

Albrecht, Linda

From: CJGoldie [cgoldie@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 1:21 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Altadore Bylaw 173D2016 - Public Hearing on July 4, 2016 - Objection to Redesignation
Attachments: Letter to City Council re Bylaw 173D2016.docx

To: Office of the City Clerk Via Email
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
PO Box 2100, Postal Stn "M"
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Re: Altadore Bylaw 173D2016 - Public Hearing on July 4, 2016 - Objection to Redesignation

I am submitting the attached written submission for consideration by City Council at the hearing on Monday July 4, 2016.

Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the public hearing to speak to the matter due to other previous commitments, however would like my submission considered by Council members.

Thank you for your assistance.

Colin Goldie
Owner of unit in Gateway Garrison Woods

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 15 AM 8:11
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

RECEIVED

2016 JUN 15 AM 8:11

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

June 15, 2016

To: Office of the City Clerk
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
PO Box 2100, Postal Station "M"
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Re: ALTADORE BYLAW 173D2016 (listed as item #35 for July 4, 2016 Public Hearing)

To redesignate the land located at 3511 and 3515 – 21 Street SW (Plan 5730AJ, Blk 7, Lots 1 to 4) from Multi-Residential Low Profile (MC-1) to Contextual Medium Profile (M-C2f.2d254) District

I am an owner of a condominium unit in the Gateway Garrison Woods adjacent to the lands which are the subject matter of the proposed redesignation. My unit which only has one living room window and 1 bedroom window both face east towards the lands which are the subject of this redesignation application.

I strongly object to the proposed land use redesignation which will allow an even higher and larger building to be developed on the subject parcel than the current designation. The property line of the subject parcel is a mere 32 feet approximately from the balconies and windows of the units on the east wall of Gateway Garrison Woods, including my unit. The developer plans to build as close as possible to the property line.

There is no street or laneway between the subject parcel and the east wall of the Gateway Garrison Woods, only a narrow utility easement area.

I would ask you to visualize a house with a 4 story high wall being built outside of the front picture window of the house at a distance that would essentially put that 4 story high wall on the front street. That is an analogous situation that approving this redesignation application will result in. I believe the City would not allow that situation for a house. I also believe very few people would be interested in purchasing or living in such a house. Typically there would be front yard set-back requirements and the street width which would result in there being a minimum of 80 to 90 feet to the front of any structure across from such a resident's front window. In other words, 2 to 3 times the distance that is being considered in this redesignation application from the front windows and only windows of the residents on the east side of the Gateway Garrison Woods. That is the situation you must visualize.

The proposed redesignation if allowed would result in a higher and larger wall of a building on the subject parcel which will extremely negatively impact the residents of the Gateway Garrison Woods who face the subject property and significantly decreases all of these residents quality of life. This is not a case of 2 sidewalls or side yards being adjacent to one another with other windows in a residence. I can not stress this point enough.

I am not against development and would be in favour of a redevelopment on the subject site provided that it is smaller, set back further from the adjoining property line to the Gateway

Garrison Woods and in keeping with the recognition that these are not sideyards but rather front yards facing each other.

I urge all members of City Council to reject this application for redesignation which would allow too high a structure and too close a structure.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Yours truly;

Colin Goldie
Owner Unit #219 Gateway Garrison Woods

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Michelle Veitch [meeschell@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 10:53 AM
To: City Clerk; Michelle Veitch
Subject: re: Public Hearing Monday July 4
Attachments: MVeitch_City Hall_Garrison Wood Development Letter.pdf

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing with regards to the City Hall Public Hearing scheduled for Monday July 4. As I understand this meeting will address the Land Use Designation at 3511 and 3515 - 21 Street SW that corresponds with the permit application LOC2015-0212/DP2015-5249. In April I attended a meeting regarding this development and I have serious concerns about the proposed building plans that I have outlined in the letter attached to this e-mail. I would greatly appreciate it if you include this in the agenda for the meeting on Monday July 4th. Also could you please send me an e-mail confirming that you received this message.

Thanks so much,

Best,

Michelle

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 17 AM 10:58
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

RECEIVED

June 17, 2016
RE: LOC2015-0212 and DP2015-5249

2016 JUN 17 AM 10: 58

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

To Whom It May Concern,

On Sunday, April 24, I attended a meeting regarding the proposed development at 3511 and 3515 21 St SW in Garrison Woods. As a long term resident of the neighborhood, I have serious concerns about the current proposal for the high-density condo complex (henceforth referred to as application LOC2015-0212/DP2015-5249).

First, the proposed building plan is too close to the property line and curtails the privacy of residents located on the east side of the Garrison Woods condo building at 2233 34 Ave SW. The application LOC2015-0212/DP2015-5249 situates the residential complex in what is essentially the backyard of first floor tenants of the Garrison Woods building, meanwhile upper floor residents would look directly into the family rooms and bedrooms of the proposed condos. Further the close proximity of the complex blocks out the sun and skyline view of the existing Garrison Woods condos.

Second, the application would exacerbate the parking and vehicular congestion in the area. Due to the development of commercial/retail space along 33 and 34 Ave SW, traffic has increased exponentially causing congestion along major intersections and compromising road safety. As I understand currently there are two buildings with 8 units that the developers want to replace with a high density singular building **that comprises 33 to 34 units. However they have not included parking stalls for 6 or 7 of those units nor have they provided space for residents with multiple cars or visitor parking.** Hence the residential complex would significantly increase housing density and vehicular congestion in the area further exacerbating road safety issues.

Third, I question the developers' claims that the proposal would enhance the "character" of the neighborhood. For starters, the developers provided no clear definition of what they mean by the term "character". Do they mean the architecture, the history, the culture, or the community? The lack of clarity around such terminology shows that the developers have not adequately thought through the concept or vision behind their proposal.

Consequently, the application fails on several counts. First, it does not adhere to the urban planning scheme of Garrison Woods that was a former army base designed as a "heritage" themed neighborhood. The area includes housing and mixed use buildings that conform to traditional architectural styles such as Tutor, Victorian, Colonial and Craftsmen. By contrast the application LOC2015-0212/DP2015-5249 follows a modernist west coast/prairie style that does not comply with the architecture, history or culture of the Garrison Woods neighborhood.

Second, I fail to see how the proposed plan responds to the community. To my knowledge this is the second proposal that the developers have devised yet the meeting mentioned above was the first consultation session they organized with the neighbors directly affected by the planned building. This “after the fact” consultation process does not allow for any meaningful exchange or community involvement and some residents are opposed to the proposal given the developer’s lack of sustained engagement.

Third, the developers suggested that the building adheres to principles of the “walkable” and “liveable” city by providing housing for people working in the neighboring retail/commercial spaces. However, the frontline employees of coffee/tea shops, restaurants, bakeries and grocery stores earn limited wages and I sincerely doubt that they could afford the cost of the proposed condo units. Such oversight raises questions about the intent behind the building plan that employs empty rhetoric by referencing urban planning buzzwords with little understanding of the meaning or implications behind such concepts.

Finally, and most importantly, I oppose the developers’ request for a re-designation from MC-1 (3 to 4 story building) to MC-2 (3 to 5 story building). Currently, the application is for a 4-story building so I question why the developers are asking for an increased height designation unless they intend to build beyond 4 stories. Given that the developers have already changed their design, it is reasonable to suspect that they may do so again. The proposed height of the most recent plan is out of sync with the buildings in the immediate area that are 3 stories high. This issue would be further exacerbated if the developers obtained the MC-2 designation.

For all the reasons listed above, I have serious misgivings about the application LOC2015-0212/DP2015-5249. To sum up, constructing a modernist high-density residential complex at an increased height designation detracts from the architecture, history and community of the neighborhood. Further the building poses significant problems in terms of increased housing density and vehicular congestion. Overall, I question the suitability of the proposal due to its lack of adherence to the urban planning design scheme of Garrison Woods.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle Veitch

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Travis Kleinknecht [travk80@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 9:53 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Zoning Concerns - Altadore - 3511 and 3515 21 Street SW
Attachments: protest.odt

Hello, I am attaching a letter relating my very real concerns about this development project. Please let me know if this letter is received, thank you for your time.

Travis Kleinknecht

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 21 AM 10:35
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

To whom it may concern,

Although I have already written at an earlier stage of this process a letter stressing my objections, I will once again highlight the negative impact a development of this nature will have on immediate neighbours. As an owner and resident of a property on the east side of the Gateway Garrison Woods building, consequences resulting from the construction and placement of this proposed building directly behind my unit will be tangible and substantial.

First of all, it is only a narrow lane of grass and trees that separate the eastern face of my building and the back yards of the existing structures that are set to be noisily demolished and replaced. Given the close proximity of this proposed build, the resulting noise disruption will be an EXTREME nuisance.

Additionally, ALL residents of the Gateway Garrison Woods building will be adversely affected by a lengthy construction process. All vehicle entry and exit from this building comes via the small roadway to the south of the proposed construction site. The Gateway Garrison Woods is a sizable building and a correspondingly large volume of in-and-out traffic occurs throughout each day. I find it hard to imagine there not being a significant disruption to both this regular traffic, as well as for those that rely upon this space for parking and special access needs.

Furthermore, there is the potential for the total obliteration of the favourable sight lines that made my unit such a desirable purchase in the first place. I'm certain many of my neighbours felt the same when they settled upon this building as a place to invest and live in. Is my current view of trees, a downtown city scape, and vast horizons to be replaced by brick, mortar, and glass? Perhaps the awkward returning gaze of a shiny new neighbour? It can not be possible for those considering this development not to understand the impact of this.

Regardless of the scale of this development, I am looking at a sharply negative impact on me personally. This impact is doubly felt if the proposed building is going to be high enough to block off all favourable views. For reasons completely unrelated to this proposed building project, I have been contemplating a move for awhile now. After almost six years of quiet enjoyment of this property I am now forced to ponder taking a direct financial hit in terms of resale. For a large development company a hit like this may seem like nothing, but it is a big deal for an owner potentially selling their one and only piece of real estate. I'm sure this is to be laughed at, but should a potential development company not be responsible for corresponding losses in value to surrounding properties? I am admittedly ignorant of the legal obligations and expectations for companies that develop infills, but to me it seems to be common sense for this financial impact to be taken into account.

Whether I continue to reside in my unit throughout a highly disruptive construction process or carry forward with my plans to sell, it is certain that I will be directly and negatively impacted. You may consider this a formal letter of concern and protest.

Sincerely,

Travis Kleinknecht
Unit 316 - Gateway Garrison Woods

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

2016 JUN 21 AM 10:35

RECEIVED

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Stephanie.quinlan@ahs.ca
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 12:22 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Online Submission on LOC2015-0212

June 23, 2016

Application: LOC2015-0212

Submitted by: Stephanie Quinlan

Contact Information

Address: 211 2233 34 ave sw

Phone: 4038284838

Email: Stephanie.quinlan@ahs.ca

Feedback:

I am opposed to the change in land use LOC2015-0212 for the following reasons: 1. The distance from our building to the property line is only 36 feet. 2. The property line between our buildings should be considered a front and back yard and not a side yard. 3. This is not a commercial corridor and the subject property is not under the Marda Loop ARP. 4. The current M-C1 designation fits within the area and any change would create an unfair precedent for all other developable parcels in the area. 5. The owner and developer has not worked with us on previous proposals for the site or on this proposal until forced to do so; 6. The expectation of anyone purchasing a condo on the east side since 2003 when the building was built is that the M-C1 designation will apply. 7. The increase in density on these two parcels is too high if it changes to M-C2. Previous proposal for this site was for 10 townhomes. 8. The increased traffic and parking is not feasible in this area. There are already parking restrictions in effect. 9. If an increase in the land use is approved, there is nothing to stop the developer and owner from creating a completely different development proposal. Thank you for your time, Stephanie Quinaln

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 23 AM 8:10
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Smith, Theresa L.

From: erinj.quinlan@gmail.ca
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 12:29 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Online Submission on LOC2015-0212

June 23, 2016

Application: LOC2015-0212

Submitted by: Erin Quinlan

Contact Information

Address: 204 2426 34 Ave sw

Phone:

Email: erinj.quinlan@gmail.ca

Feedback:

I am opposed to the land use change LOC2015-0212. We have recently purchased in the area and feel the increased traffic would highly impact us and the parking is already very limited. I feel the density would be too high for these two small parcels of land. Thank you, Erin Quinlan

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 23 AM 8:10
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Albrecht, Linda

From: vblower@telus.net
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 11:01 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Online Submission on LOC2015-0212

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 23 AM 8:30
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

June 23, 2016

Application: LOC2015-0212

Submitted by: Vera Blower

Contact Information

Address: 110- 2233 34 Avenue SW

Phone:

Email: vblower@telus.net

Feedback:

My husband and I are owners of a condominium at Gateway Garrison Woods adjacent to the lands which is the subject of the proposed redesignation. I strongly object to the proposed land use redesignation from MC-1 to MC-2 which would allow for a higher and larger building with increased density. The proposed property will be approximately 32 feet away from balconies. It is the feeling of many owners that the property line between our buildings should be considered a front and back yard and not a side yard. The increase in density on these two parcels is too high if it changes to M-C2. Previous proposal for this site was for 10 townhomes. It is important to note the current M-C1 designation fits within the area and any change would create an unfair precedent for all other developable parcels in the area. The increased traffic and parking is not feasible in this area, nor is the proposed development as it creates increased risk of accidents in an already high traffic area. There are already parking restrictions in effect. If an increase in the land use is approved, there is nothing to stop the developer and owner from creating a completely different development proposal.

Albrecht, Linda

From: martin.chamberlain@me.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 9:35 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Online Submission on LOC2015-0212

June 23, 2016

Application: LOC2015-0212

Submitted by: Martin Chamberlain

Contact Information

Address: 323 - 2233 34th Ave SW

Phone: 4036816278

Email: martin.chamberlain@me.com

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 23 AM 8:26
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Feedback:

I am a resident of Garrison Gateway Woods, the building right beside the proposed development. I cannot express strongly enough that I oppose not only the redesignation of the land use, but also the impact this building will have on the condo units facing east on our building. You have to stand there in person to appreciate how close this is, and how this is going to block sunlight from all residents on that side of the building. Not only that, the density of units currently is creating serious parking problems. If you allow this development to proceed, you are going to make many people very unhappy. The ONLY people benefitting from this development are the developers who will be building on that land. People who live here will NOT benefit from this - I am hearing nothing but complaints and objections to this proposed redesignation. Please do NOT allow the land use redesignation. The proposed footprint of the building will already make life miserable for people on the east side of our building. Building as high as the redesignation will allow, will add to the unhappiness. Thank you for your consideration.

Albrecht, Linda

From: paulfrank@shaw.ca
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 9:22 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Online Submission on LOC2015-0212
Attachments: Opposition to LOC2015-0212.docx

June 23, 2016

Application: LOC2015-0212

Submitted by: Paul Frank

Contact Information

Address: 319, 2233 - 34th Ave SW

Phone: 4034668888

Email: paulfrank@shaw.ca

Feedback:

I am opposed to the increase in Land Use and development as proposed. Please see my attached summary of concerns. Thanks, Paul

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 23 AM 8:25
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Redesignation of 3511 21st Street SW and 3515 21st Street SW

File: LOC2015-0212

I am the owner of 319, 2233 – 34th Ave SW in the building known as Gateway Garrison Woods. My unit is directly affected it is adjacent to the proposed development and looks East through it. I am a director on the Gateway Garrison Woods Condo Board.

I am opposed to both the land use change and to the proposed development. Generally speaking, I am not opposed to development and change, however, this proposed change in land use and proposed development are unacceptable.

Here are the reasons I oppose the redesignation for an increased land use:

1. The speed at which this land use change and development are being pushed through. The first time we could see the plans and drawings was two months ago.
2. The distance from the balcony of my unit to the property line is only 32 feet. The only separation is a utility corridor that has restrictions on landscaping.
3. Approving any change in land use will create a piecemeal work of different land uses in the area as well as a precedent for all other developable lands to seek increased land use density and heights.
4. The ARP that applies is the South Calgary ARP, not the Marda Loop ARP as this property is not located on the marda loop corridor.
5. The maximum height that Gateway Garrison Woods was allowed to be built was 9 meters, plus 2.5 meter false roof. That is compared to the current land use of the proposed development at 14 meters for M-C1.
6. The proposed M-C2 land use redesignation allows too high of a building and too much density on two regular residential parcels of land.
7. The previous two approved developments for the site were townhouses. Those are both better suited to the property and this area.
8. The developer and owner have chosen not to work with the owners of Gateway Garrison Woods on either this project or the previous project, instead only giving notice as required to under the Land Use Bylaw.

9. The expectation from anyone buying a condo in Gateway Garrison Woods since 2003 is an adjacent property, designated as M-C1, that would developed as infills or townhouses.

Here is why I oppose the development:

10. The developer proposes a 4 storey building with 33 units and 7 or 8 units with no parking stalls. Notably, this property is located in South Calgary, away from major transit and LRT orientated developments.
11. There is no such thing as a strata car as proposed by the developer to be used by all condo residents.
12. Parking and traffic in the area is already unmanageable.
13. The proposed development and density does not fit within the area in terms of style, design or finish. The proposal is for a modern, Los Angeles style, why the rest of the area, Garrison Woods is traditional eastern brick or Tudor style.
14. The developer proposes building the HVAC of the 4 storey building inside the building, except for the top units which will have air conditioners exterior to the building, possibly on the balconies.
15. The proposed development cannot be considered affordable housing.

Thank you for considering my points and I implore you to deny the application for an increase in the Land Use and the corresponding development.

In the alternative, this application should be adjourned until the fall to allow better and further consultation with the community and residents.

Sincerely,

Paul Frank

Director, Gateway Garrison Woods

Albrecht, Linda

From: VALERIE BARSKY [veb18@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 5:13 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Pincott, Brian
Subject: Land use change application LOC2015-0212

To: City Council, Calgary
From: Valerie Barsky

I am a resident of Gateway Garrison Woods (Unit 132). My property does not face East where the proposed land use change application from Multi-Residential-Contextual Low Profile (M-C1) to Multi-Residential -Contextual Medium Profile (M-C2) is proposed. Yet, I am still strongly **opposed** to this land usage change due to the following:

1. There is already considerable traffic congestion at the corner of 35th Ave and 21st Street making it challenging to enter and exit our building safely from our parking lot even with the considerably lower level occupancy of the current building standing. Visibility and traffic flow are poor.
2. The property value of our building will be lowered as people will not want to buy a condo on the East side that is right up against another building and is blocked by a close view of the neighbours and lack of light. This could also potentially affect our condo fees with a higher vacancy rate in the building.
3. The current M-C1 designation fits within the area and a change in land use designation would set a precedent for other developments to take away from the character and livability of the neighbourhood.
4. If the land use change is approved, the developer may well build an entirely different building causing even more concerns for us.

I am hoping that the voice of a current constituent is heard and council votes accordingly.
Many thanks

RECEIVED
2016 JUN 23 AM 8:28
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS