

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Peter Ackermans <peter.ackermans@yahoo.ca>
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2019 5:27 PM
To: Public Submissions
Subject: [EXT] Submission for Agenda of Council of July 22, ref LOC2019-002
Attachments: Letter to Council re 1516.pdf

The attached letter is provided to the City Clerk for submission to Council for the Public Hearing on Planning Matters of July 22, with reference to a proposed Land Use Amendment in Capitol Hill (Ward 7) at 1516 - 21 Ave NW, LOC2019-0002.

Thank you,
Peter Ackermans
1523 - 22 Ave NW
403-282-5900

July 13, 2019

To Members of Calgary City Council:

We are writing to register our strong opposition to the Land Use Redesignation proposed for 1516 – 21 Ave NW (ref. LOC2019-0002)

1. The City has very recently updated the Area Redevelopment Plan for this community, clearly designating residential streets that are not major arteries or collectors as R-C2. What is the point of having an ARP if it is to be violated at the first opportunity?
2. There are no comparably imposing mid-block structures in this neighbourhood except on arteries and collector roads. The proposed box-shaped design creates issues of safety, noise, sunlight shadowing, traffic congestion, and visual deterioration of the streetscape.
3. The unpaved laneway behind this lot will not support regular entry and egress by an additional 6-9 vehicles. The laneway is currently severely potholed and will suffer even more damage with concentrated traffic at the entrance to a parking facility.
4. The proposed multi-level parking facility, while creative, is inappropriate for a residential area and unproven in a climate like Calgary's. Such mechanized facility would create a hazard for children and animals, would be noisy in operation, and is ill-suited to typical residential garage utility such as storing bicycles, garden tools, sports equipment, etc. Furthermore, the concept's certification status with respect to Alberta building codes and Canadian safety codes is unknown.
5. How refuse and recycling collection would be managed on the laneway for a building of 6 units is also unclear.

In summary, this type of construction should be restricted to streets that are appropriately zoned in compliance with the ARP.

We strongly urge City Council to reject this Amendment.

Yours truly,
Peter & Pauline Ackermans
1523 – 22 Ave NW
403-282-5900
peter.ackermans@yahoo.ca

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Crichton <margaret.crichton@telusplanet.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 4:03 PM
To: Public Submissions
Cc: City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] Submission for council for July 22, 2019 re land amendment proposal for 1516 21 Ave. NW
Attachments: Submission for council on July 22,19.pdf

Submission to Council For July 22, 2019 concerning Policy and Land Use Amendment proposal for 1516 - 21 Ave NW (LOC2019-0002)

Members of the Council,

I am vehemently opposed to this proposed development for the following reasons:

This is a MID BLOCK location with a 1 1/2 storey attached infill on the west (our home) and a bungalow on the east zoned RC-2 at present. The recently commercial zoned and renovated building on the corner is a ONE STOREY building. A 3 storey building does NOT belong here.

This community has also seen developers get their desired land zone change and then sell the land. The M-CG zone then allows another developer to build up to a six storey building. This is a dangerous precedent and totally unacceptable for this community.

The KHA proposal contained many inaccuracies and presumptions which we addressed in our submission to city planning. Our point by point response to KHA and our concerns were not addressed in Kelsey Cohen's report. (I have attached our original submission.)

The community association encouraged an open house which was finally held April 24, 2019 long after submissions from the community were closed. The planning department allowed KHA to use this open house for his submission. We have found KHA to be an extremely unreliable source of accurate information. Community members should also have had the opportunity to present their viewpoint. The community was NOT informed or we would have recorded the meeting. Maybe a city representative should be present at these meetings??

KHA makes claims about the benefits that his construction would provide but engineers, electricians and a geophysicist all doubt his claims and his unproven technology.

The present structure (bungalow with secondary suite) provides urban forest and storm water management. The KHA proposal will destroy urban forest and put a burden on the city infrastructure. We have had multiple floods on this street due to aging infrastructure.

The well respected and progressive Capitol Hill Community Association do NOT support this proposal. They support the R-CG zoning as indicated in the ARP which meets the MDP for this area. Why should community volunteers dedicate large amounts of time and energy in preparing a report to the city when their report recommendation is completely ignored by both the planning department and the planning commission?

This proposal does NOT match the ARP which leaves us feeling betrayed. What is the purpose of all the tax dollars and the community work, compromise and involvement if the city doesn't follow the ARP agreement?

If you need two bylaws and have to amend the future ARP to approve a developer's plan then this is not a good plan for this location! This amendment is beyond the proposed R-CG zoning and way beyond our present R-C2 residential zone and I truly believe should have been rejected outright by the Planning Department.

Sincerely,
Margaret Crichton (1520 21 Ave. NW)

February 15, 2019

Kelsey Cohen File Manager IMC #8076
800 Macleod Trail SE P.O. Box 2100 Station M
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

Re Objection to Land Use Amendment LOC2019-0002

We absolutely object to the KHA (on behalf of the landowner) proposal to change the land use at 1516 21 Avenue NW from R-C2 to M-CG.

This is a residential street with bungalows, a designated heritage building and three infills. The lot at 1516 21 Ave. is MID BLOCK with a bungalow on one side and our home, a one and a half storey attached infill on the other side. The structure size and associated density of a M-CG does not belong at this location. Allowing this change would set a dangerous precedent for future development plans in this community.

The type of project allowed by a M-CG rating will have a huge negative impact on our quality of life both in the short term with construction (the larger the project the more construction) and in the long term with loss of privacy and light and increased noise, parking and sewer concerns. Margaret's health (CFIDS/ME plus noise and chemical sensitivities) will be particularly adversely impacted.

Parking is already problematic. This street is a two hour parking zone and is frequently heavily parked with an active community centre, community garden, playground, the day care, the Scout hall and the baseball diamonds.

The sewer system on this street is old and there have been multiple extensive problems along the street which would pose a concern with the increased usage of a heavy density population.

While we would prefer the current R-C2 designation to be maintained we understand the change in the City of Calgary's vision. A change in the land use amendment to R-CG for this particular property would be a reasonable compromise with the goal of a moderate increase in population density.

KHA's proposed land use amendment does not comply with either the present R-C2 zoning nor the proposed future R-CG plans for LOW DENSITY row houses.

KHA's submission to the city contains many inaccuracies, presumptions, and unsupported suppositions. We do not agree that this proposed multi residential development will be an asset to the Capitol Hill revitalization program. This is our response to the KHA rhetoric.

- 1516 21 Ave NW is mid block. It is NOT adjacent to the building on the corner lot that was recently rezoned commercial (justified by that property facing the 14th Street corridor).
- 14th Street does provide good access though the traffic volume is already heavy.
- The businesses that are within close proximity include a computer repair shop, a liquor store, a paint supply store and a cheese store all of which are located on 14th Street. It is absolute supposition that new residents will support these businesses and add vibrancy to the neighbourhood. The City of Calgary MRP recommends that there be a 600 to 1000 metre access to a large format grocery store in order to receive a M-CG designation. The closest large grocery store is the Safeway which is many blocks away (19th St and 14th Ave).
- This proposal does not align with the MDP whose goals include not only housing choices but also accessibility to daily needs and protecting heritage areas and urban forest.

- Community engagement is also a concern. The submission says KHA is waiting for a response from neighbours. We received a leaflet in the mailbox over Christmas and responded by email on December 28, 2018. Kelvin Hamilton's email replies kept reiterating the same information. He wishes to remove the present property that is detrimental to the environment with excess green house emissions and will create a more affordable energy efficient development that will demonstrate 'net zero' footprint. The development will promote passive design ideologies leading to less demand on the energy grid. This jargon was neither pertinent to our specific request for more detailed information nor helpful in initiating a meaningful dialogue. He also said his 'undetermined' plan would enhance the streetscape. The 'streetscape' is currently an attractive bungalow that was professionally landscaped to use rainwater for irrigation.
- Please note that the current house contains asbestos which poses a significant risk to people and the environment if it is disturbed unless it is very carefully and diligently removed.
- The KHA submission does not specify housing type but we requested and received information from the Capitol Hill Community Association that shows a five unit (two 3 bedroom, two 2 bedroom and one single unit) multi-storey project with only four parking spaces. This could mean upwards of twenty people in this one development with the associated concerns of noise, parking and sewer not to mention the increase in greenhouse gas emissions from more people and vehicles.
- The Capitol Hill Community Association have advised us that they do NOT support this proposal.
- We reached out to Ward 7 and spoke with Dale Calkins who advised us that this proposal does NOT match the future planned ARP for this community despite KHA's claim on the submission. We were further advised that Druh (not Clir as is written in the KHA submission) Farrell is neutral on this project.

KHA's conclusion is a plethora of further inaccuracies and presumptions. Again, it is not true that this proposed development is adjacent to existing commercial development(s) nor to other properties designated M-CG.

The City of Calgary has already identified key issues with land designation changes including how to manage privacy in neighbouring parcels and how to sensitively integrate larger buildings into established neighbourhoods. These issues have not been addressed in this submission. They are a huge concern as the massive project that is allowable under the M-CG designation is unacceptable at this location.

In conclusion, we chose this community twenty years ago, greatly care about this community (we are two of the founding and active members of the Capitol Hill community garden) and would like to spend our retirement years in this community. We do NOT support this proposal.

We would support a change to R-CG although we would want meaningful input into the development plans.

We are available if the planning department has any further information or questions.

Sincerely,

Lynn and Margaret Crichton

(Resident landowners 1520 21 Ave. NW)

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: E K <kosabeth@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 8:21 PM
To: Public Submissions
Subject: [EXT] Fwd: reference # LOC2019-0002

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

To the Members of the City Council:

My name is Elizabeth Kosa. I am the sister and the sister-in-law of the residents of the neighboring property of the proposed development at 1516 – 21 Ave. N.W. (reference LOC2019-0002) I attended the information meeting held by KHA concerning the development as my sister and brother-in-law were unable to attend. The presentation consisted of a haranguing about global warming and the necessity of “green” development such as the one proposed by the developer. There were many stock phrases and platitudes that littered the presentation about it being a green development. The only unique green idea presented was a roof top garden that would make the height of the building even higher and also poses serious concerns about privacy to the residents of the block. The developer called the attendees of the meeting “selfish” when questions and concerns were raised about the development.

There was a questionnaire passed out at the end of the meeting for feedback to the developer that I originally was going to fill out until I studied it and realized that the questions were biased and not open ended and truly wanting feedback from the community. He was not interested in what the community had to say in respect to the height/density for the proposed development – basically if you did not agree with his vision you were “selfish”. I was later to find out my assessment was accurate when his take on the meeting was a disparaging one of a bunch of old people not understanding his vision.

1) He forgot that not all attendees were “middle aged” including several attendees that raised concerns about privacy due to the height and position (mid-block) of the development and the young mother that arrived after the meeting started (due to her work schedule) who was concerned about the safety of her children due to increased traffic in the back alley because of the density of the development.

2) I didn’t realize that one’s age automatically disqualified one’s viewpoint.

I had raised a concern about the plumbing on the street accommodating such a high density development. My brother-in-law, after experiencing a serious flood in his basement several years ago talked with one of the city workers that worked on the city pipe in the street. The city worker told my brother in law that the pipe under the street was an ancient clay one that the city didn’t even have proper schematics for - there was some lining put in the pipes to fix the issue but the technology is new and untested. The developer’s response to my concern was “That is the City’s problem”. Should there be flooding for the residents on the street it would be their problem first as they would suffer the damage from such a flood. The problem then, I guess, would be the City’s should residents or their insurance companies decide to sue the City for allowing such an ill-conceived development .

My brother in law is legally blind and he depends on the natural light that currently floods the property. The proposed height of the building would cast such a large shadow as to seriously impact his quality of life and ability to navigate both inside the house and in the backyard. My sister is an avid gardener (a true “green” activity) and this development would curtail that activity, especially in the back yard.

The street is a unique one in that there is a Community Hall and a historically protected site (the Scout's Hall) on the same street. The proposed development would impinge on the entire community's ability to use these facilities as the parking proposed by the developer for his property sounds dubious in its technology and expensive in its construction. The developer insisted that the units would be "affordable" but refused to give even a ballpark figure on what one unit would cost and I suspect that the proposed parking would be the first thing scrapped due to the price tag and would not accommodate the extra cars that would come with the development.

I think that there is a concern on the part of many Calgary residents that developer's plans are just being rubber stamped in the frenzy of wanting to making communities have denser populations. This development seems to be one that is calculated to change zoning and set a dangerous precedent on the street. It would be a blight on the community.

I strongly encourage the City Council members to view the newly renovated and beautifully landscaped property at the end of the block at 14 street and 21 avenue. When viewing that anchoring property I think that this proposed development -mid- block of a high density and towering building -would be viewed as a scar on the block as it would not fit in and it would shadow the surrounding properties and cause numerous other concerns for the residents of the community.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Kosa

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: John Lathrop <john.lathrop@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 8:25 PM
To: Public Submissions; City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] Reference No. LOC2019-0002

Dear Members of the City Council:
Re: Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2019-0002
Location: [1516 21 Ave. N.W.](#)
The application proposes to redesignate the land use for the property listed above:
From: R-C2
To: M-CG

I object to the proposed rezoning from R-C2 to M-CG because the proposed increased density would adversely affect parking, traffic congestion, city sewage, neighbouring green space, and quality of life. I further object to the proposed development of the property because the rationale for the proposal was exaggerated and misleading.

I object to being described as a conservative person not in tune to the need for responsible development of our resources and our land just because I question the developer. Moreover, I don't see how the proposed development of a six unit three to four storey apartment with its associated six to twelve vehicles and up to a possible twelve visitor vehicles at a time will contribute to the Green ambitions of the developer. What I find particularly offensive is the use of such serious issues as Global warming and Greenhouse gasses as pat jargon. I am a U.S. Air Force Veteran and a meteorologist and take these issues seriously.

The traffic congestion on this block is a big problem and a safety issue. On weekdays there is constant traffic bringing children to and from the morning and afternoon sessions of the preschool. Parents arrive with such large vehicles (vans, SUVs) that the traffic is reduced to one lane. In the evenings there are so many vans and buses bringing children to activities in the playing fields, the community centre, the playground, and the park that we can't even park within 200 feet of our home. There is also the community garden across the street which brings more traffic to the block.

Both I and my neighbours in the adjoining duplex have suffered multiple floods caused by city sewer backups. The addition of six family units concentrated on one major sewage line output could have a catastrophic effect on one of the oldest clay city sewer lines (post 1912) still in use. When this was mentioned to the developer he said that the sewer lines were the city's problem.

The proposed development will cast into shade our back garden and entirely remove the extensive lawn, mature garden, lilac hedges, and trees of the building site. So much for being green.

The application states that the proposed development would support neighbouring businesses and supermarkets. In fact, small businesses are leaving this area. Neighbouring businesses are limited to a one man computer repair shop, a small liquor store, a gourmet cheese shop and a paint store. The nearest grocery store is 10 blocks away and across 16 Ave. N.W. There is also mention of the future and possible zoning of the neighbouring properties. This is clearly putting the cart before the horse as these properties are not likely to be developed in the foreseeable future. The scale of the proposed development is completely inappropriate to the present situation.

Also inappropriate is reference to affordable housing and more taxes for the city. The fact that putting in six units would in reality be at a more marketable price point for the developer in comparison to his competitors

should have no bearing in any decision to rezone. When queried about the price per unit, the developer had nothing to say. Which would be natural as there appear to be no concrete plans (that were open to viewing by the neighbours), no specifics, as the goal at this time it to get the rezoning and as a young neighbour said “do a switch and bait”.

Sincerely yours,

John Lathrop

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: M Kosa <kosam1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 8:29 PM
To: Public Submissions; City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] Reference No. LOC2019-0002

Re: Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2019-0002

Location: 1516 21 Ave. N.W.

The application proposes to redesignate the land use for the property listed above:

From: R-C2

To: M-CG

We are opposed to the suggested redesignation.

We object to this proposal for the following reasons:

- It is out of scale for the rest of the block.

So far major density new developments in the area have been on corner properties or next to property where there is already density on the corner. This proposed new development on 1516 is a middle lot. The 50 by 120 foot lot only has a 50 foot frontage of the street, unlike all the other new developments in Capitol Hill which are on 50x120 corner lots which allow parking along the 50 foot side, the 120 foot side, and have a garage for each unit. The proposed development will not enhance the street scape at all. It is far too big in size and far too tall. It will tower over every other building on the block. It will be very aesthetically displeasing.

- It disregards the active nature of the community centre.

The green space across the street is more than just a public park. It is actually playing fields (soccer/baseball), playground, community gardens with extensive raised beds that are leased out to community members, and a community hall housing a preschool, and additional hall and meeting rooms with an active schedule of weekly events. The community centre is across the street from the proposed development.

This community is already actively vibrant. It has no need of a rezoning project that would add congestion and is out of context with its environment.

The traffic congestion is extensive on 21 Ave throughout the week because it is the safest access for parents dropping off and picking up their children for preschool, games and community events at the community centre and for the Scout Hall across the street.

The Capitol Hill Community Centre brings more than the nearby community together. To those of us that live on 21 Ave. N.W. it brings congestion, traffic woes, but also brings together people. The community scene is so vibrantly active that we feel that the current zoning is appropriate.

- Lack of proximity to commercial businesses and supermarket.

The application states that the proposed development is adjacent to commercial businesses and supermarket. It is not. Other than a small family office/home on the corner, the nearest commercial building is a block away on the other side of 14 St. and comprises a one man computer repair shop and a small liquor store. A further block away is a boutique cheese shop and a paint store. It is important to note that these businesses are all on 14 St. N.W. The nearest supermarket is across 16 Ave. (the Trans Canada Highway) and 1.5 km away—a twenty minute walk.

- Municipal Development Plan Alignment

The site at 1516 – 21 Ave. N.W., in view of its position in midblock of the street and in view of the properties on either side of it, would not be appropriately designated as M-CG. An M-CG is not suitable in the middle of a

street in an already congested area and is out of rapport with its neighbouring properties. The proposed infill would really be an overfill. It would be an addition that does not take into any consideration the one story homes that separate it from 14th street. Those very one story homes are likely to be there for the foreseeable future. It is also important to note that the Community association is also against the rezoning to M-CG.

- Quality of our life

We are concerned about a development that is too big, too close, and too tall for us. The proposed height of 12 metres would seriously degrade the sunlight available to our kitchen, dining room and family room windows. We would have no light at all from the east—nothing but a wall facing our windows. Our entire back garden would get no light at all from the east and the light from the southeast would also be blocked. My husband, since his stroke is legally blind and mostly wheelchair bound, but he is able to walk through the house with a cane, provided the sun through the east windows is strong. Due to his blindness, a single kitchen window's morning sun is worth dozens of light bulbs. Also, he is able to make his way out the back door into the garden, just to feel the light and see colours. The proposed development would plunge our back garden space into darkness and would also affect some of our front garden. I am an avid gardener and enjoy planting colourful flowers in the hope that my husband can see them. In our second story bedroom we have a south facing window with a view of the city. We would like to see a future development that does not completely block all the sun and the view from the only upstairs window that we have facing that direction. Therefore, we would like the proposed building to be no closer to the boundary line between our properties than we are, to have the proposed building set back appropriately in the streetscape so the south-facing big window of our living room is also not shaded, and the height of the project limited to 10 metres.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Kosa

1518 – 21 Ave. N.W.

