
From: IDI Director <idi@icacalgary.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 7:11 PM
To: Ward9 - Jordan Stein; Bevill, Brad C.; info@hungerfordproperties.com; CPC
Cc: [REDACTED] ICA President; Planning Advisory & Coordination
Subject: [EXT] LOC2020-0194 - Letter of Opposition
Attachments: LOC2020-0194 (Hungerford on 17th) - Letter of Opposition (ICA).pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good evening,

Please see attached letter in opposition to the proposed land use redesignation (LOC2020-0194) for the Hungerford on 17th project in advance of the CPC meeting coming up this Thursday, June 17. We hope the CPC can seriously evaluate the concerns we have raised, principally concerning the lack of engagement on this project.

Regards,

*Erin Standen, Vice-President and Planning Committee Chair
Inglewood Community Association (ICA)*

CITY OF CALGARY
RECEIVED
IN COUNCIL CHAMBER

JUN 17 2021

i b on
CITY CLERK'S



INGLEWOOD COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

*1740 24TH AVE SE
CALGARY, ALBERTA*

*T2G 1P9
PHONE: 403-264-3835
FAX: 403-261-2724*

June 23, 2020

To Whom it May Concern:

We are writing in response to the proposed land use change at 1390 and 1401 – 17th Avenue SE (Hungerford on 17th). The Community Association and residents were completely bewildered to discover on June 4, 2021 that the above land use redesignation application was going to CPC on June 17, with little to no engagement with the applicant and City Administration since January 2021.

We are strongly opposed to this proposed development based on the following:

1. Failure to Engage

- Hungerford failed to conduct any meaningful engagement with affected residents, with only drops of postcards in the mailboxes of surrounding residents. The only resident engagement was led by the Inglewood Community Association (ICA).
- The ICA led two community meetings in December and January, encouraging residents to contact the applicant, Councilor and File Manager. The ICA also distributed a survey that collected over 260 responses in three weeks and delivered the feedback in a 166-page submission to the City in early January objecting to the development.
- Three (3) information sessions held in late November/early December 2020 by Civic Works after the land use change application was submitted and were for information purposes only. Civic Works even flaunted a special relationship with City Administration in one of the online sessions.
- The applicant made no further attempts to meet with the ICA or affected residents beyond an offer extended by the ICA Planning Committee in December that they declined to attend. The applicant made no further attempts after that to meet with ICA or affected residents.
- Between January and June, the ICA heard next to nothing in terms of the application's status, with occasional check-in emails sent to the File Manager (Brad Bevill).

2. Out-of-Context

- This application was revised from an earlier application filed by Hungerford at 13 storeys which is now at 20 storeys, which coincidentally aligned with the increases in height for the site in two subsequent drafts of the Historic East Calgary LAP/ARP.

- The ICA was provided with an incomplete draft of the Direct Control Bylaw on June 2, 2021 and as of today's date, has still not received a complete/finalized draft.
 - There is no building in the entire community of Inglewood at a height of 65 metres (let alone three (3) buildings each at 65 metres in height) and with a 6.5 Floor Area Ratio (FAR).
 - The community benefits/amenities to get the bonus FAR include access to the Greenline, a plaza and public art (none of which are wanted or were discussed) in a DC drafted by the applicant.
 - The project is overwhelming insensitive to the height and scale of the single-family homes to the north of the proposed development – the homes on 11th and 10th Avenues between 12th and 14th Streets being the most impacted.
3. Impacts on Surrounding Residents
- The applicant has not addressed any resident concerns including privacy/overlooking, traffic, parking (and parking enforcement), noise, shadowing, impacts to property values, etc.
 - There have been no updates shared with residents regarding these concerns since the information sessions in December 2020 which were not intended for collecting feedback.
4. Traffic Disruptions and Parking Concerns
- Impacts on the public lane between two homes on the south side of 11th Avenue SE have not been addressed. No traffic calming has been proposed or was planned – the question was asked directly to Civic Works who ran the sessions.
 - The primary concern flagged by the City related to inadequate access/egress from the site – there are two only, one from 17th Avenue and the other a narrow lane between two houses.
 - The City met with the ICA in January, indicating it was unlikely the project would proceed without a third access point.
 - In the first week of June, the City announced a third emergency access point to be added onto 12th Street – a road with limited visibility, that is fast-moving and a block away from where a pedestrian fatality took place two years ago.
 - The significant parking relaxation expected concerns the development's surrounding neighbours, who believe the building's residents and visitors will spill over into the surrounding residential streets.
5. Alignment with the City's "Development next to Freight Rail Corridors Policy & Implementation Guide"
- It is unclear how the proposed development adheres to the City's "Development next to Freight Rail Corridors Policy & Implementation Guide".
 - The ICA has not seen anything concerning how this development will address some of the policy's criteria, mitigations, risk tolerances, and risk assessments will be in alignment with the requirements outlined in both documents.

- The ICA is not aware of any plans to address noise impacts for residents or for how derailments will be managed for the parcel.
- One of the applicant's proposed amenities for extra height/density is a pedestrian and cycling connection along the freight rail line, which many residents and other stakeholders are having difficulty understanding the value of, given the potential risks (e.g. derailment), and it felt generally to be a means of moving the main building structure to be further from the Rail Proximity envelope.
- Developments that are within the Rail Proximity Envelope are exposed to varying levels of risk due to the potential physical impacts of a train derailment based on the physical relationship between each parcel and the rail. It is unclear how the application is addressing these risks and subsequent mitigation measures with the City.
- Vibration, chemical releases, and noise caused by rail operations are also aspects that should be considered for the development's residents when developing adjacent to a freight railway corridor, with noise requiring a specific study and specific mitigations – a question was asked at one of the information sessions on this topic but there have been no updates since.
- A Site-Specific Risk Assessment is required which we are unaware of being prepared would need to be submitted in support of development proposals within the Envelope which must: contain quantitative and qualitative assessments of the mitigations required to address the risks and hazards associated with freight rail operations on an individual parcel; the mitigation measures (which must be incorporated into the development proposal) and three additional criteria.

The height and density being proposed is beyond unreasonable. It should not outweigh the destruction in the quiet enjoyment of the property of surrounding residents, impacts on property values, the loss of privacy, an increase in traffic congestion, a substantial increase on parking pressures in surrounding streets, significantly reduced sunlight, among many other factors.

Why did City Administration allow Hungerford to completely avoid meaningfully engage the community on a development that exceeds the height of every single building in the community of Inglewood?

Who is going to hold Administration accountable to provide meaningful engagement with the residents that will be most impacted by this project?

How did Administration determine that postcards in the mailboxes of residents, many of whom are renters, were acceptable in terms of engagement for a project of this size and significance.

This application progressed with no resident awareness and little Community Association awareness between December 2020 and June 2021. The ICA was led to believe by Administration, in two separate meetings that included the File Manager, that it was unlikely that the development would proceed at the height and density proposed (mainly due to access/egress

concerns). A last-minute solution was communicated to the ICA in June 2021 **making the lack of engagement and the lack of sharing any pertinent updates/information on the progress of the application seem intentional on the part of both Hungerford and City Administration.**

The voices of the community seem to continue to fall on deaf ears with City Council (and Administration) with each major development application the City has received for Inglewood. This current application being the 5th high-density, multi-family development headed to Council in the last four (4) years.

If the applicant and the City can get away with avoiding any meaningful consultation with residents to the point progressing this application “in secret” over the last six months, the question remains whether it was a democratic process. How can this application move forward in good faith with so many concerns unaddressed and questions unanswered, with so little care/concern for the affected residents and the overwhelming failures in City Administration process?

We are **strongly opposed to the land use redesignation** of 1390 and 1401 – 17th Avenue SE and the proposed development for that land (Hungerford on 17th) and we ask that the CPC strongly consider a delay of decision.

Thank you for considering our viewpoint expressed above.

Sincerely,

Erin Standen, Vice-President & Planning Chair
Inglewood Community Association (ICA)