

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions](#); [svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 4104 20 ST SW - LOC2023-0407 - DMAP Comment - Tue 5/21/2024 10:45:47 AM
Date: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 10:45:54 AM

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: LOC2023-0407

Submitted by: Emily Forrest

Contact Information

Address: 2031 40th Ave SW

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Overall, I am/we are:

In opposition of this application

Areas of interest/concern:

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:

-the proposed 11 metres (3stories) is too high for this block. We are already experiencing more shade due to 3 storey homes being built behind us. Most of the homes are just 2 storey and have the same setback distance, on this block. Our yards are negatively affected by these 11 metre high houses.

-This is not a typical corner; with bike lanes out front, it is a staggered intersection (Cambrai), in a school zone, with a crosswalk. There are school pick ups/drop offs on 40th ave and also sports throughtout the summer months in the field. Both traffic and parking will become a concern with 4 (+ 4 suites possibly)

- the developers building these units are removing all trees, not allowing for any setbacks, and not enough parking garages.

- the 5 homes behind us that were built had all the trees removed from 3 original properties, amounting to over 15 mature trees. Currently we have construction on 2 other corners, and have been living in a construction zone for 5 years now. I have had 4 punctured tires as a result of all the construction debris being left in the alley, and we are experiencing significant noise and damage in the alley. Hence we would like to see only a duplex built on this property to minimize construction impact (noise, alley closures, debris, safety). Is has been very frustrating to have constant construction 7 days a week, for five years now. Its time for a break. There will be considerably less construction if this lot has a duplex, as opposed to 4 or 8 suites.

Attachments:

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions; svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 4104 20 ST SW - LOC2023-0407 - DMAP Comment - Tue 5/21/2024 2:05:1 PM
Date: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 2:05:05 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

Application: LOC2023-0407

Submitted by: Emily Forrest

Contact Information

Address: 2031 40th 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, 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:

In reviewing the size of this lot, it would seem impossible to have a rowhouses that

also included parking. I am opposed to any multiple dwelling located on this lot. I am in favor of single unit with garage only, This is due to traffic and parking issues on this complex and fragile school corner. This intersection is a playground zone, with two crosswalks, and bike lanes. In addition, it is a staggered intersection, offset from Cambrai Ave. 40th Ave is a pick up and drop off zone for parents/children and also is utilized for parking for the sports that occur in the school field. Having multiple housing units on this corner that cannot even park out front due to bike lane, will create a very dangerous intersection for all users.

In addition, I am opposed to anything over 2 storey due to shadowing. We have experienced three, 3 storey homes , built behind us on 41st ave that sold for 2.2 million each. These houses create significant shadowing for those of us behind them on 40th Ave. I am opposed to anymore shadowing from any direction, i think we have more than our fair share.

Additionally, we have been living in a construction zone for five years, 7 days a week. These permits should be much more spread out so that we don't have multiple construction zones affecting our access, noise, and alley debris, all that the same time. They just took down a house immediately behind this address, and it will create alot of issues through to its completion. At what point do we get a break from all of this. We have lived through 12 redevelopments on our square block in the last 5 years. Including two row house complexes at the east end of 40th ave.

A signle family dwelling only will be much less disturbing and be completed faster. But it should not begin until the one behind is complete.

Attachments:

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Submissions; svc.dmap.commentsProd](#)
Subject: [External] 4104 20 ST SW - LOC2023-0407 - DMAP Comment - Sun 5/26/2024 3:45:7 PM
Date: Sunday, May 26, 2024 3:47:55 PM
Attachments: [Opposition to LOC2023-0407.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: LOC2023-0407

Submitted by: Selena Au

Contact Information

Address: 2025 40 Ave SW

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

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:

Dear city of Calgary

I have been a resident of Altadore since 2017, purchasing my house and choosing to pay property taxes for its specific environmental esthetic and cache at the time of purchase. My assumption is this current housing proposal for 4104 20 St SW would require removal of the old growth evergreens that are crucial to our neighborhood's urban biodiversity. This development would be approximately the tenth new build between our 40th Ave SW block and the 41 Ave SW block with which we share an alley. The current proposal is detrimental to evidence-based benefits of urban green space for which we chose our housing location. For that reason, as well as disproportionate impacts on my block with this new build, I object to this rezoning proposal.

1. The IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) endorses a 3-30-300 rule for healthier and greener cities: 3 trees from every home, 30% tree canopy cover in every neighbourhood and 300 metres from the nearest public park or green space. The health benefits of 30% tree covers includes less diabetes, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, psychological distress and loneliness. (International Journal of epidemiology 2020)
2. As an acute health care professional with up to 80-100 hour work weeks, I am limited in my access to nature and the beautiful mountains enveloping our city. My exposure to nature typically consists of a 20 minute round trip walk to drop and pick up my children from school and I savour my exposure the outside as simple as it is. For children with ADHD (such as mine), a 20 minute walk with exposure to nature has effects on attention span similar to that during the peak effects of Ritalin. Please do not turn our walks into condensed traffic nightmares where old evergreen growth is replaced by a dinky pollinating plants that meet a plant quota on paper, but diminishes the value of the block. Canadian urban health data notes that 10 more trees per block improved health perception substantially. (Scientific Reports 2015)
3. Shaded surfaces are 11-25 degrees cooler than peak temperatures of unshaded ones. Increased shade would decrease the need for air conditioning and lower energy demand, air pollution and GHG emissions. There is reduced stormwater runoff and improved water quality by absorbing and filtering rainwater. We need this shade and these tree roots!

