

CITY OF CALGARY  
RECEIVED  
IN COUNCIL CHAMBER

SEP 09 2022

ITEM: 7.2 IP2022-0989  
Distribution

CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT

From:

Subject: [External] per councilor wong's request here is my oral submission

Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 11:19:13 AM

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

ATTENTION: Do not click links or open attachments from external senders unless you are certain it is safe to do so. Please forward suspicious/concerning email to [spam@calgary.ca](mailto:spam@calgary.ca)

Thank you for hearing me. My name is Jason New and I live in the community of Bowness

I was able to review some of what was posted before this meeting. I will say, posting multiple documents with 100 pages mere days before the hearing, is in my opinion insufficient time to do a proper evaluation and get input from the public. I would ask, as a future improvement, that Council ask administration to provide these documents with 60 days notice.

For the topic at hand, the City administration has indicated they did not do public consultation because "Citizens do not have the technical expertise to the writing of land use districts".

I find that statement not only presumptuous and high handed, but blatantly incorrect. I ask administration, are the only architects and people that know land use, employed by the City, and amongst the few developers the City contacted? I believe that answer would be no. Further, our community association has a planning committee with a paid person to evaluate planning issues, as well as an architect on the committee. Also on our planning committee are realtors, and local everyday people who see multiple planning submissions every month. They are keenly aware of the land uses & the bylaws. They hear the complaints and praises of residents & stakeholders every month. Suggesting these members of the public are not knowledgeable is simply incorrect.

It is ironic that later in the report, administration indicates on page 2 of attachment 8: Administration took a balanced approach to community concerns and industry feedback on these forms.

The two statements by administration are contradictory as administration cannot know what the community concerns are on their proposed changes if they did not consult the public. All of the letters of support are by developers, none from the public and none from community associations

I would ask this committee to abide by council's own engage policy, CS009, which states:

"Inclusiveness – The City makes its best efforts to reach, involve and hear from those who are impacted directly or indirectly.

and send these changes back to administration and direct administration to have robust engagement & meaningful with the public.

I will talk to some of the issues I found in the 100 page document

the proposed parking at 0.375 stalls per unit has been promoted as the same as MU district on page 6 of Attachment 5. This is incorrect. The Bylaw part 14 for multi use districts state, and I will read verbatim:

1350

The minimum number of motor vehicle parking stalls:

a

for each Dwelling Unit is: 1) 0.75 stalls per unit for resident parking; and 2) 0.1 visitor parking stalls;

These can be reduced by close proximity to frequent bus and by having class 1 bicycle stalls.

The current proposed bylaw amendments for RCG and HCO look's to make class 1 required for some units but I do not see micro units:

"1411 The minimum number of motor vehicle parking stalls is calculated based on the sum of all units and suites at a rate of 0.375 stalls per unit or suite."

Administration may indicate that this land use is not intended for outside of main collectors. However any land owner can ask council for a land use change, and the city is introducing as the crow flies straight line rules for distances to BRT service in their proposed section 14(3) where before it was a defined frequent bus services. I would ask committee to keep the frequent bus service requirement and change these as the crow flies distance calculation and instead use sidewalks, paths or roads to determine distance, otherwise someone across a major road with no path to cross would be eligible for this criteria

I ask that the proposed bylaw be amended to be the same parking requirements as MU district, with 0.75 stalls per unit and 0.1 visitor stalls per unit.

I would also request that the new RCG/HGO for midblock have the following added to the bylaw to minimize the impact to adjacent residential neighbors and give certainty to those that live there:

When adjacent to RC1, R1, R2, RC2,

- (1) the maximum parcel coverage is per the adjacent parcels' district
- (2) the front, rear, and side setbacks must conform to the min rules of the adjacent parcels' district
- (3) the required motor vehicle stalls must conform to the min rules of the adjacent parcels' district

I would direct the committee to Table 2 page 2 of Attachment 5 which shows a comparison. An adjacent property should not get reduced requirements than those of neighbors, simply because there are more units on a parcel. There is no evidence in the report that the proposed types of developments require less vehicle parking.

The City is also changing building height from a definitive: "measuring from grade at any point adjacent to the building" to "measuring from grade" for some districts. It is unclear as to the rationale. And any rationale should be circulated for public consultation to prevent developers from manipulating grade to achieve higher buildings

These are just the items I had time to review. I reiterate that these changes should have public and community association meaningful consultation