

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 2001 56 AV SW - LOC2023-0328 - DMAP Comment - Sun 2/18/2024 4:22:42 PM
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 4:22:46 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

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

Application: LOC2023-0328

Submitted by: Aman Singh

Contact Information

Address: 83 Lissington Drive SW

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

Overall, I am/we are:

In opposition of this application

Areas of interest/concern:

Land Uses

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:

Subdivision of lots in this RC1 zone should not be allowed. It alters the feel and make up of the neighbourhood and comprises the community feel. We do. Or support

this application what so ever.

Attachments:



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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

First name [required] Robert

Last name [required] Clapperton

How do you wish to attend?

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] Standing Policy Committee on Community Development

Date of meeting [required] Mar 5, 2024

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



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2023-10)

[required] - max 75 characters

LOC 2023-0328

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required]

In opposition

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

Office of the City Clerk
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
PO Box 2100, Postal Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Re: LOC 2023-01990328 Bylaw 78D2024

We would like to express our strong opposition and concern for the amendment to the proposed Land Use Designation (zoning) for this property listed above. We have lived across the street at 2016 56th Ave SW diagonally adjacent to this proposed development for twenty seven years and purchased the property as it was designated R1 and all surrounding units were designated the same way. This is a dangerous and community altering precedent.

Our primary concerns for the proposed Land Use Designation (zoning) is that the City of Calgary is not engaging in good faith with all stakeholders or the community of North Glenmore park. Further the City does not meet its own redesignation requirements for densification in this location.

1. Stakeholder Engagement has not been completed for the increased traffic and parking with the City of Calgary development plan of the new track and field, Arena, Swimming pool and Tennis Court development directly adjacent to this property, above. It is also our understanding that the Arena and the Pool are scheduled for demolition and construction for new larger Community buildings. The first portion of that redevelopment (track and field) has been completed but not put into use yet. The impact of that increased traffic, pollution and parking have not been assessed. The Arena and pool development are coming afterwards and will cause further stress on the Community. The City of Calgary has not conducted any Stakeholder engagement or townhall open house to address those implications and **any** further development without addressing those implications is a failure of best practices and good faith. This includes changing the Land Use designation on the property above and its stress on the entire community. We as property owners and stakeholders within our community are not receiving representation or consultation for any of these projects or the land use Designation proposal. Our concerns have not been put forward.

2. This property sits at the junction of the Track and Field Parking, Tennis Parking, Tennis Dome parking, Green space parking and this corner is an access for the **Elbow Park pathway**. As well, it is at the main entrance to the City of Calgary Water Plant. Any more densification at this key location will mean increased parking issues at this junction point which is dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as well as access to the Water plant. Currently, during the start and release of the schools (4), the three exits and entrances of this community are currently backed up for several blocks and it would be difficult for emergency vehicles and buses to exit or enter. **Currently the City of Calgary has not conducted any type of traffic review or monitoring to see the current flow and volume of traffic here. It also should be assessed by emergency services. At this specific location of the proposed land use designation there has been several near misses of pedestrians and cyclists by vehicles that have failed to stop at this corner.**

We are also surprised that the City of Calgary Water works is not objecting (as a major Stakeholder) to the increased densification at this location as this is key access point for critical infrastructure. Have they been consulted and reviewed this Land use change? They may also have further long-term concerns for this Critical Access point.

3. This property is not located close to rapid transport, grocery shopping, banking, a gas station, or often used amenities that are needed to support the City's agenda for densification. Currently there are properties further West and North towards Crowchild trail that meet these needs. In addition, properties closer to Crowchild Trail are already designated R2 and the land value is less expensive which would encourage more affordable housing. The price point for anyone purchasing these proposed units on this property list above, would be substantially higher than other areas closer to Crowchild Trail. Properties already rezoned closer to mass transit and Crowchild Trail amenities are more affordable housing for new Calgarians, landed immigrants, and new families.

4. For us as homeowners and our direct community, this proposal would have a profound negative affect. We purchased this property in good faith as R1 at a higher rate and have continually paid higher taxes for that privilege. We feel our **Ward 11** representative **Kourtney Penner** has not put our community concerns forward or held any open houses or Town Halls like other City Councillors about the development within the ward. Her office has stated publicly that she is not interested in hosting Townhall meetings or hearing the concern of her constituents. She is supposed to represent us. We feel ignored and that we are not being represented properly. For land use Redesignation (zoning) of this magnitude, we believe the City of Calgary **failed in its own best practice of public consultation and consultation in good faith for putting forward this amendment to land use (zoning)**. This proposal will have long term implications for everyone in this community. There has been no attempt made by the **City of Calgary, Kourtney Penner**, to share their sustainable plans for this area.

In conclusion, the Lands Use Designation for this property does not currently meet the **City of Calgary's** own standards for densification: adjacent to rapid transit, access to amenities within walking distance, or affordability. The increased development here would also strain the current infrastructure. This development should be a single-family home keeping with the character and heritage of the neighborhood. We ask all involved parties to reject this application and protect the longstanding integrity, sustainability, and safety of our neighborhood.

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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

First name [required] Craig

Last name [required] Soppit

How do you wish to attend?

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] Mar 5, 2024

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



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2023-10)

[required] - max 75 characters

LOC2023-0328 LAND USE REDESIGNATION BYLAW 78D2024

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required]

In opposition

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

2011 56 Ave SW,
Calgary,
AB T3E 1M7
February 25, 2024

Re: Application for Land Use Amendment LOC2023-0328

To Members of Council,

I am writing to note my grave concern to this application for land use re-designation from RC-1 to R-CG for the following reasons:

- Impact on neighbouring property and local infrastructure: The proposal to build a 25 foot single house and a 50 foot corner 4-unit row house with basement suites on a lot which currently contains a single dwelling will result in a considerable increase to the number of individuals, noise, and traffic in this area which would have a adverse effect on the quality of life of current property owners and residents. In addition to this, given that the allowable building height can be increased with R-CG this would negatively impact neighbouring properties privacy, outdoor space, and resale value.

The current application also makes note of access to the property via the rear lane. However, this rear lane is very narrow and all residents would struggle to accommodate this increase in traffic which would impair access to neighbouring properties. It is also worth mentioning that parking on 19th street in front of this lot is currently restricted at specific times of day. Therefore the proposed allocated parking is not adequate for the number of future residents. This would result in these residents parking in surrounding streets which again would negatively impact access to neighbouring property, and increase the likely hood of an accident.

- Adverse impact on surroundings: This land use amendment and associated application, which is for a single house and corner lot with 4-unit row houses with basement suites, will result in a significant increase in density to the North Glenmore Park community. Given that surrounding property is predominantly zoned R-C1 with single detached dwellings, this increased density and subsequent increase in traffic poses a substantial safety risk given that this corner lot is situated directly across from the access road to the Glenmore Water Treatment Plant, Aforza Tennis Academy and Elbow River Pathway. This intersection is regularly used by pedestrians of all ages and vehicles of all sizes throughout the day and the safety of these users would be put at risk by this development and the associated increase in traffic. Additionally, access in and out of this section of North Glenmore Park is already problematic with the current volume of residents and users of surrounding amenities including the Glenmore Aquatic Centre, Glenmore Athletic Park, and Lakeview Golf Course and this development would further exacerbate this issue.
- Not in keeping with the broader community and overall City goals: I recognise that this site is located within the Inner-City area of Calgary's Municipal Development Plan which encourages

redevelopment of inner-city communities. However, this application is not in keeping with the plan to build properties that are similar in scale and sensitive to existing development.

I understand that Calgary communities are changing and growing. However, I do not feel that this land use amendment application and development proposal meets the needs of both current and future residents of North Glenmore Park and would implore the Calgary Planning Commission to reject it and urge the applicant to consider reducing the scale of the proposed development.

Sincerely,

Craig Soppit



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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

First name [required] Mhairi

Last name [required] Mitchell

How do you wish to attend?

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] Mar 5, 2024

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



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2023-10)

[required] - max 75 characters

LOC2023-0328 LAND USE REDESIGNATION BYLAW 78D2024

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required]

In opposition

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

Office of the City Clerk,
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE P.O. Box 2100,
Postal Station 'M' Calgary,
Alberta T2P 2M5

25 February 2024

R.E. Application for Land Use Amendment LOC2023-0328

Dear Members of Council,

I am writing to note my objection to this application for land use redesignation from RC-1 to R-C1 N and R-CG on the following grounds:

- Adverse impact on surroundings: This land use amendment application, which currently proposes a single house and corner lot with 4-unit row houses with basement suites, will result in a significant increase in density to the North Glenmore Park community given that surrounding property is predominantly zoned R-C1 with single detached dwellings. This increased density and subsequent increase in traffic poses a substantial safety risk given that this corner lot is situated directly across from the access road to the Glenmore Water Treatment Plant, Aforza Tennis Academy and Elbow River Pathway. This intersection is regularly used by pedestrians of all ages and vehicles of all sizes throughout the day and the safety of these users would be put at risk by the scale of this development and the associated increase in traffic. Additionally, access in and out of this section of North Glenmore Park is already problematic with the current volume of residents and users of surrounding amenities including the Glenmore Aquatic Centre, Glenmore Athletic Park, and Lakeview Golf Course and this planned development would further exacerbate this issue.
- Negative impact on neighbouring property and local infrastructure: A R-C1 N and R-CG development with the current proposal to build a 25 feet single house and a 50 feet corner 4-unit row house with basement suites on a lot which presently contains a single dwelling will result in a considerable increase to the number of people, noise and traffic in this area which would have a negative effect on the quality of life of current property owners and residents. Additionally, given that the allowable building height can be increased with R-CG this would adversely impact neighbouring properties privacy and outdoor space. The application makes note of access to the property via the rear lane however this rear lane is narrow and would struggle to accommodate the increased volume of traffic associated with this development and impair access to neighbouring property. Currently parking on 19th street in front of this lot is restricted at specific times of day and given the substantial increase in density associated with R-CG developments especially with basement suites the allocated parking will not be adequate for the number of future residents which may result in them parking in surrounding streets which again would negatively impact access to

neighbouring property. The utility infrastructure in North Glenmore Park is dated and already struggling to meet the demands placed by current residents. The drastic increase in density which would result from this rezoning would intensify this further.

- Not in keeping with the broader community and overall City goals: I acknowledge that this site is located within the Inner-City area of Calgary's Municipal Development Plan which encourages redevelopment and modest densification of properties in these communities. However, this application for a land use amendment from R-C1 to R-C1 N and R-CG is not in keeping with the plan to build properties that are similar in scale and sensitive to existing development which is primarily R-C1.

I understand that Calgary communities are changing and growing however I do not feel that this land use amendment application and associated proposal meets the needs of both current and future residents of North Glenmore Park and would encourage the Calgary Planning Commission to reject it and urge the applicant to consider reducing the scale of the proposed development.

Sincerely,
Mhairi Mitchell

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 2001 56 AV SW - LOC2023-0328 - DMAP Comment - Sat 2/24/2024 12:14:17 PM
Date: Saturday, February 24, 2024 12:14:37 PM
Attachments: [LOC20230328.pdf](#)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

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

Application: LOC2023-0328

Submitted by: Kim Clapperton

Contact Information

Address: 2016 56th Ave SW

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

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, Included amenities, Community character, Traffic impacts, Shadowing impacts, Offsite impacts, Other

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:

Attachments:
LOC20230328.pdf

Office of the City Clerk
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
PO Box 2100, Postal Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Re: LOC 2023-01990328 Bylaw 78D2024

We would like to express our strong opposition and concern for the amendment to the proposed Land Use Designation (zoning) for this property listed above. We have lived across the street at 2016 56th Ave SW diagonally adjacent to this proposed development for twenty seven years and purchased the property as it was designated R1 and all surrounding units were designated the same way. This is a dangerous and community altering precedent.

Our primary concerns for the proposed Land Use Designation (zoning) is that the City of Calgary is not engaging in good faith with all stakeholders or the community of North Glenmore park. Further the City does not meet its own redesignation requirements for densification in this location.

