



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2023-10)

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act* of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making and scheduling speakers for Council or Council Committee meetings. **Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes.** If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes. Your e-mail address will not be included in the public record.

ENDORSEMENT STATEMENT ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION, ANTI-RACISM, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND BELONGING

The purpose of The City of Calgary is to make life better every day. To fully realize our purpose, we are committed to addressing racism and other forms of discrimination within our programs, policies, and services and eliminating barriers that impact the lives of Indigenous, Racialized, and other marginalized people. It is expected that participants will behave respectfully and treat everyone with dignity and respect to allow for conversations free from bias and prejudice.

First name [required] Anthony

Last name [required] Imbrogno

How do you wish to attend? In-person

You may bring a support person should you require language or translator services. Do you plan on bringing a support person?

What meeting do you wish to comment on? [required] Council

Date of meeting [required] Apr 9, 2024

What agenda item do you wish to comment on? (Refer to the Council or Committee agenda published [here](#).)

[required] - max 75 characters CNIB Land Use Redesignation

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required] Neither



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2023-10)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME
(hidden)

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME
(hidden)

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

Comments are forthcoming and will be emailed. Thank you.

From: [Planning Director](#)
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Subject: [External] Comments for City Council 9 April meeting, CNIB agenda item
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 8:02:35 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

Hello,

BRCA Planning Committee has registered to speak at City Council on April 9th on the CNIB item and we would like to submit the below comments for the meeting.

LOC2023-0408 | 10 11A ST NE | CNIB Land Use Amendment

BRCA Planning Committee wishes to raise the need for further consideration of the CNIB development proposal given the feedback we have received from community members as well as the the fact significant development is occurring in the immediate area, what with the upcoming Silvera development (LOC2024-0074) and ongoing work at the Continuing Care Centre.

We note that BRCA conducted significant engagement with the community in previous years under the East Riverside Master Plan and there was general support for density in this location. However, the proposed density raises significant concerns when viewed in tandem with the other development sites. As well, considering the City decided not to move forward with an updated Bridgeland-Riverside's ARP after significant community engagement, there is still work to be completed to integrate Bridgeland-Riverside into the North Hill LAP and provide the community with support as it considers development applications of the size of CNIB and Silvera.

At this time in the development process, City Council can reject the CNIB's land use amendment in order to provide the community the opportunity to work with the city, development proponents, and community stakeholders to address the following concerns:

- Density, Infrastructure and Safety

- **Recommendation:** Given multiple development proposals for this area, including Silvera / Bucci East Riverside development's Land Use Amendment and its anticipated DP for two 15-storey buildings (and relaxation request to increase height to 52m), the CNIB's proposal for 3 towers with one up to 27 storeys is excessive for this location. Further consultations are required to understand and address the impacts of multiple developments in this area. City Council can reject the land use

amendment to open time and space for further engagement to address the concerns. An open house will be hosted by Silvera developers on April 16th where the community will be discussing concerns about the amount of development proposed for the immediate area. However, broader engagement to discuss the full East Riverside Master Plan and associated infrastructure is needed at this time to ensure we are planning appropriately for the future.

- **Access/Infrastructure:** Concerns have been raised about access into this part of the neighbourhood. Vehicle and emergency access is extremely limited, available only from McDougall Road, with the bulk of traffic coming onto 11a St NE. The existing access point into this part of the neighborhood is also an area of significant concern. 12 St NE and St George's Drive is currently experiencing significantly increased congestion given changes to the light signals at the south end of the 12 St NE overpass. Tailbacks are often observed stretching back past McDougall Rd. The existing infrastructure is not adequate to support anticipated traffic from residents and visitors to the 3 development sites (CNIB, Silvera, Continuing Care Centre). And there are concerns about construction traffic along key access roads where congestion and safety are growing concerns, such as along 9 St NE. The community would also like to understand the broader plan for road infrastructure and additional modes of transportation like sidewalk expansion, bike lanes, pathways and transit.

- **Safety:** Increased density with limited infrastructure has also raised several safety concerns. Emergency access is an area of concern, given the limited access points into this neighborhood. As well, a significant increase in the level of density and traffic from the proposal raises risks to pedestrian and active transportation users. There is a high density of seniors residences in this area, and there are concerns about walkability, and pedestrian and alternate transport safety from interfaces with anticipated traffic and parking.

- **Density concerns such as schools and amenities:** The addition of potentially thousands of units to this area without accompanying services and infrastructure such as schools, roads, emergency services, green spaces, recreation and amenities causes significant concerns for the community. Riverside School is already at capacity and many residents are not able to enroll in its science alternate program. Stanley Jones school in Renfrew is nearing capacity, and is also surrounded by growing communities. The BRCA Community Hall has not been fully developed to accommodate the proposed density, with many community members also expressing a desire for more supports, including park maintenance and access to recreation facilities (such as a pool and additional community gathering spaces). Additional density without additional services and amenities is not an outcome the community supports.

○ **Parking:** Parking throughout Bridgeland-Riverside is already a significant challenge, and thus far all ‘no parking’ developments have instead driven a significant number of vehicles onto the streets. The proposed development raises concerns about resident, visitor and commercial parking, which we anticipate will not be sufficient for this level of density. While close to transit and pathways, even buildings with ‘no parking’ do not have ‘no cars’. Bridgeland is unique from other inner-city communities like Inglewood and Kensington in that there are no private parking solutions like surface lots or parkades, and thus the impact of density is felt much more significantly than in other communities that have these options.

• **Height, Context and Shadowing:**

○ The CNIB’s proposal for a 27 storey tower is far too excessive for this location. There are no buildings close to this height in Bridgeland-Riverside. It is recommended that proposed buildings remain consistent. A rejection of the LOC at this time will allow further engagement on the right scale for the community, particularly given that there are no other buildings like this on the north bank of the Bow River nor in any of the adjacent communities with similar characteristics (Inglewood, Ramsay, Kensington).

○ Concerns have been raised regarding impacts on Tom Campbell’s Hill Nature Park. A unique 270 degree landscape view of the river valley, downtown and mountains will be cut in 2 from the vantage point of the Hill’s lookout. Further consultation is necessary with area residents and with City Parks. The issue of insufficient park maintenance applies to Tom Campbell’s, as does the issue of safely accessing the park across 12 St NE.

○ The proposed development will negatively impact the adjacent buildings to the north by shadowing those existing developments. As well, the existing fragrant gardens will be impacted. City Council can reject the amendment now and allow time for shadowing studies in addition to studying the proposed impact on Tom Campbell’s Hill.



Anthony Imbrogno
Planning Director

w: www.brcacalgary.org e: planning@brcacalgary.org