



May 31, 2021

To: File Manager, Derek Pomereinke – [derek.pomreinke@calgary.ca](mailto:derek.pomreinke@calgary.ca)  
Development Circulation Controller – [DP.Circ@calgary.ca](mailto:DP.Circ@calgary.ca)

Re.: DPP2021-2435 @ 2206 33 AV SW  
RNSQR / ARC 33

Thank you for the opportunity to comment again on this project (note our letter on LOC2021-0017 of March 18, 2021.)

Related to our comments on the Land Use application (excerpts in appendix)

- The land use should be “tied to plans”. Any significant increase in height and FAR from the ARP (2014) and land use (2019) should have design certainty, so that the design of what is built can be clearly judged to mitigate the variance.
- While the design of this application has many merits, we maintain our general support for the ARP in terms of height and step-backs at higher levels per (ARP 4.2)
  - While the open area at the SE corner is attractive and well-framed, and a good patio for a private operator, we do not believe it is large enough to be a true public space or “plaza” – such as envisioned in the ARP 4.2.1.2 to justify greatly increased height.
  - The applicant’s Design Brief references the MDP policy 3.4.1: “Create a human-scale environment along the Main Street by generally encouraging a maximum of a 1:1 building height to right-of-way width ratio.” The 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue right of way is between 20.12 and 20.5 metres, according to the Marda Loop Streetscape Master Plan (p. 32), not the 22 m requested.

We do agree that the building has many merits and attractive elements:

- We support the activation of the lane with small live-work businesses. This should be a great benefit to the neighbourhood and the business community.
- We support the aesthetic intent: the material and materiality of the exterior will contribute to an attractive and varied streetscape.
- We support the canopy that shelters the commercial entrances and frames the SE corner of the project.



- We support the inclusion of all the required parking. The parking amount beyond the minimum (marked to phase 2, in the applicant's Design Brief 2.0) we hope will be offered to the businesses for their staff, at least in the interim.
- Regarding the public art or heritage interpretation element for this site noted in the ARP, we appreciate the offer of funds (in the applicant's "What We Hear Report") to support an installation. If the ARP intent of providing art or similar is met, it need not necessarily be provided directly on-site but must be located in the BIA main street area. We ask that the BIA be involved in the decision.
- Please include outdoor electrical outlets to enable seasonal lighting and programing.
- Question: Where is the venting infrastructure for food and beverage operations? It is best to avoid venting by the sidewalk, for example.
- Regarding the sidewalk, we want the salvage and re-installation of original/historic "sidewalk stamps", as has often been done on other sidewalks around the City. Marda Loop has too few heritage assets, but we could these among them.
- Consider upgrading the pedestrian crosswalk light to a RRFB (rapid flashing).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Bob van Wegen  
Executive Director



Appendix: Excerpts from March 18, 2021 letter regarding LOC2021-0017

*The City-initiated land use for this site was done only in 2019, at 16m and 3 FAR. This is also reflected in the 2014 ARP. We believe the current (and very recent) land use designation and ARP policies reflect the need to build out our main street, are respectful of the interests of nearby residents, and are also representative and respectful of recent planning processes with the community.*

*When developments propose large increases in height and density in this location, they should be “tied to plans” to ensure that the volume provided by land use is mitigated by the actual development shape and design. Therefore we do not support rezoning of the Phase 2 site without more design certainty... (nor phase 1)*

*Regarding the scope of the land use envelope proposed on the block, which is based on the CY33 approval: CY33 was exceptional due to its gateway location, as a western anchor of main street commercial, and especially for the provision of an unusual interior public space that enabled and required additional height and volume. A like redesignation of the rest of the block face (at 22m/4FAR), as proposed, is not necessary to achieve a good outcome on this block, nor is it necessarily desirable.*

*We note that the applicant, as the owner of the rest of the block face, has a great deal of flexibility in how they manage this block’s redevelopment. We have very good recent examples in the area of commercial and mixed-use projects of 4-5 storeys (16-20 m) with around 3-3.5 FAR. This location is identified in the ARP as having the potential for 5 storeys if a public plaza is provided (ARP 4.2.1.2). While the site in question can be redeveloped within the current land use envelope, there is some potential (per ARP) for increasing the height from the base so long as there is major public benefit and other impacts on neighbours are mitigated.*

*We also point out that that for buildings of 4 storeys and up, the ARP (4.2) calls for step backs to minimize massing and shadowing and maximize sky. While this has not always been done (south façade of CY33, and the north façade of Treo are exceptions), we support this ARP direction for larger buildings.*