1. Stakeholder Engagement has not been completed for the increased traffic and parking with the City of Calgary development plan of the new track and field, Arena, Swimming pool and Tennis Court development directly adjacent to this property, above. It is also our understanding that the Arena and the Pool are scheduled for demolition and construction for new larger Community buildings. The first portion of that redevelopment (track and field) has been completed but not put into use yet. The impact of that increased traffic, pollution and parking have not been assessed. The Arena and pool development are coming afterwards and will cause further stress on the Community. The City of Calgary has not conducted any Stakeholder engagement or townhall open house to address those implications and **any** further development without addressing those implications is a failure of best practices and good faith. This includes changing the Land Use designation on the property above and its stress on the entire community. We as property owners and stakeholders within our community are not receiving representation or consultation for any of these projects or the land use Designation proposal. Our concerns have not been put forward.

2. This property sits at the junction of the Track and Field Parking, Tennis Parking, Tennis Dome parking, Green space parking and this corner is an access for the **Elbow Park pathway**. As well, it is at the main entrance to the City of Calgary Water Plant. Any more densification at this key location will mean increased parking issues at this junction point which is dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as well as access to the Water plant. Currently, during the start and release of the schools (4), the three exits and entrances of this community are currently backed up for several blocks and it would be difficult for emergency vehicles and buses to exit or enter. **Currently the City of Calgary has not conducted any type of traffic review or monitoring to see the current flow and volume of traffic here. It also should be assessed by emergency services. At this specific location of the proposed land use designation there has been several near misses of pedestrians and cyclists by vehicles that have failed to stop at this corner.**

We are also surprised that the City of Calgary Water works is not objecting (as a major Stakeholder) to the increased densification at this location as this is key access point for critical infrastructure. Have they been consulted and reviewed this Land use change? They may also have further long-term concerns for this Critical Access point.

3. This property is not located close to rapid transport, grocery shopping, banking, a gas station, or often used amenities that are needed to support the City's agenda for densification. Currently there are properties further West and North towards Crowchild trail that meet these needs. In addition, properties closer to Crowchild Trail are already designated R2 and the land value is less expensive which would encourage more affordable housing. The price point for anyone purchasing these proposed units on this property list above, would be substantially higher than other areas closer to Crowchild Trail. Properties already rezoned closer to mass transit and Crowchild Trail amenities are more affordable housing for new Calgarians, landed immigrants, and new families.

4. For us as homeowners and our direct community, this proposal would have a profound negative affect. We purchased this property in good faith as R1 at a higher rate and have continually paid higher taxes for that privilege. We feel our **Ward 11** representative **Kourtney Penner** has not put our community concerns forward or held any open houses or Town Halls like other City Councillors about the development within the ward. Her office has stated publicly that she is not interested in hosting Townhall meetings or hearing the concern of her constituents. She is supposed to represent us. We feel ignored and that we are not being represented properly. For land use Redesignation (zoning) of this magnitude, we believe the City of Calgary **failed in its own best practice of public consultation and consultation in good faith for putting forward this amendment to land use (zoning)**. This proposal will have long term implications for everyone in this community. There has been no attempt made by the **City of Calgary, Kourtney Penner**, to share their sustainable plans for this area.

In conclusion, the Lands Use Designation for this property does not currently meet the **City of Calgary's** own standards for densification: adjacent to rapid transit, access to amenities within walking distance, or affordability. The increased development here would also strain the current infrastructure. This development should be a single-family home keeping with the character and heritage of the neighborhood. We ask all involved parties to reject this application and protect the longstanding integrity, sustainability, and safety of our neighborhood.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 2001 56 AV SW - LOC2023-0328 - DMAP Comment - Sat 2/24/2024 8:11:38 PM
Date: Saturday, February 24, 2024 8:14:43 PM
Attachments: [DEMOCRACY.docx](#)
[Land Use Amendment .docx](#)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

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

Application: LOC2023-0328

Submitted by: Jean Hunt

Contact Information

Address: 2015-56 Ave SW Calgary Alberta T3E 1M7

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

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, Community character, Traffic impacts, Shadowing 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:

As per my attached letters

Attachments:

DEMOCRACY.docx

Land Use Amendment .docx

Regarding the following Land Use Amendments:

File Number: SB2023-0374

File Manager: J.K. CHOI J.K.Choi@calgary.ca 403-710-7852

Address: Legal: 4010AK;26;20-222001 56 AV SW

Community: NORTH GLENMORE PARK Ward: 11

Application Description: Subdivision by Instrument - NORTH GLENMORE PARK 0 - Section 32S

Existing Use: Single Detached Dwelling Proposed Use: Single Detached Dwelling(s)

File Number: LOC2023-0328

File Manager: SARAH WHALEN Sarah.Whalen@calgary.ca (825) 945-8427

Address: 2001 56 AV SW Legal Description: 4010AK;26;20-22

Community: NORTH GLENMORE PARK Ward: 11

Application Description: Land Use Amendment to accommodate R-CG

Existing

Land Use District:

Proposed

Land Use District:R-C1 R-CG

I am vehemently AGAINST the approval for these lots to be changed and believe that they should be left as RC1

My reasons are many but I will high-lite the main ones here.

1) A COUNCIL THAT SELDOM LISTENS

It is becoming increasingly disheartening that our elected officials court our votes and while doing so promise to listen to our views and be guided by what the people who elected them, and pay them, want. Once in office it rapidly becomes clear that their agenda is driven by something other than the community that they said they would "serve". Council has become a "do as I say, but not as I do" group. Democracy? I am not sure anymore.

We were just advised that a "significant compromise was made regarding properties on 20th street and 54th avenue" – I don't think it is called a compromise when the residents are actually listened to when considering the future development of their community.

And the compromise was only for the lot on 54th, not the one on 20th street.

Half of a compromise??

2) LOSS OF THE "FAMILY FABRIC" OF OUR COMMUNITY

I have been a resident on 56th Avenue for almost 50 years. I have raised my daughter here and have been a part of a vibrant family community. One where we know our neighbours, take pride in our properties and one where our children from a young age can play in the streets without fear. Adding more housing with inadequate parking, most of it UNAFFORDABLE for most to purchase, is not an answer. As so many multi-family units are built and come with huge purchase prices they fast become rental properties so developers can get their money and move on. This will ruin this area for young families who have already made the investment to live here. There are many other communities that are designated R-1 and are left that way, why not this area? We

are only talking a small area – from 54th Avenue to the causeway as everything north of that has already been rezoned.

3) STREET SAFETY

We have shared our community with golfers, cyclists, tennis players, swimmers, walkers, runners, church communities, pets, children, soccer groups, rafters and more. We have taken in our stride, and without complaint, the many times that the streets are full of vehicles looking for parking spots. On a weekly basis we deal with the fact that the small area from 50th avenue to the causeway has limited access in and out of the community and when the schools go in and let out that you are sometimes in a four block or more line up. The streets CANNOT handle more without jeopardizing the SAFETY of our community. Recently it took me 20 minutes to get from my home on 56th avenue to Marda Loop!

This corner sees a ton of traffic from the tennis courts, tennis bubble and restaurant, the gold course and what will be the newly developed track and playing fields. I also believe that this corner is part of an emergency roadway for the water treatment plant?

Marda Loop is a great example of not listening and over densifying too rapidly for what an area can handle. Businesses are losing their clientele and now closing– I have supported Marda Loop since I moved here and I now avoid going there as much as I possibly can. Traffic has become exceedingly congested and dangerous for both pedestrians and vehicles, I already know of several people who have been involved in accidents there. The planned changes will only make things worse, especially as more density is added. No one in power chose to care or listen to what the residents had to say. Now not only the residents but the businesses trying to make a living are paying the price.

4) THE ENVIRONMENT

CITY COUNCIL: we care about the environment and climate change. Please explain how demolishing perfectly good housing and replacing it with new multi-unit structures is good for the environment?

I have lived and raised my family in a house that would have been considered a tear down for almost fifty years. It still stands and is perfectly good for all of my needs. Has anyone considered the effect that a three-story structure would have on neighbouring homes, yards and gardens? When commercial properties are being considered community concerns regarding shade must be addressed. Does it work the same for residential? Or does the city not care that home owners here have well maintained yards and gardens that will not thrive or can be enjoyed in the shade of larger structures?

