

-----Original Message-----

From: idmckay@shaw.ca <idmckay@shaw.ca>

Sent: Sunday, April 4, 2021 11:08 AM

To: Public Submissions <PublicSubmissions@calgary.ca>

Subject: [EXT] 469 21 AV NW - LOC2020-0150 - Comment from Development Map - Sun 4/4/2021 11:07:58 AM

Application: LOC2020-0150

Submitted by: Ian McKay

#### Contact Information

Address: 437 21 Ave NW, Calgary, T2M 1J6

Phone:

Email: [idmckay@shaw.ca](mailto:idmckay@shaw.ca)

#### Feedback:

I am writing to communicate my concerns over the widespread conversion of corner lots (and possible future conversion of mid-block lots) zoned R1 into 4 unit row housing.

My neighbour, Danny Vescarelli, has written a very well-researched, and thorough opinion on this subject. He has shared this with me, knowing of my similar concerns. I have attached his comments as a file to my submission.

I note the following:

1. These lots typically face a busier street on which parking is not allowed. Provisions for alley-facing garages are minimal, possibly not up to code. Vehicles larger than sub-compact cannot fit into the garages. They are really little more than a storage shed.
2. 12 bins sit side by side across the garage doors of these "sheds". No one will move them everytime one wishes to "park".
3. The side of the 4-plex faces the side street and therefore perhaps 1 parking space is available. The remainder of the 6 - 8 cars that the 4-plex occupants own will have to park up and down the side street, competing with existing residents on R1 or R2 lots. This is completely unfair.

The attached file contains a more thorough and well-written objection to this practice. I want you to know that I am fully against this densification (tax grab) that is going on. Developers and city coffers benefit at the clear expense of residents currently living in these neighbourhoods.

Having written to my alderperson on this subject, I know that "affordable housing" is more important than parking concerns or congested alleys. Typical prices in these row houses can exceed \$500,000.

The so called "affordable housing" argument is facetious, at best. I would hope that someone within the city's organization will listen to these concerns.

Sincerely,

Ian McKay



**From:** [vescared@gmail.com](mailto:vescared@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] 469 21 AV NW - LOC2020-0150 - Comment from Development Map - Thu 3/25/2021 12:54:35 PM  
**Date:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 12:54:41 PM

---

Application: LOC2020-0150

Submitted by: Daniel Vescarelli

#### Contact Information

Address: 435 21 Ave NW

Phone: 4038198821

Email: [vescared@gmail.com](mailto:vescared@gmail.com)

#### Feedback:

I'm writing to express my concerns about the proliferation of the conversion of corner lots zoned R1 to allow for 4 unit row housing to be built on corner lots. This particular location is on the street where I live.

My biggest concern is that the parking problems created by the increased density. The parking requirements as stated in the city by-laws that require parking spaces to be a minimum of 2.6m wide in a private garage is not always being enforced.

How did a 4 unit townhouse on the corner of 4th St and 19th Ave NW get approved when the garage door opening itself is only 1.8m wide with not much more room beyond that inside? I've attached a picture of a small SUV backed into one of the "garages". The vehicle could go in no further unless the mirrors were folded in and then the driver then would not be able to open the door and get out. (See attachments). The parking provided for these units will NEVER be used for parking vehicles as they simply won't fit. They will be used as storage shed and/or to park bicycles and the vehicles will be parked on the street.

I've attached a picture of another garage at a 4 unit row house complex in Mount Pleasant to demonstrate another problem. Although the garages probably comply in terms of size (I didn't have a tape measure) there has been no provision for the 12 waste containers required by the city. (See attached photo). Therefore they are parked in front of the garage doors and would need to be moved each time a vehicle entered or left the garage. This isn't likely to happen and therefore the vehicles would be parked on the narrow residential streets.

There is a 6 unit building on the corner of 4th St and 28th Ave NW that only has a 3 car garage. Apparently the 3 units that are partially below ground and have a separate entrance and are less than 45m<sup>2</sup> and it was therefore approved.

Statistically Canadians have 1.9+ vehicles per family so the parking required according to the by-laws should be considered the minimum. Visitor parking will also be greatly increased with visitor parking now needed for 4 units instead of the one unit that was previously at the same address.

#### Summary

- Two unit developments should be the norm and corner lots should not be allowed to be developed into 4 unit town homes as they are not large enough to accommodate the increased parking both for the residents and the increased visitor traffic.
- No units should be allowed that do not meet the minimum parking size requirements spelled out in the city by-laws.
- Any development drawing should be checked to ensure that there is adequate space for the city waste containers that doesn't involve placing them in front of the garage doors. Access to the garage or other parking spot should be unimpeded.

- Every self contained unit with a separate entrance and address regardless of the unit size should be required to have a designated properly sized parking spot. By law 546(2) strangely doesn't require a parking spot for apartments less than 45m<sup>2</sup>. By that strange logic if an apartment is twice as large as another then it should require 2 stalls rather than 1.
- Signage posted indicating a proposed land use change should be more specific as the development planned for that lot and not stating that it "could be a duplex and/or row houses." In addition, along with a phone number there should be an e-mail address to allow for someone to express their concerns with regards to the proposed development

On Mar 25, 2021, at 1:28 PM, [vescared@gmail.com](mailto:vescared@gmail.com) wrote:

I'm writing to express my concerns about the proliferation of the conversion of corner lots zoned R1 to allow for 4 unit row housing to be built on corner lots. This particular unit is located on the corner of the street where I live and therefore of particular concern. I do know that it is in step with the 'Planning Guidebook that I recently downloaded and read and there are many parts of that document that are of concern.