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Tom Anthony <tom_anthony@shaw.ca>
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2019 11:33 PM
To: Public Submissions
Cc: planning@capitolhillcommunity.ca; Cohen, Kelsey L.
Subject: [EXT] Public comment To LOC2019-0002 Bylaw150D2019
Attachments: Response To LOC2019-0002-Bylaw150D2019.pdf

I would like to enter the attached letter into the record for review by city council in the matter of LOC2019-0002 (and/or Bylaw150D2019) as part of the public hearing for this application on July 22nd.

I will not be able to attend the hearing in person due to work conflicts, but trust that our concerns and objections will be taken into consideration by council.

Regards,
Tom Anthony

Rebecca Jacksteit & Tom Anthony (Tom_Anthony@shaw.ca)
1515 22 Ave. NW, Calgary, AB, T2M 1R2

July 13, 2019

Attention: Office of the City Clerk

RE: Request for Comment on LOC2019-0002 / Bylaw 150D2019 (1516 21 AVE NW)

We are long-time residents of Capitol Hill, currently residing on the lot immediately north of the subject property, and am writing to follow up on our previous letter to express our strong opposition to the proposed land use amendment and our desire to see the ARP honoured.

Some of our concerns with the proposed change include:

Inappropriateness of location: In addition to the issues noted further below, the proposed rezoning is inappropriate for its location for several reasons. This location is in the middle of a low traffic street (30 km/hr playground zone), not a high traffic location like 14th St or 20th Ave as misleadingly suggested in the application. The proposed change will exacerbate problems with parking, and increase traffic and decrease safety in this playground zone. The change in character of the area brought on by a significantly taller multi-unit building in the middle of the block would also be inappropriate, and deviates significantly from the stated goals of the ARP. Approving this zoning change will also likely lead to pressure to repeat the rezoning at adjacent locations and other similar parts of the community.

The community and ARP have already provided for densification: the recently-updated ARP, which incorporated comprehensive community engagement, already 'up-zoned' many parcels of land in the community to address the needs for more multi-family units in the neighbourhood. The developer could have simply picked one of those parcels of land, as other developers have done. Those parcels are appropriate for the kind of development that is envisioned, unlike the one under consideration here. It is also worth noting that the area is already significantly more densified than the ARP would indicate due to the extensive presence of non-conforming secondary suites and the traffic/parking issues that entails. Adding further multi-unit developments in areas not appropriate for them will just exacerbate these issues.

Power, fibre optic, and cable line conflicts (Parking issue): There are multiple sets of low-strung overhead utility wires immediately adjacent to the northern edge of the subject property. Due to conflicts with minimum setback requirements, it would not be feasible to construct the nine vehicle elevator garage that the developer has proposed. This returns us back to the question of how all the vehicles of a six-unit complex will be managed, especially in light of the space limitations that the waste management issue noted below raises. This issue was not addressed during the KHA presentation.

Waste management: There is no room to place 18 black, blue, and green carts for six units on a property sized for two units. Commercial bins for waste management are also not feasible at this location as the subject property is in the middle of a residential block backing onto a narrow single car-width dirt laneway. This means that there is no room for larger commercial waste management trucks to maneuver to pick up commercial waste bins. The aforementioned low hanging power/utility lines also means that commercial waste trucks will not be able to operate here. This again highlights why this zoning change is inappropriate for the location. This significant issue was not addressed during the KHA presentation.

Loss of privacy and shadowing: The change in character would be significant to us and our neighbours, with a loss of privacy due to a significantly taller multi-unit building overlooking our backyards and houses; the loss of sunlight due to a significantly taller building immediately south of our properties will have a significant, negative, impact on us (especially in fall, winter, and spring when the sun is lower in the sky). Shadowing was not addressed during the KHA presentation.

Community engagement: In his submission to The City, the architect (KHA) characterizes the residents of the area as ignorant of current societal challenges facing the community and the city as a whole. KHA unnecessarily spent almost half of his original allotted time at the community town hall showing multiple slides of stressed polar bears and forest fires to educate us on the perils of climate change, instead of focusing on the immediate issues at hand – this application. The truth is, the community is very engaged, well educated, and socially aware. This is evidenced, in part, by the fact that community has already supported the rezoning of numerous parts of Capitol Hill for multi-family units, as appropriate. It is the developer that has chosen to circumvent the community and city-approved planning document.

We trust that the City will honour its own ARP process that incorporated significant community engagement and buy-in.

For the all the aforementioned reasons, we request that the proposed land use amendment be rejected. However, if, despite the notes above, council chooses to let the application proceed, we would like to see a requirement for the application to be tied to actual plans to allow the community to better understand the full impact of a proposed development on the surrounding area.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Jacksteit & Tom Anthony

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Lynn Crichton <lcrichton@telusplanet.net>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 11:04 AM
To: Public Submissions
Subject: [EXT] Proposed Land Use Amendment in Capitol Hill (Ward 7) at 1516 - 21 Ave NW, LOC2019-0002.
Attachments: Land Amendment.pdf

The attached letter is provided to the City Clerk for submission to Council for the Public Hearing on Planning Matters of July 22, with reference to a proposed Land Use Amendment in Capitol Hill (Ward 7) at 1516 - 21 Ave NW, LOC2019-0002. Would you please advise if these go directly to City Council or if the developer is given a copy? Thanks

Members of the City Council

Re: Land Amendment: 1516 21 Avenue NW LOC2019-0002

I oppose the proposed Land Amendment changing the above property to M-CG. M-CG does not fit in a mid block location with a duplex infill on one side and a bungalow on the other. Although the corner lot is designated commercial it is a single storey building which has been extensively renovated in the last six months.

The proposed change would set a poor precedent for future development in the community. This concern was also expressed by the Capital Hill Community Association.

Currently the property is R-C2. The changes proposed in the pending ARP, last updated June 19, 2019, amends this property to R-CG. Various departments of the City including the Planning Department, Capital Hill Community Association and community members were involved in the process. I trust City Council will respect the time, energy and tax dollars used to make this decision.

The Planning & Development Report advises water and sanitary mains are available and can accommodate the potential redevelopment. We and our neighbours have had numerous floods. The Department is obviously unaware of the floods which have occurred due to the city mains being blocked by city tree roots. The grey water floods which we have experienced due to aging city infrastructure are not acceptable.

Parking needs to be addressed. Street parking is required by the Campus Pre-School located at the Capital Hill Community Centre where children are dropped off/picked up four times daily, a very active Capital Hill Community Centre, St Cyprian's Boy Scout Hall, Dinosaur playground, community garden , fruit orchard, baseball diamonds and current residents.

KHA's respect for the community is negligible. In KHA'S Application Summary Mr. Hamilton indicated there had been no response to his initial delivery to four addresses. He was contacted by and responded to e-mails from us. At the community meeting in April, which had been requested by the Capital Hill Community Association, he had no recollection of e-mails or his responses. The Planning Department allowed Mr Hamilton's recollection of the April meeting to be included in his application even though the meeting was held long after the submission date closed. Residents in attendance at the meeting were not given the same opportunity. Our recollections do not match. Based on our email exchanges, I question Mr. Hamilton's memory of the April meeting.

We understand the cities desire for increased housing density and understand the change to R-CG but not to M-CG

Yours truly
Lynn Crichton
1520 21 Avenue NW