You may question the notion as to whether our household should object to evergreen removal not directly attached to our property. When we purchased this home and pay the city property taxes for it, we are buying into a neighbourhood and the houses/gardens directly on our block was very much a contributing factor of why we chose our home. There are already two other 4-plex row houses that newly went up on 40 Ave and 19 St. The INEQUITY of pre-existing Altadore residents disproportionately shouldering these rezoning changes and suffering density related downstream effects on local school access and street safety should be raised. I would object to this row house proposal until other neighbourhoods have caught up in its contribution to housing solutions. As it stands, I would not have bought my current property if I knew the city would've drastically changed the block's fundamental character. How does that compensation occur? Unfortunately we are not in a position to move readily. However, the city is in a position to listen and to not proceed with further destruction of natural elements as part of its housing solutions. I have previously listed my concern for this same proposal (LOC2023-0407) a few months

ago. This proposed land use change board has gone up again without addressing any of the previous concern- why is that? Will the same proposal without adaption continually be re-submitted until it gets snuck by because the neighbours are busy with work and cannot attend? Please address neighbourhood concerns before bringing up the exact same proposal!

Attachments:

Opposition to LOC2023-0407.docx

May 26 2024

Dear City of Calgary

Re: LOC2023-0407
Bylaw 156D2024

I have been a resident of Altadore since 2017, purchasing my house and choosing to pay property taxes for its specific environmental esthetic and cache at the time of purchase. My assumption is this current housing proposal for 4104 20 St SW would require removal of the old growth evergreens that are crucial to our neighborhood's urban biodiversity. This development would be approximately the tenth new build between our 40th Ave SW block and the 41 Ave SW block with which we share an alley. The current proposal is detrimental to evidence-based benefits of urban green space for which we chose our housing location. For that reason, as well as disproportionate impacts on my block with this new build, I object to this rezoning proposal.

1. The IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) endorses a 3-30-300 rule for healthier and greener cities: 3 trees from every home, 30% tree canopy cover in every neighbourhood and 300 metres from the nearest public park or green space. The health benefits of 30% tree covers includes less diabetes, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, psychological distress and loneliness. (International Journal of epidemiology 2020)
2. As an acute health care professional with up to 80-100 hour work weeks, I am limited in my access to nature and the beautiful mountains enveloping our city. My exposure to nature typically consists of a 20 minute round trip walk to drop and pick up my children from school and I savour my exposure the outside as simple as it is. For children with ADHD (such as mine), a 20 minute walk with exposure to nature has effects on attention span similar to that during the peak effects of Ritalin. Please do not turn our walks into condensed traffic nightmares where old evergreen growth is replaced by a dinky pollinating plants that meet a plant quota on paper, but diminishes the value of the block. Canadian urban health data notes that 10 more trees per block improved health perception substantially. (Scientific Reports 2015)
3. Shaded surfaces are 11-25 degrees cooler than peak temperatures of unshaded ones. Increased shade would decrease the need for air conditioning and lower energy demand, air pollution and GHG emissions. There is reduced stormwater runoff and improved water quality by absorbing and filtering rainwater. We need this shade and these tree roots!

You may question the notion as to whether our household should object to evergreen removal not directly attached to our property. When we purchased this home and pay the city property taxes for it, we are buying into a neighbourhood and the houses/gardens directly on our block was very much a contributing factor of why we chose our home. There are already two other 4-plex row houses that newly went up on 40 Ave and 19 St. The INEQUITY of pre-existing Altadore residents disproportionately

shouldering these rezoning changes and suffering density related downstream effects on local school access and street safety should be raised. I would object to this row house proposal until other neighbourhoods have caught up in its contribution to housing solutions. As it stands, I would not have bought my current property if I knew the city would've drastically changed the block's fundamental character. How does that compensation occur? Unfortunately we are not in a position to move readily. However, the city is in a position to listen and to not proceed with further destruction of natural elements as part of its housing solutions. I have previously listed my concern for this same proposal (LOC2023-0407) a few months ago. This proposed land use change board has gone up again without addressing any of the previous concern- why is that? Will the same proposal without adaption continually be re-submitted until it gets snuck by because the neighbours are busy with work and cannot attend? This would make the Public Hearing in Council Chambers process disingenuous - please address neighbourhood concerns before bringing up the exact same proposal!

Sincerely,
Selena Au

1. Thomas Astell-Burt, Xiaoqi Feng, Urban green space, tree canopy and prevention of cardiometabolic diseases: a multilevel longitudinal study of 46 786 Australians, *International Journal of Epidemiology*, Volume 49, Issue 3, June 2020, Pages 926–933, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyz239>
2. Kardan, O., Gozdyra, P., Misic, B. *et al.* Neighborhood greenspace and health in a large urban center. *Sci Rep* 5, 11610 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep11610>

May 26 2024

Dear City of Calgary

Re: LOC2023-0407
Bylaw 156D2024

I have been a resident of Altadore since 2017, purchasing my house and choosing to pay property taxes for its specific environmental esthetic and cache at the time of purchase. My assumption is this current housing proposal for 4104 20 St SW would require removal of the old growth evergreens that are crucial to our neighborhood's urban biodiversity. This development would be approximately the tenth new build between our 40th Ave SW block and the 41 Ave SW block with which we share an alley. The current proposal is detrimental to evidence-based benefits of urban green space for which we chose our housing location. For that reason, as well as disproportionate impacts on my block with this new build, I object to this rezoning proposal.

1. The IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) endorses a 3-30-300 rule for healthier and greener cities: 3 trees from every home, 30% tree canopy cover in every neighbourhood and 300 metres from the nearest public park or green space. The health benefits of 30% tree covers includes less diabetes, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, psychological distress and loneliness. (International Journal of epidemiology 2020)
2. As an acute health care professional with up to 80-100 hour work weeks, I am limited in my access to nature and the beautiful mountains enveloping our city. My exposure to nature typically consists of a 20 minute round trip walk to drop and pick up my children from school and I savour my exposure the outside as simple as it is. For children with ADHD (such as mine), a 20 minute walk with exposure to nature has effects on attention span similar to that during the peak effects of Ritalin. Please do not turn our walks into condensed traffic nightmares where old evergreen growth is replaced by a dinky pollinating plants that meet a plant quota on paper, but diminishes the value of the block. Canadian urban health data notes that 10 more trees per block improved health perception substantially. (Scientific Reports 2015)
3. Shaded surfaces are 11-25 degrees cooler than peak temperatures of unshaded ones. Increased shade would decrease the need for air conditioning and lower energy demand, air pollution and GHG emissions. There is reduced stormwater runoff and improved water quality by absorbing and filtering rainwater. We need this shade and these tree roots!

You may question the notion as to whether our household should object to evergreen removal not directly attached to our property. When we purchased this home and pay the city property taxes for it, we are buying into a neighbourhood and the houses/gardens directly on our block was very much a contributing factor of why we chose our home. There are already two other 4-plex row houses that newly went up on 40 Ave and 19 St. The INEQUITY of pre-existing Altadore residents disproportionately

shouldering these rezoning changes and suffering density related downstream effects on local school access and street safety should be raised. I would object to this row house proposal until other neighbourhoods have caught up in its contribution to housing solutions. As it stands, I would not have bought my current property if I knew the city would've drastically changed the block's fundamental character. How does that compensation occur? Unfortunately we are not in a position to move readily. However, the city is in a position to listen and to not proceed with further destruction of natural elements as part of its housing solutions. I have previously listed my concern for this same proposal (LOC2023-0407) a few months ago. This proposed land use change board has gone up again without addressing any of the previous concern- why is that? Will the same proposal without adaption continually be re-submitted until it gets snuck by because the neighbours are busy with work and cannot attend? This would make the Public Hearing in Council Chambers process disingenuous - please address neighbourhood concerns before bringing up the exact same proposal!

Sincerely,
Selena Au

1. Thomas Astell-Burt, Xiaoqi Feng, Urban green space, tree canopy and prevention of cardiometabolic diseases: a multilevel longitudinal study of 46 786 Australians, *International Journal of Epidemiology*, Volume 49, Issue 3, June 2020, Pages 926–933, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyz239>
2. Kardan, O., Gozdyra, P., Misic, B. *et al.* Neighborhood greenspace and health in a large urban center. *Sci Rep* 5, 11610 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep11610>



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

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]

Charles

Last name [required]

Gunn

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 Infrastructure and Planning

Date of meeting [required]

Jun 4, 2024

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

[required] - max 75 characters

Land Use Redesignation Altadore LOC 2023-0407 BYLAW156D2024

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

Neither



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

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

In case counsel is not familiar with the area, 20 ST SW is a neighborhood connector and generally busy travel corridor (Bus Route, Bike Lanes, Snow route, etc.). Parking is not currently allowed on 20 ST SW near this lot due to the proximity of a crosswalk and also the northbound bike lane. This leaves only a short section of 40 AVE SW for street parking (approximatly 2 car lengths) for this lot of 4 residence which does not seem adequate.

I'd like to ask what the plan is for parking, should the redesignation to R-CG (with 4 units) be approved, where will residents park and will there need to be a parking zone created on 40 AVE SW to ensure adequate parking for nearby residents?

As of May 27, 2024, there is a road closure due to a sink hole at 20 ST SW and 40 AVE SW (next to this property). Will the distribution infrastructure (Water, electrical, sewage, gas) need to be upgraded to accomodate the new designation? While new services are being installed, can we make sure the infrastructure is evaluated prevent potential future sinkholes?