5) SENIORS

Our city council talks at length about the plight of our seniors and what needs to be done. Not enough appropriate housing, not enough staff to take care of the numbers etc etc.

What about considering “aging in place options”? if you want to do something positive look at using properties in this community to build tiny aging in place housing for seniors. This could be a shining example for every other community in this city and elsewhere. We have many seniors and also retired people who do not want to leave this

community. This is where they have lived, it has the amenities they need and are used to and it is where friends and neighbours are. Friends and neighbours who look out for them and check to make sure they are ok. Why are plots of land like this not being looked at to be developed into small or tiny one level housing for seniors? I know of many, myself included, that would jump at the opportunity to move into something close by and free up my home for a new family to move in. This would mean that city council would need to take a stance and make developers and investors consider and choose options that would make this city a better place for all to live, not just some.

There are many other considerations and I implore city council to reject these applications.

I am not against change or progress but there are many more appropriate options that should be considered. If council passes this amendment then it really is just a rubber stamp to move forward on construction. We have seen this before where we are told that concerns can be addressed later, well that never happens. If the designation change is approved I not only fear but know that more investors and developers will buy up more homes to make some fast money in this desired community. This request is not about what THIS community needs but what someone wants to do to make money. I fear that our councillors are complicit.

I would be very happy if I actually got a “personal” answer to this but I am not hopeful. Form letters and rote replies are so much more in vogue now!

Jean Hunt
2015-56 Ave SW
Calgary, Alberta
T3E 1M7

DEMOCRACY:

The word democracy comes from the Greek words "demos", meaning people, and "kratos" meaning power; so democracy can be thought of as "**power of the people**": a way of governing which depends on the will of the people.

CITY of CALGARY INTERPRETATION OF DEMOCRACY:

Commission approved all matters as per Administration recommendations, without comment. City administration supported the R-CG on the basis that it “represents an appropriate density increase” and new development “may be compatible with the character of the existing neighbourhood”. Finally, they concluded that it “provides a modest density increase while being sensitive to adjacent development and is in alignment with the MDP” (municipal development plan).

The 200+ letters that were filed last January during the R.C., one to R.C. to application are not carried forward to this matter **effectively the city has ignored them**. 50 letters of concern about the current R-CG application were noted in the CPC report. Any of the new letters will not be going forward directly to city council. They are summarized by the planning staff and not included as an attachment to the Planning Commission (or Council) in their report.

And we wonder why mistrust, fear and division are prevalent in society today. Officials who are elected to listen to and serve the people who pay the taxes that pay their wages do not listen. In most cases they do not even give the impression of listening or caring. **It appears that once you are an elected official that you can do as you please and whatever please you.**

These applications to change zoning are just more examples in our neighbourhood that it really does not matter what the people of the community have to say.

There is no interest in looking at the many reasons why the community is not in favor of the changes.

There is no interest in sitting down to discuss options or compromises.

There is no interest in looking at “long term” options to solve the issues that the city is facing - just a knee jerk reaction to appear to be solving the problem.

There is no interest in considering and addressing long term issues that these changes have the potential to produce.

There is certainly an interest and I feel a personal desire to support developers who do not live in the neighbourhood and who are not building “affordable” housing.

There certainly has been no one who has come to the community and really looked at it or they would realize how ridiculous the comment **“that it is compatible with the existing character of the current neighbourhood”** Laughable? Pathetic? Or downright scary” that these are the people making decisions for a city and with a budget in the millions of dollars.

The map that was sent to the adjacent landowners of this application is totally incorrect. 55th, 56th, and 57th avenue are all RC-1 and are not infill as shown on the map sent out by the city.

My attached letter that has already been submitted to someone who either did not read it or did not understand it states many issues that are of real concern. I have read many others from members of this community that raise more real concerns. And many of these concerns will affect most of the communities in the city at some point.

I will summarize what I feel are the major, valid issues if zoning is changed:

- 1) **Traffic** – from a safety and an emergency access point of view. We have only a couple of exit roads out of this small area (50th to Glenmore, 19th street to Crowchild) We have a city water treatment plant; tennis bubble and tennis courts; an under renovation pool, hockey, velodrome, baseball, soccer, track recreational area; a golf course; several churches and schools; walking, cycling and running pathways, dog parks and cycling paths. Doubling the population of this small area alone would create even more traffic chaos and safety issues with and for the children, elderly and athletic minded citizens that use this area.
- 2) A good number of the homes in this area have been renovated or rebuilt with new families moving in and rejuvenating an older community. It is by no means a “budget friendly” community and the city knows this. To say that they are encouraging **affordable multi-family housing** options is not just a joke, it is absolutely disingenuous. If anyone on council can explain to me how a \$750,000 townhouse(in the development on the corner of 50th and 19th) is affordable I would suggest that they are existing in a different dimension and have no concept of the plight of the unhoused in this city.
- 3) **Aging in place** – again the sound bites that make it look like something is being done. Why not look at small homes in the community versus two or three story monster structures that dwarf everything around them, that seniors who have lived in the community all their lives and raised their families can live out their lives where they want to? Build these homes in such

a way that in the future as our glut of elderly is easing that young couples, or students or single people starting out could purchase and move into them until they build equity or require more space. This alleviates the problem of communities needing all the amenities for young families and then when the kids are all grown the need for schools etc dives. Why not challenge developers to come up with options for affordable, for elderly, for young families that actually fit in with the look and fabric of the community? If they don't have to they won't? As noted on a recent news piece on TV "there are lots of juicy profits right now in building"

- 4) Parking** and what a hot button this is? Everything from paid permit only parking in neighbourhoods, to transit safety to transitioning to electric vehicles. Well council perhaps you should canvas your family and friends and see how many of them own .5 of a vehicle/family? The majority of people that I know have a minimum of 1 vehicle and most have two vehicles per couple. I have neighbours that have 5 vehicles, one for each person in the family. Paid parking permits and allowing developers to only have .5 parking space per unit is only causing huge problems – now and in the future. Utopia would be that the majority of the cities population walked, rode their bike or took transit but that is not happening now or even anywhere in the near future and the decisions council is making is not going to make it happen. We will have the issue of not only where the homeowners park let alone anyone using the amenities or visiting the community. And it may sound like a stupid question but how would you charge your electric vehicle if you don't even have a parking spot in front of your home?

I could easily say more but I fear that even what I have written has been a waste of my time and only adds to my frustration that our system is failing dramatically. Events in other parts of the world should make council take pause and think about the real role that an elected official should assume. It is a sacred trust and this council has broken that trust. You do as you please and you do not even have the decency to try and understand the thoughts and concerns of those who have lived and supported this community.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 2001 56 AV SW - LOC2023-0328 - DMAP Comment - Mon 2/26/2024 3:31:19 PM
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:31:25 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

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

Application: LOC2023-0328

Submitted by: Janet P. Rogers

Contact Information

Address: 2304 54 Ave SW

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Overall, I am/we are:

In opposition of this application

Areas of interest/concern:

Land Uses, Height, Density, Amount of Parking, Privacy considerations, Community character, Traffic impacts, Shadowing impacts, Offsite impacts, Other

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:

Zone change, Density concerns, City of Calgary lack of transparency, Strain

current infrastructure, the proposed development will have parking and traffic concerns / impact, Environmental concerns, Drainage issues, Could impede access to Calgary water treatment plant, the proposed land use is adjacent to the elbow river park pathway, 4 nearby schools with St. James and Central Memorial starting at 9AM - ending at 3:30PM. This already creates traffic concerns. North Glenmore Park is a small neighborhood with limited access in and out.

Attachments:



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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

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.

I have read and understand the above statement.

First name [required] David

Last name [required] Flint

How do you wish to attend?

