subsequent development does not fit in the community, nor is it needed in the community. The community already has a commercial neighbourhood development 400 m (or a 4 min walk) away from the proposed land use redesignation and subsequent development. In addition, there is a large scale commercial development underway directly East, between 85th St SW and 77th St SW.
22. The proposed land use re designation and development lack greenspace and soft landscaping. Such a development could cause a risk of flooding due to replacing soft landscaping with large amounts of concrete.
23. The Applicant has submitted a Market Analysis for your consideration (ST. Moritz Square Development Feasibility Analysis dated September 2019). Since that date there has been activity in our market area that make sections of this document irrelevant

In addition, I wish to add the following comments for your consideration.

- I value fair process. I do NOT believe this process has been fair to date, with the applicant ignoring community concerns, using threats and bully tactics to get their way, being deceptive, presenting "half truths", and lacking transparency. Most concerning is the fact that the applicant has stated at previous meetings with the community that "they (the applicant) knew people at the City" and that they would get their way regardless. Myself and fellow community members heard these words spoken. All I want is a fair process and hope that this applicant was speaking out of turn.

- Additionally, I was one of three community members invited to a Zoom call with the applicant Ilona Boyce and Sue Patton on June 30, 2020. I believe the applicant intends to present this call as community engagement. I want to state that I do not consider this community engagement, it is unfair to think that I, or the two other community members at the meeting speak for the entire community. It is also extremely unfair and bad practice in my opinion of the applicant to be asking a few select community members on a Zoom call 3 weeks before the application is before Council for amendments. I also want to state that no amendments were provided to the applicant. After learning that Ilona Boyce had purchased the S-CI parcel of land to the North, we suggested that she put her application on hold and go back to the drawing board to consider a holistic, cohesive development of the entire parcel which could be a benefit to all stakeholders and especially for Ilona Boyce to get the return on her investment she desires.. This suggestion was declined a number of times, just like other previous suggestions. I truly feel the applicant is just box checking when it comes to so called engagement and that there has been zero purposeful dialogue.
- I support development in our community when it is in compliance with the Area Structure Plan and addresses the concerns and wishes of all stakeholders’.
- It was very frustrating during my talks with community members on how little informed residents were on the proposed changes to this property. Many believed it was going to be a church and a daycare which most supported and welcomed. However, the same could not be said for a commercial development.

In summary, if in fact the applicant is serious about cooperating and working with the community, they will pull this application for 6 months and work on a positive resolution that benefits everyone. I trust that my concerns will be documented and taken into account by both the City and the applicant going forward.

Sincerely,

Paul Morrell

Paul Morrell

From: [Connie Craig](#)
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Cc: [Ward6 - Frano Cavar](#); [Ang, Benedict](#); [Yun, Joseph](#); [Bishoff, Melanie M.](#); planning@springbankhill.org; [Elio Cozzi](#); [Marshall Naruzny](#); [Davison, Jeffrey R.](#)
Subject: [EXT] Land Use Re-designation Proposal - 131 St Moritz Drive SW, Community Petitions Against
Date: Monday, July 13, 2020 1:24:45 AM
Attachments: [St Moritz Land Use Change Proposal Petitions for Submission.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please find attached a collection of 43 signed petitions from community members against the proposed land use re-designation at 131 St Moritz Drive SW which will be before council on July 20th, 2020. I am submitting these to be included in the Agenda of Council, on behalf of myself and my fellow neighbours/community members.

Please confirm receipt of same.

Respectfully,

Constance (Connie) Craig, MBA, P.Geo

283 Tremblant Way SW, Calgary, AB T3H 0S8
(403) 874-7296

Please note:

An opinion poll with 45 individuals' names and their location was provided with this submission, with respect to Report CPC2020-0521, Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment in Springbank Hill (Ward 6) at 131 St Moritz Drive SW.

***As no Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* statement to collect personal information with the intent of reproducing it in an Agenda was included, the opinion poll will not be made part of the public Agenda, but the list of names and locations will be provided to Council by a confidential attachment, not to be released further.**

