

Community Association Response

CPC2023-0553
Attachment 4



Geneva Chaudhary
Planner | Community Planning North
Planning & Development Services
The City of Calgary
geneva.chaudhary@calgary.ca



May 11, 2023

Re: CHCA Comments on LOC2023-0046 & LOC2023-0048

Capitol Hill Community Association (CHCA) would like to thank you for your outreach and is pleased to provide comment on this land use amendment application. We have reviewed these two Land Use resignation applications that propose a change from R-CG to H-GO and offer the following comments.

Let's begin with some reflection to how Capitol Hill has, in general, been supportive of the what was at the time an experimental RC-G Land Use dating back to its initial drafts. The community was even supportive of the idea to blanket redesignate various properties to from R-C2 to R-CG including the 20th Avenue corridor. If you wish to learn more about this history, please feel free to review this YouTube video <https://youtu.be/Vg4PzDxWHxo> prepared by one of our community members.

To date, the original intended R-CG form has not been respected for the mid block sites. Rather we have seen Direct Control (DC) applications being made to develop the current 2 building front-back scenarios with 4 units per building much like your proposal. Accepting these DC's and now the recently revised R-CG land use zone to accommodate this form has already been an uncomfortable transition for many community members. These proposed Land Uses change applications are pushing beyond what was agreed too and disrespecting the very recently updated to Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) outcome that community worked on with the Planning department.

We like the form of 3 row houses facing 20th Avenue in the LOC2023-0046 application and ignoring the addition of the rear building, point out that this was the exact form that was intended in the original R-CG Land. We were told this form was unfeasible from a lot width perspective by certain developers and Planners thereby bringing us to the current R-CG we have at hand. We had felt the revisions to the original RC-G were pre-mature and voiced our concern that the change should not be based on limited developer (we believe one developer) input and seems this may have held true after all.

Possibly the applicant was not aware of this history and the efforts put in by community members to bring transparent development assurance to our neighborhood. As such. we request that these applications be refused and that the applicant be required to adhere to the newly adopted R-CG form and the recently



Reasons for objection:

1. The proposals don't adhere to the ARP that recently just changed these sites from R-C2 to R-CG.
2. HG-O's should be within 200m of a Main Street or Activity Center. These sites are not within 200m of a Main Street per the Main Streets implementation plan or Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) per the MDP Vol 2 Implementation Guide Book.
3. HG-O's should be within 600m of an LRT Station per the Main Streets implementation plan. These sites are beyond 600m walking distance to an LRT.
4. HG-O's should be within 400m of a BRT stop per the Main Streets implementation plan. These sites are beyond 400m walking distance to a BRT stop.
5. The 12m permitted height for the rear building creates very undesirable shadowing within the courtyard area of the development. For this reason we believe the H-GO developments are better suited for a sites, or a combination thereof, fronting a north/south roadway rather than a east/west roadway.
6. The 12m permitted height for the rear building creates very undesirable overlooking into adjacent properties.
7. The 12m permitted height for the rear building creates very undesirable shadowing into adjacent properties when located on the north side of a roadway as is the case for one of these applications. For this reason we believe the H-GO developments are better suited for a site fronting a north/south roadway.



8. Respecting the permitted RC-G rear building 8.6m height would actually create more diverse affordable housing options in our community as it would limiting the size of the units and therefore presumably the rental or purchase costs.
9. We currently have a similar type proposal being built at 1615 20th Avenue NW (pictured below) that has a rear building height of 11.25m. We can now see in real built form how imposing this is.



We encourage our Councillor and the Planners to visit the 1615 20th Avenue NW site and then compare it to a project of similar form but that has the rear building respecting the maximum 8.6m height per the R-CG (suggest 1309 20th Avenue NW).

In summary we oppose the H-GO Land Use resignation and request that the applicant respect our recently updated ARP & LAP thereby developing within the constraints of the current R-CG.

Sincerely,



Cam Collingwood
Director, Planning & Development
Capitol Hill Community Association