

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)  
**Subject:** [External] 2215 5 ST NW - LOC2023-0410 - DMAP Comment - Mon 4/29/2024 7:39:59 PM  
**Date:** Monday, April 29, 2024 7:40:05 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](mailto:spam@calgary.ca)

Application: LOC2023-0410

Submitted by: mary henderson

Contact Information

Address: 520 21 ave NW

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone:

Overall, I am/we are:

In opposition of this application

Areas of interest/concern:

Land Uses, Density, Amount of Parking, Lot coverage, Community character, Traffic 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:

Cumulative impact of RCG development within 2 block radius in Mount Pleasant.

The neighborhood is already attempting to manage the impact to quiet enjoyment (20+ fold increase in parking, traffic, density, loss of neighborhood character, safety, loss of tree canopy) of another RCG development 1 block away (corner of 22 ave and 4th street). And 1.5 blocks away (east corner 21st ave and 4th street) there is yet another RCG proposal. Adding another 8 dwellings on what is currently zoned for 2 is too much to impose on a single neighborhood. Who is taking into account the cumulative impact?

This is not on a Main street. Develop beyond R2 on Mainstreets. Or R2 plus a secondary back unit.

Parking is already an issue. This is NOT just an issue of convenience (most of us are prepared for inconvenience of some sort) - it is absolutely a significant safety concern - for both pedestrians, in particular school children, and vehicles.

First, there are 2 schools within 2 blocks of the proposed development, and a community center with parks, swimming and skating across the street. 5th street is a walking and cycling street to school and activities. The development is adjacent to a back alley used to access the garages for houses on 21 ave and 22 ave (east of 5th street) - including the 10 parking stalls of the 20 UNIT RCG development on corner of 4th and 22nd (east of 5th street) and backs on to another back alley used to access the houses on 21 ave and 22 ave west of 5th street. It's impossible that the proposed development will be able to provide sufficient parking for 8 units (4 plus 4 secondary). Residents of the proposed RCG development will park on the street near to the access point of both back alleys. This develops obvious and frightening blind spots for turning onto 5th street or into the alleys vis children cycling and walking to school. And this is ALREADY an issue. Near misses happen weekly and there is only infrequent parking on 5th street. Add to this, the fact that vehicle traffic in the east back alley will increase 10 fold when the RCG development on 5th is occupied and the safety impact on school children and bicycles is too far too weighty.

Vis vehicle safety: neither 21 ave nor 22 ave is wide enough to have cars parked on both sides and enjoy dual direction traffic. This means that cars accessing the neighborhood and proposed development from 4th street - on either 21 or 22 ave - are having AT THE MOMENT, WITH THE CURRENT increase in density, to come to a stop to allow cars to exit onto 4th. As 4th is a main street, you are stopping on a main street. Near misses have been recorded three times in the last week as a result of this congestion. Stating the obvious, adding another 8-16 vehicles into the mix will push the limit of what this area of Mount Pleasant can manage. I question who is accounting for the cumulative impact of this development.

Mount Pleasant is enduring the brunt of accelerated RCG development. Main Street higher density development is creeping further into the neighborhood. There is no reason, the City cannot PHASE high density development, restrict RCG development to Main Streets and restrict other development to R2 with the opportunity for back alley suites. Inequitably distributing mitigation of the Calgary housing crisis to neighborhoods like Mount Pleasant is simply and on its face, unfair. The City must

slow the pace of development outside development on Main Street and insist Main Street development occur across the City.

If RCG is approved for rental use, the City must develop bylaws to address the neighborhood changes that occur when the owner does not occupy the dwellings. Of the 3 primary parties impacted by high density , the developer and the renters win. The existing neighbors lose. The imbalance must be addressed. Change impact must be shared equitably. New bylaws requiring the owner to take neighborhood accountability for its asset is imperative.

Attachments: