

Community Association Responses



January 19, 2021

Tom Schlodder
Planner 2 | Centre West Community Planning
The City of Calgary
5th Floor, 800 Macleod Trail S.E.
Calgary AB T2G 2M3

Dear Tom:

Re: LOC2020-0147 - 1408 33rd St SW LAND USE AMENDMENT

The applicant has innovative ideas for micro-units for the above noted lot which may or may not warrant consideration when details are known. When presented to us on October 7, 2020 a rendering of the expected Development Permit contemplated an 8 story, 50 micro-unit building on a 50 ft by 110 foot single-family lot, with kitchenettes, no kitchens and no parking.

MU-1 is a very new land use designation which the Shaganappi Community Association ("CA") has previously supported in 2017 for specific parcels on 17th Avenue as part of our Main Streets re-designation, after very recent and significant engagement. At that time, residents were informed that these buildings would typically consist of street-oriented mid-rise buildings between four and six stories in height, and that the new designation was to be implemented with reference to local area policy. At that time, there was no local area policy for 17th Avenue, and new policy was accomplished through an amendment and extension of the Killarney/Glengarry ARP. With a Westbrook Local Area Plan not yet completed or approved, we believe that the applicant will require a direct rationale for supporting proposed changes to the Westbrook ARP.

In addition, the CA has encountered at least three recent non-viable densification proposals on small single-family lots, including a previous proposal for micro-units on this lot (see DP2017-2423) which was proposed and withdrawn by a prior owner, and at Bow Trail and 26 Street SW (see DP2018-0963), which after four Detailed Team Reviews was determined by SDAB to be inappropriate to the site (SDAB2020-0018).

As with those prior proposals, and due to the unique nature of the desired concept, we do not yet understand how the land use re-designation, as concurrently amended, and as specifically tied by the applicant to the built form through an incomplete Direct Control ("DC") rationale, will support a proposed building with an FAR of 5 on this very small lot. Of particular concern is a viable street interface and sufficient visibility for vehicles exiting the lane. Specifically, based on our experience of similar projects, we do not understand how the provision of a loading bay, waste and recycling, an electricity room and other servicing requirements for a proposed building will result in a viable first floor.

There has been more than adequate City signage at the site, with the applicant preparing a website, but there has been no substantive two-way engagement of adjacent residents beyond our email distribution of the City circulation document to 15 nearby households who also happen to be CA members. Also, DC details were completely omitted in the City circulation document. At our request, a DC rationale was provided by the file manager after the circulation, and this has not yet been disseminated to affected

stakeholders by the City or the applicant. In addition, the rationale received by us did not address the above concerns about the viability of the building concept, the context of the local area plan and the specifics of the DC designation itself.

We have reached out to the applicant's representative and requested additional engagement to help stakeholders understand the relationship of this land use with the local area plan, and to allow the applicant and City staff to present the DC rationale. We have recently had great success with video engagement of residents during the current COVID situation, with at least two recent meetings serving as effective alternatives to an open house or a group meeting of adjacent residents. Accordingly, we have encouraged and expect the applicant to perform a mail drop and plan such a meeting when this proposal is further along.

However, at this time, we believe that granting a land use change would be premature. Therefore, the Shaganappi Community Association cannot support this application. Thank you.

Yours truly,
Michael Wilhelm
President
Shaganappi Community Association

Ramneet Cheema, B. Arch, M.Arch,
M.A. Housing & Urbanism
Shaganappi Community Association Development Committee Member

Ron Goodfellow, FRAIC
Advisor, Planning and Development
Shaganappi Community Association

Weston Bronconnier, CFA
Westbrook Area Rep
Shaganappi Community Association

Cc: Evan Woolley, Zev Klymochko, Ward 8 Office, City of Calgary
Breanne Harder, Peter Schryvers, Heloisa Ceccato Mendes, Westbrook LAP Team
Development Committee, Shaganappi CA, Adam Harrison, Brian Horton, O2 Planning + Design Inc.



April 20, 2021

Tom Schlodder
Planner 2 | Centre West Community Planning
The City of Calgary
5th Floor, 800 Macleod Trail S.E.
Calgary AB T2G 2M3

Dear Tom:

**Re: DP2021-1907; LOC2020-0147 - 1408 33rd St SW – Second Letter of Opposition
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND LAND USE AMENDMENT**

Subsequent to our letter of January 19, 2021, the Shaganappi Community Association (“CA”) reviewed and commented on a more advanced concurrent application on the same street by Truman Homes. Consistent with area context and new information provided by that application (LOC2020-0022+0023), we now request the MU-1 height modifier at this location to be set at 21 meters (+31% to current ARP requirements) and FAR to 3.75 (+50%).

We acknowledge the applicant for providing more details and including a concurrent Development Permit (“DP”). Unfortunately, the CA sees very little progress on concerns raised previously with the application:

- This project contributes nothing to the public realm which would justify significant relaxations from policy and bylaw.
- The parking concept is not supported by meaningful Transportation Demand Management Measures as required by the Westbrook ARP.
- We see no acceptable rationale for an ad hoc Direct Control (“DC”) district approval by Council in an area already pending a new area plan. We suggest the current ARP be amended, and the same changes be considered for the Westbrook Local Area Plan (“LAP”). Parking relaxations should then be appropriately made in the DP.

Parking is a DP approval condition not a land use matter. Section 20 2(b) of the Land Use Bylaw (“LUB”) does not allow a DC land use district to regulate a matter that should be ordinarily regulated by a DP approval condition.

“Risk mitigation for the applicant is not a planning consideration” (Andrew Palmerie, CPC, March 18, 2021). We agree with this; there would be no need for a DC for this purpose, and we will not support a proposal that would compromise any resident’s legitimate right to appeal.

We would support an ARP amendment to support a parking relaxation on the land use. The CA has no historic issue with parking relaxations next to transit and opposed efforts to promote cars at Westbrook in June 2009 and April 2019. In addition, the CA did not make parking relaxations near transit stations an issue in our recent appeal (SDAB2020-0018). With a recent Westbrook ARP in place, we could justify a more relaxed area parking policy now to accommodate this type of proposal.

A residential parking relaxation will impact the availability of parking for current and future commercial development at Westbrook. It could also impact parking at the City’s recent and facing investment at the new Westbrook library. Therefore, we suggest that important local landowners not yet asked to fully

engage in the Westbrook LAP process be active participants in setting appropriate parking target for the ARP amendment.

- The street interface is not viable, or consistent with other plans for the area. In comparison, Truman's concurrent application (LOC2021-022+023) on the same street will create a significant (~4 meters) set back streetscape on 33rd. We are waiting for the DP to confirm this, but this proposed building appears to hug a narrow 5-foot monowalk on what will be a busy location on a collector street. It will not create a positive pedestrian realm and could impede access to the busy Bow Trail intersection crossing to Westbrook station.

A negative pedestrian realm is counter to a transit justified parking concept and we would like this project to support a consistent future build out of the street. With important local landowners not yet asked to fully engage in the Westbrook LAP process, we will advance this concept in the LAP. We also expect City Transportation might want to allow road expansion of this emerging and important collector route (as they consistently have on 17th Avenue).

- A bylaw mandated loading bay should be required. The applicant has framed these as an affordable alternative to basement suites, for young professionals, singles and anyone who wants a car-free lifestyle. We would suggest that people do not live-in basement suites for long, and this building has no balconies, no current amenities, no varied layout option, nothing to support pets (one elevator, no suitable green space). So, there will be turnover; with significant loading and unloading each month.

One tiny back stall, covered by the building and smaller than an average passenger car (constrained by 3 pillars) will not work, and we expect from our recent appeal that Transportation appeal will not support loading on the front street of an emerging key collector street.

- We have received no response to our prior request for additional engagement by way of a virtual town hall meeting to:
 - Allow area residents to understand the relationship of this land use with the ARP, and to allow the applicant and City staff a two-way discussion on DC rationale and the basis for significant relaxations. The DC rationale for parking will restrict resident's right to appeal without any apparent attempt to address area policy, We would have thought this engagement would therefore be a priority.
 - Answer ongoing, and unanswered, questions on plans to manage this innovative building. Trust and support of the concept is particularly important as current ownership of the property has very low maintenance standards. A member of our affordable housing committee has reached out to invite the applicant's team to work with us if that option is chosen.

Therefore, with details now provided, and the additional area context provided by a concurrent application with more area scale, the Shaganappi Community Association now opposes this application.

Thank you.

Yours truly,
Michael Wilhelm
President
Shaganappi Community Association

Ramneet Cheema, B. Arch, M.Arch,
M.A. Housing & Urbanism
Shaganappi Community Association Development Committee Member

Ron Goodfellow, FRAIC
Advisor, Planning and Development

Shaganappi Community Association

Weston Bronconnier, CFA
Westbrook Area Rep
Shaganappi Community Association

Cc: Evan Woolley, Zev Klymochko, Ward 8 Office, City of Calgary
Breanne Harder, Peter Schryvers, Heloisa Ceccato Mendes, Westbrook LAP Team
Development Committee, Shaganappi CA, Adam Harrison, Brian Horton, O2 Planning + Design Inc.