

Community Association Response



Attention: Ms. Angie Dean
City of Calgary
Planning and Development

December 8, 2020

Re: Graywood Proposed land use application LOC2020-0173 – Fish Creek Exchange

Background: Greywood Developments, through their consultant O2 Planning + Design, is proposing a land use redesignation on a portion of land located in the new community of Fish Creek Exchange – specifically at 10, 14, 18, 22, 50, 54, and 58 Shawnee BV SW. It is currently zoned DC 54D2012, which is a mixed-use multifamily site with some neighbourhood commercial. At this time, commercial tenants include a fitness studio and a hair salon (coming in Dec. 2020), and there is vacant residential and commercial space. Graywood would like to expand the list of retail and commercial uses for the site. Appendix A of their proposal lists examples.

Position: We appreciate that COVID-19 and the Calgary real estate market have dramatically impacted sales and leasing, which is why Graywood is seeking this amendment. However, this situation is temporary; COVID-19 is a one-in-a-generation phenomenon and hope is on the horizon. Decisions made today about expanding commercial and retail use will shape the lives of residents and our community for many years to come.

The Shawnee Evergreen Community Association (SECA) is committed to seeing Fish Creek Exchange succeed. It is now part of our community. However, neither the City nor the citizens of this community agreed to this expanded use when the land was originally rezoned for development. More importantly, it was not designed for the intensified commercial uses Graywood is proposing. For this reason, we cannot support Graywood's application as it stands. Our specific concerns fall under two categories – parking and liveability – which are further detailed below.

We are eager to work with Graywood to find a viable solution we can all support. We had a preliminary meeting to begin the process. In the addition to the community, the Fish Creek Exchange residents will have opinions as they will be most impacted by the zoning amendments in the application.

Parking: The community of Fish Creek Exchange is unusual in its design. Side streets are intentionally narrow, so residents (and their visitors) are not permitted to park in front of own homes. Instead, overflow parking is available in visitor stalls, generally five cars wide, sprinkled throughout the community. If you want to park on the street, it has to be on the main boulevard. As this community grows, finding parking is going to be a major pressure point, even without large scale commercial and retail proposed.

A portion of the area under consideration is located on the main boulevard where there is street parking, but it is very limited. Establishments such as large restaurants and supermarkets, which are listed in Appendix A of Graywood's proposal, are therefore not viable in this location.

Appendix A also lists establishments that, in our opinion, do not require as much parking, such as small restaurants, vet clinics and financial institutions. Under the right circumstances, these may be good options.

The community is concerned that Greywood will ask for parking relaxations at the DP stage, allowing them to provide insufficient parking stalls to meet the demand. The City has a parking ban around the Fish Creek Lacombe LRT station that was recently expanded to include the east side 6th St. next to the subject property. Recently residents have noted more vehicles from Fish Creek Exchange parking on Shawnee Drive. In the future, it may be necessary to extend a parking restriction for non-residents on Shawnee Drive. Therefore, any request for a parking relaxation should be analysed at the Land Use Redesignation stage rather than at Development Permit.

Liveability: Graywood's proposal suggests that expanded commercial activity will benefit the community. However, Fish Creek Exchange is part of a community that's more than 40 years old. As their website says, there is "easy access to have an established community with a wide assortment of shops, services and conveniences." Adding higher intensity commercial services does not fill a gap. It does, however, change the quality of life for the people who live here.

The businesses listed in Appendix A of Graywood's proposal will put incredible pressure on residential parking and they will increase traffic congestion well into the evening. They will also require loading zones to accommodate large, noisy trucks. They will need a place to store garbage. Hours of operations are incompatible with the residential uses above and around the site. No matter how effective, the exhaust system of the businesses proposed will emit odours that are incompatible with residential use. The noise and lights from restaurants and pubs as well as evening and late-night traffic will be disruptive to surrounding residents.

These are just a few examples, but they are not in alignment with Graywood's original vision of a purpose-built community. Other communities, such as McKenzie, are an example of design created with these uses in mind, and it works. Retrofitting larger commercial into a residential area, especially the one area within Fish Creek Exchange that offers alternative housing, is not conducive to supporting healthy families and

communities. It places this area at a disadvantage, which is exactly what we want to avoid.

Simply put, most of the proposed commercial uses proposed for this site are incompatible with the residential nature of the surrounding area. Therefore, SECA cannot support this application.

We are willing to continue the conversation.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Norm Rousseau". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Norm Rousseau
Director of Development
Shawnee Evergreen Community Association
403-818-8859
Norm@view-our-homes.com

March 31, 2021

**RE: Proposed Land Use Amendment (file #LOC2020-0173)
for Fish Creek Exchange**



Graywood Developments is proposing a new and expanded range of uses for the Fish Creek Exchange buildings that are in addition to the existing approved uses.

While Graywood is focusing on the *uses*, we believe the **operational characteristics** of those uses should be the primary consideration of the community, the adjacent residents and ultimately the Planners and City Council.

By operational characteristics we are referring to how the proposed uses would impact the residents.

Operational characteristics may include but are not limited to the following list with accompanying questions related to impacts to residents:

1. Hours of Operation

- a. Day time traffic related to staff and service vehicles (beep, beep, beep)
- b. Late night or early morning disruptions
 - i. Which uses will create noise from patrons who may be intoxicated and rowdy?
 - ii. Which uses will create lights and vehicular noise from departing patrons and staff members
- c. Service vehicles (deliveries, waste removal)
 - i. What sized of trucks will be involved and what noise, traffic and light disruption will result?
- d. Entertainment noise
 - i. Will live or recorded music that may be heard beyond the commercial premises?
 - ii. Will music or commercial activities be taking place on outdoor patios?
 1. While pleasant for customers, will the patios be open late at night?

2. Loading requirements

- a. Access – Waste Removal
 - i. Where will the waste be stored? How and when will it be accessed? If underground, and inaccessible to larger waste trucks, how will the garbage be moved to the access point?
 - ii. Is the loading stall large enough to accommodate the trucks that will need to service the proposed uses?
 - iii. What is the volume of waste that a medium sized restaurant produces and how?
- b. Volume and frequency – Waste Removal
 - i. How much more loading and waste removal will occur with the large more active proposed uses?
 - ii. Will there be more bins, or will they be unloaded more often?
 - iii. At what time of the day or night will the bins be loaded and unloaded?
 - iv. If the waste is odorous, will it be removed more frequently, especially in warmer months?

- c. Access – Deliveries
 - i. How close is the loading zone to the commercial access?
 - ii. Will there be grade issues?
 - iii. Will lease holders take large deliveries through their front doors for their convenience to the detriment of residents?
 - iv. How frequently will deliveries occur for some of the proposed uses, and will this become onerous for residents?

3. Parking

- a. What is the rate and times of usage for the available parking currently with half of the space leased?
- b. The parking requirement of the staff and clients will increase, especially with some of the proposed uses, yet there is limited parking and no opportunity to increase it on site.
- c. Given the restricted street parking and increasing demand related to future approved development there may be conflict between commercial and residential needs.
- d. Is there sufficient parking for the existing residents and the expanded commercial uses?
 - i. what are the hours of parking requirements?
 - ii. is there overlapping demand,
 - iii. Is there overflow capacity in the project and on the street?

4. Odours

- a. Some of the proposed uses will bring more hours of cooking or brewing plus likely greater volume.
- b. Where are the exhaust outlets? Is the building setup to exhaust odours at rooftop levels (not always an effective solution) or will they exhaust outside walls to impact neighboring residents?
- c. Other uses bring different odours. Vet clinics can have challenges around odours.

Fundamental Issues:

A. It's Built

Does this building have the physical capacity to accommodate these expanded uses? The building is built; the loading zones, parking stalls, garbage storage space and access to the commercial units are all fixed.

B. Traffic and Parking Analysis (TIA)

Has the Applicant or the City done a study to determine how these proposed uses with their extended hours of operation, and loading/delivery needs will impact the traffic and parking given the limited capacity of nearby roads and available parking?

C. Decide once

It is an unreasonable burden for the community association and residents to respond to a DP every time a space is leased. It's not good use of the developer's time either. These and other issues have to be addressed at the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) stage, NOT at the Development Permit (DP) stage.