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] Mar 5, 2024

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



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2023-10)

[required] - max 75 characters

Land Use Redesignation North Glenmore LOC2023-0328 2001 56 Ave SW

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required]

In opposition

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

2007 56 Ave. SW
Calgary, Alberta T3E 1M7
Feb. 27, 2024

Katarzyna Martin, City Clerk
Community Planning, Planning and Development
City of Calgary, Mail Code #8108 submitted online at [Calgary.ca/Public Submissions](https://calgary.ca/PublicSubmissions)
P.O. Box 2100, Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

**Re: Land Use Redesignation North Glenmore Application Notice: LOC2023-0328 Bylaw 78D2024
2001 56 Ave SW**

Dear Katarzyna Martin,

As long-term residents of the community of North Glenmore and as owners of the home adjacent to this proposed development and land use, this letter is to inform you that we are opposed to the proposed land use redesignation. We believe the proposed development is an inappropriately high density, in an inappropriate location and that this ad hoc spot zoning is premature relative to the establishment of a more comprehensive plan. **We therefore request that Council reject this proposed land use designation application.**

The following summarizes our concerns:

- **The proposed change in density permitted on this property is a radical 6-12x increase**

We appreciate that there is a need in Calgary for many different types of neighbourhoods. However, we respectfully suggest that this North Glenmore neighbourhood south of 54th Avenue SW has historically been R-C1 zoning and currently has the look and feel of single family detached dwellings located on lots of 50 feet width or more. The current application, allowing for a six-plex plus suites on the R-CG and an “infill” on the R-C1N, is absolutely inconsistent with the current density and neighbourhood character.

To illustrate the nature of the neighbourhood, the following photos (Figures 1 and 2) show the houses across the street and beside 2001 56 Ave. SW



Figure 1: across the street from 2001 56 Ave. SW



Figure 2: Two houses Adjacent to 2001 56 Ave SW

Please let North Glenmore retain the characteristics of single-family dwellings in an increasingly densified area of the city.

- **The location of the property on 19th Street is inappropriate for R-CG development**

The property is not located on a transit corridor. There is restricted parking on one side of 19th Street. The property literally faces significant vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian and pet traffic volumes at the uncontrolled offset junction of 19th Street and 56th Avenue SW and the Elbow bike pathway. 19th Street currently provides the access to the Glenmore Athletics Park's new athletics complex, outdoor tennis courts, the Lakeview Golf Course and the community to the south, including St James School. The traffic on 19th Street is already fast-moving and congested at times. East of 19th Street, 56th Avenue provides access for employees and heavy supply vehicles to the Glenmore Water Treatment plant and for patrons and students at the Aforza Tennis Academy. In 2023, a vehicle westbound on this stretch of 56th Avenue lost control, crossed 19th Street and collided with the wall of a garage on the subject property proposed for R-CG development.

Traffic ingress and egress into our neighbourhood is already limited to exits along 19th and 20th Streets at 50th Avenue and an entrance from and exit onto Crowchild northbound at 54th Avenue. Increased traffic with increased housing density can only add to the current traffic delays for commuters and for students at the Central Memorial/Lord Shaunessey high school complex located at 50th Avenue and 21st Street SW.

- **Approval of ad hoc spot zoning is premature relative to the establishment of a more comprehensive plan**

Any change in land use designation from the zoning in effect for the last 60+ years should be implemented within the context of a longer-term and well-thought-out plan developed with honest consultation with the community. In the long run, reacting on an ad hoc basis to requests for spot subdivision and changes in zoning does not benefit the residents of our community or the City. Our community relies at present on old infrastructure for utilities, roads, etc. The Planning and Area Redevelopment Committee (PARC) of the North Glenmore Park Community Association (NGPCA) has been supportive and flexible to low density / multi-dwelling (R-CG) applications in the past. However, due to site-specific density and location issues for these applications, PARC submitted in its letter of November 27th to Planning that said:

“Given the continuing discussions with City Hall about neighbourhood traffic management; and given the ongoing City-wide consideration of a blanket low-density district, the NGCPA is unable to support this application at this time. Given the ongoing West Elbow LAP, material changes to the zoning of any parcel may be better served in being deferred until there is a comprehensive plan in place. PARC would view increasing zoning from R-C1 directly to R-CG as being a large and unnecessary step at this time.”

We encourage Planning to engage further in genuine consultation with PARC on applications affecting our community.

In summary, please reject this application at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

and Dave Flint