

## Mount Pleasant Bylaw 51D2016 by David Mulligan March 29, 2016

Ref LOC2014-0147 CPC 2016-058 pages 171-180:774

As a nearby resident to the proposed rezoning of 2014 & 2020 5<sup>th</sup> Street NW from R-C2 to R-CG, I wish to object to this proposed rezoning. My objections include the following which reference your pdf document LOC2014-047:

1. (Page 1:10)The proposal is in keeping with the applicable policies of the Municipal Development Plan and the ARP as amended. The proposed R-CG land use district is intended for parcels in proximity or directly adjacent to low density residential development. The proposal represents a modest increase in density for these inner city parcels and allows for a development that has the ability to be compatible with the character of the existing neighbourhood. In addition, the subject parcels are located on a corner of a collector road, and have good public transit connections.

In my opinion, the proposed development is not “compatible with the character of the existing neighbourhood”. It is also a doubling in density, **NOT** a “modest increase in density”.

2. (Page 5:10)The rules of the R-CG District provide for development that is low height and sensitive to adjacent low-density residential development such as single-detached and semi-detached dwellings.

In my opinion, the proposed development is **NOT** “sensitive to adjacent low-density residential development”.

3. (Page 5:10) ...that is similar in scale and built-form to existing development,

In my opinion the proposal is **NOT** “similar in scale and built-form to existing development.”

4. (Page 6:10) This application is in keeping with relevant MDP policies as the rules of the R-CG District provide for development that is sensitive to existing low-density residential development in terms of height, built-form, and density.

In my opinion the development is **NOT** “sensitive to existing low-density residential development in terms of height, built-form, and density.”

5. (Page 6:10) The proposed R-CG District, while generally consistent with the overall intent of ARP policies for *Low Density Residential Areas*, allows for the rowhouse built-form which isn't contemplated in this area;...

Comment by Mulligan: Rowhouses were/are **NOT** contemplated in this area.

6. (Page 8:10) Our client is interested in the change of Land Use Redesignation for the following reasons:

- 1) From a business point of view, the development of these two properties is an attractive development opportunity that will generate a reasonable amount of return on the initial investment.
- 2) To develop an attractive high quality townhouse development that will be very visually appealing and contribute positively to the character of Mount Pleasant. A townhouse development will respect the streetscape features and community character.
- 3) It would seem like a missed opportunity to not increase density in this location. The site is on the corner, at the end of a low density street. The location and scale will provide a compatible new infill development that contributes to the renewal and vitality of Mount Pleasant.

Comment by Mulligan: Points 1 and 3 essentially state that the developer wishes to maximize profit from this development. A reasonable objective but not sensitive to existing residents.

Ref point2: In my opinion "a townhouse development will **NOT** respect the streetscape features and community character".

.....

Regards,  
David Mulligan  
2009 5<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Calgary AB  
T2M 3C5