

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 4819 3 ST NE - LOC2023-0347 - DMAP Comment - Fri 5/17/2024 4:05:28 PM
Date: Friday, May 17, 2024 4:05:36 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: LOC2023-0347

Submitted by: Peter Feluch

Contact Information

Address: 327-48 AVE NE

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, 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:

I am opposed to re-development on this lot with 3 stories (11m high) and more than a

duplex or 2 in-fills on this lot (ie not a 3-4 plex or rowhouses). It is way too dense for the space available, overwhelming/shadowing the neighbouring house, poor corner traffic visibility, etc, so I am totally opposed to that. This is a corner lot with already difficult road visibility around the current hill/tree/parking let alone adding a row/town house, 4plex, or condo style to its outer land edges at 3 storeys high. This neighbourhood street is always full with multiple vehicles per house on average. Parking, lot access, and driving visibility/safety will be a nightmare on this corner, not to mention it floods in chinook/spring conditions due to extremely poor sewer drainage there. The city should NOT approve/allow a big 4plex development here.

Its sole purpose of a 4plex is just to make a developer (SOCIIS Design) more \$ per a single lot size, provide a tall edge to edge building eye sore that doesn't fit into the neighbourhood/housing dynamics. I'm positive they don't care about our community or impacting its nearby residents (other than lip service), not to mention 2yrs of noisy construction and terrible corner traffic confusion/safety. They just want maximum \$ per lot with minimal development.

Only Developers buy the corner lots so they can make maximum profit by putting in a row house/4plex, they don't care about an acceptable path/direction for our community. I've lived here for 60yrs and have seen a lot of development & improvements over those years. This big of one, in such a small tiny corner lot (and another corner lot down 3rd street) for the purpose of building rowhomes/townhouses/condo/4plex style building for financial gain ONLY, is not one I want see implemented at all.

The City of Calgary zoning planners etc should be ashamed of themselves, they are not transparent at all with their development plans for each lot, as they NEVER indicate what type of dwelling is proposed!! It's always a blanket for all types so developers don't have to divulge their plans to the public/community and face negative feedback prior to approval, they just wait on a blanket zoning approval and then make huge profits by maximizing a building to the lot size available. Way to go! Every time I see one of those land re-zoning signs, it sickens me as it ALWAYS means a row house/4plex or condo going in (or as big as can be) and the community doesn't know what until it's quietly pushed through....then it's too late to change.

The city rezoning vote was not a majority, and the public outcry was not in favour of it, so I sure hope this doesn't ruin every community going forward, but I think it will .

Attachments: