

# Community Association Response

**Received: 2023 April 12**

Application: LOC2023-0083

Submitted by: Jonathan Slaney (Windsor Park Community Association Director)

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, Shadowing impacts, Offsite impacts

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:

Dear City Planner, Re: LOC2023-0083

The Windsor Park Community Association is opposed to the land use change designating this lot R-CG. This position is consistent with our community's objection to all R-CG applications that are within the core of the community (not on a major thoroughfare). We are in support of such developments on the periphery of the community. Based on data from the ongoing LAP for the Chinook zone, Windsor Park is the only community that has increased its density over the past 50 years. Windsor Park has nearly doubled its density while every other community has reduced their density's by up to 40%. We feel that this a clear case of unfair planning practices and this land use change is another example of this. Our concerns include:

1. Further densification of Windsor Park is not in line with The City's own stated Green Space and Urban Tree Canopy Goals. We are already underserved in regards to green space and a land use change here would impact numerous mature trees which are important to the community.

2. This redevelopment does NOT represent modest sensitive densification. 4 rows houses with potential basement suites will allow for 8 units on the property where now there is one.

3. The community has concerns with services infrastructure around these row house developments. Most of the community was originally designed for single family homes on 50' lots. We would like to see confirmation from City of Calgary engineering that storm drainage, sewer, and other services have capacity to safely accommodate such a density increase. It has not been shown that the increased density is not putting existing homes at risk.

4. We also have concerns with Internet infrastructure. Currently much of the community is still receiving internet via copper telephone lines and further densification will slow internet speeds. This may seem trivial but many people require high speeds to work and this could impact their ability to provide for their families.

5. Windsor Park is in little need of more housing choices as we already have a broad range of housing types for rental and ownership including condominiums, apartments, town houses, duplexes, fourplexes, infills, two story homes and bungalows.

6. The single garages typically seen accompanying the row houses built in Windsor Park are very impractical. They are already too small for most cars and access to them is largely blocked by blue and black bins as there is no location for residents to store the bins. Alternatively, the bins are stored at the side of the garage facing the street which makes for a less than appealing streetscape.

7. The existing RC-G units that have been built have been a significant nuisance from a noise, garbage and animal point of view. One adjacent neighbor has already sold their house due to the disruption in enjoyment of their property. The aggressive and unequal policies regarding densification in R-2 communities such as Windsor Park are favourable to developers but not to single family home owners.

The Windsor Park Community Association will be leveraging its members and the numerous community members opposed to this type of development to speak at the council review of the application which I am sure we can agree is not an efficient use of time. As such, we implore you to deny this land use designation change requiring the developer to revert to a duplex development creating a win-win scenario rather than a win-lose.