Of particular concern, the parking requirements as stated in the city by-laws that require parking spaces to be a minimum of 2.6m wide in a private garage is not always being enforced.

How did a 4 unit townhouse on the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> St and 19<sup>th</sup> Ave NW get approved when the garage door opening itself is only 1.8m wide with not much more room beyond that inside? I've attached a picture of a small SUV backed into one of the "garages". The vehicle could go in no further unless the mirrors were folded in and then the driver then would not be able to open the door and get out. (See attachments). The parking provided for these units will NEVER be used for parking vehicles as they simply won't fit. They will be used as storage shed and/or to park bicycles and the vehicles will be parked on the street.

I've attached a picture of another garage at a 4 unit row house complex in Mount Pleasant to demonstrate another problem. Although the garages **probably** comply in terms of size (I didn't have a tape measure) there has been no provision for the 12 waste containers required by the city. (See attached photo). Therefore, they are parked in front of the garage doors and would need to be moved each time a vehicle entered or left the garage. This isn't likely to happen and therefore the vehicles would be parked on the narrow residential streets.

There is a 6 unit building on the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> St and 28<sup>th</sup> Ave NW that only has a 3 car garage. Apparently the 3 units that are partially below ground and have a separate entrance and are less than 45m<sup>2</sup> and it was therefore approved.

Statistically Canadians have 1.9+ vehicles per family so the parking required according to the by-laws should be considered the **minimum**. Visitor parking will also be greatly increased with visitor parking now needed for 4 units instead of the one unit that was previously at the same address.

#### Summary

1. Two unit developments should be the norm and corner lots should not be allowed to be developed into 4 unit town homes as they are not large enough to accommodate the increased parking both for the residents and the increased visitor traffic.
2. **No units should be allowed that do not meet the minimum parking size requirements spelled out in the city by-laws.**
3. **Any development drawing should be checked to ensure that there is adequate space for the city waste containers that doesn't involve placing them in front of the garage doors.** Access to the garage or other parking spot should be unimpeded.
4. **Every self contained unit with a separate entrance and address regardless of the unit size should be required to have a designated properly sized parking spot.** By law 546(2) strangely

doesn't require a parking spot for apartments less than 45m<sup>2</sup>. By that strange logic if an apartment is twice as large as another then it should require 2 stalls rather than 1.

5. There are many other cases of dwellings being built in violation of setback requirements and size of units allowed on a lot. You should look at the twin monstrosities being built at 136 21Ave NE being built in the middle of the lot that I saw as I walked past.
6. Signage posted indicating a proposed land use change should be more specific as the development planned for that lot and not stating that it "could be a duplex and/or row houses." In addition, along with a phone number there should be an e-mail address to allow for someone to express their concerns with regards to the proposed development.

It would appear that the guides for development are being written under the misconception that everyone is either going to ride a bike or take public transit and this is simply not the case.

Thanks for allowing me the opportunity to share my thoughts with all of you.

Danny Vescarelli

-----Original Message-----

From: mikeseto@gmail.com <mikeseto@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 4, 2021 11:04 PM

To: Public Submissions <PublicSubmissions@calgary.ca>

Subject: [EXT] 469 21 AV NW - LOC2020-0150 - Comment from Development Map - Sun 4/4/2021 11:04:19 PM

Application: LOC2020-0150

Submitted by: Michael Seto

#### Contact Information

Address: 468 - 21 Ave NW

Phone:

Email: [mikeseto@gmail.com](mailto:mikeseto@gmail.com)

#### Feedback:

I have attached a letter in opposition of bylaw 37D2021. I ask that the City Clerk include it in the Agenda of Council for the meeting on April 12 2021. Thank you!

DATE: April 4, 2021

TO: The Honorable Members of Calgary City Council

RE: Land Use Redesignation: Mount Pleasant Bylaw 37D2021

I am the owner and resident of 468 – 21 Ave NW, located across the avenue from the subject property at 469 -21 Ave NW. I have resided at this property for over 12 years.

**I am opposed to use of the land at 469 – 21 Ave NW as row housing, as I do not believe the Landowner and Mount Pleasant Community Association (MPCA) have updated their plans with learnings from the recent commercial failure of row housing along 4<sup>th</sup> St.** I refer specifically to the development at 19<sup>th</sup> Ave (2 blocks away) known as Condominium Plan 1811744, with address 468 – 19<sup>th</sup> Ave NW.

The 4-unit rowhouse at 468 – 19<sup>th</sup> Ave NW was brought to market on 2018/09/18, and half of the rowhouse units remained unsold until 2020/01/09 (478 days later), when the remaining units were dumped at foreclosure. This information can be verified via Service Alberta's SPIN2 system.

I am aware that City of Calgary and that the MPCA espouse densification along regional road arteries, including 4<sup>th</sup> St. However, I submit that there is a lack of demand for rowhouses along 4<sup>th</sup> St and certainly within the proximity of 469 – 21 Ave NW, and that a recent rowhouse project demonstrates this. In addition to financial hardship for the developer, the rowhouse on 19<sup>th</sup> Ave failed to bring benefit to the Mount Pleasant microeconomy as some units of the rowhouse appear (to the best of my knowledge) to be unoccupied to this date. Ostensibly, an increase of failed housing along 4<sup>th</sup> St will also draw unproportionally on city resources.

I ask that the City Council deny redesignation of the land at 469 – 21 Ave NW. I also hope my public comment reaches the developer, so that they may consider adapting their plans, should the knowledge of the commercial failure of the rowhouse at 468 – 19 Ave NW be new information to them.

Michael Seto

Landowner, 468 – 21 Ave NW