

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Subject: [EXT] 402 26 AV NW - LOC2021-0097 - DMAP Comment - Tue 12/28/2021 3:57:52 PM
Date: Tuesday, December 28, 2021 3:57:56 PM

Application: LOC2021-0097

Submitted by: Joyce Johnson

Contact Information

Address: 406 26 Ave NW

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Overall, I am/we are:

In opposition of this application

Areas of interest/concern:

Land Uses, Height, Density, Amount of Parking, Lot coverage, Building setbacks, Privacy considerations, Included amenities, Community character, Traffic impacts, Shadowing impacts, Offsite impacts, Other

What are the strengths and challenges of the proposed:

Will the proposed change affect the use and enjoyment of your property? If so, how?

The City views applications in the context of how well it fits within the broader community and alignment to Calgary's Municipal Development Plan (MDP). Do you see the proposed changes as compatible to the community and MDP? If not, what changes would make this application align with The City's goals?

How will the proposed impact the immediate surroundings?

General comments or concerns:

I want an interpretation of this. Is it something that can be abused going forward?

I do not understand the meaning (use) of the stated new code as stated in the documents. Please advise
Please give me an interpretation/meaning of this (new applying for Building/Land use code)

my house [REDACTED] 1 person use between 4mc and 8mc units of water + sewer service. I can only imagine -
-4 units -likely 2 persons or more per unit
so 8+ Persons. Serious increase in services (water and services). Disruption of the 2nd Street walking following
increase in traffic.

From 2nd street to 4 street on 26 Ave NW We can only have 2 vehicles registered at any address and now we add more vehicles. This 26th Ave is also a Fire and emergency vehicle traffic thoroughfare. The City refuses to change that. At 86 years of age I do not have the energy to walk the street for agreeing signatures to cancel that FINAL, The proposed NEW BYLAW will allow the buildings that are not friendly or advantageous to our well settled Area (ZONE JJ)

If this NEW BYLAW is allowed it will only be the beginning of the destruction of our well structured and settled Community.

This new code will be the demise of a well PLANNED and SETTLED HOUSING ZONE

And then there is the added TRAFFIC and PARKING on 2nd STREET, THIS IS A BIKER LANE AS WELL AS WALKING.



FORM TITLE

Header text

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of [Procedure Bylaw 35M2017](#), the information provided **may be included** in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)

Last name (required)

What do you want to do? (required)

Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)

Date of meeting

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

Re: Land Use Redesignation, Mt. Pleasant Bylaw 3D2022 – land at 402 26 Ave NW
Dear Members of City Council,
Please consider the following four main points regarding the proposed land use redesignation.

A) Input was requested from the community but was severely impeded by the following procedures which I will outline below, and therefore you have NOT received adequate and representational feedback from the community.

1) The signage announcing this proposed monumental change to a bylaw in our community was inappropriately placed and therefore unseeable to most. (Sign was placed on the SW corner of the property facing 26 Ave. directly and behind a bush from most angles. Should it not have been placed on the SW corner so it could be seen by both 26 Ave and 2nd St? 2nd St is the bike path and the lot is on the corner so that placement would provide greater access to be seen, and those walkers and riders weren't able to see it at all.)

2) Proper procedures were further impeded in that when I brought this item forward to planning I was assured I was correct and that the sign would be moved. This did not occur.

3) Procedures for procuring community feedback were also impeded by the timeline. Given it was over the Christmas and New Year holiday season and many residents were away at the time and unaware that this bylaw was being discussed and that their input was sought. (Said sign appeared on Thursday Dec. 16th just prior to

DISCLAIMER

1/2

This document is strictly private, confidential and personal to its recipients and should not be copied, distributed or reproduced in whole or in part, nor passed to any third party.

Jan 3, 2022

2:33:33 PM



FORM TITLE

Header text

the last weekend before Christmas and we were expected to have all feedback in prior to Jan. 4 at noon.)

4) Procedures for feedback were further impeded by the usual holiday arrangements of holiday schedules of the Planning Dept. as well. I first spoke to someone in charge who shortly thereafter went on holiday until Jan. 10. Someone else was on call for a few days and then she went on holiday. Following her departure another person was to be in charge but I received an automated out of office reply email and was directed to yet another person. Yes, the office was open but it was difficult to get solid answers etc. I also sent a letter of concern to my alderman but did not hear from him likely because he too was on holiday. I have no quarrel with any of the aforementioned employees but am concerned that the thread of major concerns could easily be lost with so many transitions and a general lack of clarity.

B) I propose that this decision and all discussion around the proposed land use resignation b