

# Community Association Response



April 30, 2021

Re: LOC2021-0040

---

Dear Mr. Joseph Silot, City of Calgary File Manager:

The Hillhurst Sunnyside Planning Committee (HSPC) respectfully submits its comments on the above **Land Use Amendment** application. We appreciate your time in helping answer questions from the community. Our feedback is informed by statutory policies: the Hillhurst Sunnyside Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP), the Land Use Bylaw, and resident feedback.

## Background

1. Being that the Development Permit plans are contingent on Council's approval of the rezoning application, we have provided this letter summarizing resident concerns on the concurrent Development Permit plans with the building design and site layout.
2. Hillhurst Sunnyside is within *Zone A* of the proposed Guidebook for Great Communities and has had a longer history with infilling and cycles of development. Since Council's approval of the Part II Transit Oriented Development ARP amendment in 2009, the community has welcomed approximately 1,800 new neighbours into the community through increased housing options and redevelopment.
3. This development proposal has attracted considerable interest from residents. HSCA has received 28 individual letters and a resident-initiated petition that included 124 signatures in opposition to LOC2021-0040 and DP2021-1502. These residents' concerns have been summarized on the next page. As an actively redeveloping community, we note that there has been a much higher level of citizen involvement on this application when compared to all other applications.
4. This application is within Ward 7. Our community's City Council member representative has recused themselves from commenting and participating in the Land Use and DP discussions. This has left the community in an untenable situation where the community is left to advocate for sound planning & design principles and options on its own.

## Engagement

HSPC aims to achieve a balanced point of view when it prepares its formal submissions to the City Planning Department. As is our practice, we invited the Applicant's team and City File Manager to our regular monthly meeting on April 8, 2021 to facilitate conversation.

We acknowledge and give our thanks to the applicant's representative, Mr. Andre Chabot for his time and presentation to the HSPC/neighbours and taking the community's questions and comments to the applicant's team.

1

Throughout the City's public onsite posting stage, inquiring residents were redirected to contact the City of Calgary; requests to view the development applications were redirected to the City Property Research Department.

### Summary of Community Comments

As mentioned in #3, HSCA has received 28 individual letters and a resident-initiated petition containing 124 signatures in opposition to applications LOC2021-0040 and DP2021-1502. These comments have centred around height, massing, residential context, and opposition to the large mechanical structure as proposed. Community comments have been summarized below:

- That the current zoning can already accommodate multi-unit density and family housing.
  - Given that the base Land Use District of M-CG has not changed, the M-CG bylaw rules should be followed on the proposed building renovation design.
  
- That there is a lack of compliance for the Hillhurst Sunnyside Area Redevelopment Plan residential guidelines and Land Use Bylaw rules for M-CG .
  - Concerns with height, massing, lot coverage, and setbacks.
  - As stipulated in the ARP, residential (peaked) rooflines and building step backs would help decrease the massing of the renovated building.
  - Questions were raised about the large lot coverage and if the 40% at-grade landscaping has been met.
  - Fairness – development in the community should be held to the same rules.
  
- That the height of the proposed mechanical structure, at 46 feet, is too tall and does not complement the streetscape. The increased height and massing does not respect the context of the modest dwellings to the north of the site.
  - The elevator structure is over the 12m height limit of the M-CG district at 14.17m.
  - Concerns about shadowing on the properties to the north of the site.
  - Some residents expressed that larger structures should be moved to the south side of the building, where it would have less impact on the human scale of the street.
  - Chamfer rules for adjacent M-CG parcels with buildings that are 6m and under should have a larger setback. This is not possible due to the proposed location of the elevator shaft and stairwell structure.
  
- That existing parking concerns would increase and generate more automobiles in the area.
  - The alley condition is particularly difficult as the parcel is located at the T-intersection of the Kensington and 10 Street NW alley, where there is already additional traffic due to the shared commercial/residential alley.
  - Garbage and recycle has not been identified on the plans and per Bylaws 566 and 567, should be located inside the building or in a City-approved enclosure.
  
- That the proposed design does not fit contextually with the residential part of the community
  - Concerns that the proposed building breaks from the rhythm and cadence of the street, which includes well-maintained century-old heritage buildings and modestly-sized infills.
  
- That precedent may be set for future development in the community in terms of larger and larger residential buildings.
  - There are no current redevelopment plans from adjacent neighbours in the area
  - Existing infills have generally followed development guidelines and are appropriate and contextual to the street.

**Unit Density**

M-CGd72 (*Multi-Residential Contextual Grade-Oriented District with the density modifier of 72 units/ha*) is the established Land Use District for residential areas between 14th Street NW and 5A Street NW and is reflective of the intent of the ARP. The request for the additional d89 is inconsistent with the entire area. The existing zoning can already accommodate the Applicant's intent to allow for intergenerational housing. Given that the base Land Use District of M-CG has not changed, the M-CG rules should be followed.

**Precedent Examples**

- a. We refer the appropriate approving authorities to a prior Land Use Redesignation from a different developer and parcel in the community that sought a change in density from M-CGd72 to M-CGd111. Similarly, the design concept had demonstrated a lack of sensitivity to the adjacent neighbourhood in terms of massing, height, and site layout.

LOC2016-0312 was recommended for refusal by Calgary Planning Commission and the file was unanimously rejected and abandoned by City Council. Subsequently, a M-CGd72-compliant design was submitted. This DP was supported by the neighbouring community and approved by the Development Authority.

- b. We note that a single detached housing redevelopment in another part of the community that was recently built and includes an elevator that is fully enclosed within the building. This building has become a positive example of modern/traditional architecture that fits in the residential nature of the community and accommodates aging-in-place without adding additional height, massing, and lot coverage.

**Recommendation**

Based on sound planning and urban design policy and provides, resident feedback, the volume of letters and petition signatures against the proposed development, ***HSPC supports the residents' opposition to applications LOC2021-0040 and DP2021-1502.***

Hillhurst Sunnyside has been open to change and over the years, has welcomed appropriate, contextual development. Redevelopment has generally adhered to the ARP and Land Use Bylaw rules. The concurrent submissions as submitted, have not demonstrated sensitivity to the rules set out in the ARP and Land Use Bylaw. We look forward to working with you as this application moves through the development process with a revised plan application.

We thank you for your time,

Hillhurst Sunnyside Planning Committee  
Hillhurst Sunnyside Community Association

cc: Members, Hillhurst Sunnyside Planning Committee (planning@hsca.ca)  
City of Calgary Circulation Control, Planning and Development (cpag.circ@calgary.ca)