

Community Association Response



Brentwood Community Association

Mailing Address 5107 – 33rd St. NW, Calgary, Alberta T2L 1V3
Tel. (403) 284-3477 Fax. (403) 284-3951 office@brentwoodcommunity.com
www.brentwoodcommunity.com

June 13, 2024

Setara Zafar
Planning and Development
City of Calgary
Setara.Zafar@calgary.ca
(587) 215-4174

Application: LOC2024-0089

Application Type: Land Use Amendment to accommodate M-CGd85
Address: 2936 Blakiston Dr NW
Land Use Designation: R-C1
Proposed Development is: land use change to M-CG
Proposed Use: multi-residential development

Dear Ms. Zafar,

The Development and Transportation Committee (DTC) has reviewed this LOC and offers the following comments:

Description: The Brentwood CA has received an application for a Land Use Redesignation (LOC) to allow for a Multi-Residential – Contextual Grade-Oriented development. According to the development map (<https://developmentmap.calgary.ca/?find=LOC2024-0089>), the application proposes to change the land use designation to allow for multi-residential buildings (e.g. rowhouses, townhouses), with a maximum of 5 dwelling units, and a maximum height of 12m.

Role and Process followed by the Brentwood Development and Transportation Committee (DTC)

The DTC of the Brentwood Community Association acts in an advisory role. The BCA is circulated on DPs and LOCs within our community so that we have the opportunity to promote community involvement by informing our residents and including them in the review and planning process.

- We provide an opportunity for residents to have a voice in the planning and development decisions that impact their homes and their neighbourhood.
- For every Discretionary DP or LOC received, the DTC circulates the nearby neighbours by delivering Neighbour Notifications (NN). The purpose of the NNs is to ensure that neighbours are aware of a proposed development near them and so that they know how to submit their feedback.
- We listen to our residents and then provide comments to the City on how a proposed development fits into the community based on community feedback.
- As a Community Association, we recognize that we are key stakeholders in the planning process.
- Therefore, our DTC acts as a reflective voice for the community on issues related to planning and development.

For LOC2024-0089, there was an unprecedented level of interest and comments received.

The BCA received emails and letters from 32 residents who live near the site. Other residents called or spoke to a DTC member with general comments in opposition; only 1 resident voiced their support. Many residents wrote detailed and thoughtful feedback which deserves to be heard.



Brentwood Community Association

Mailing Address 5107 – 33rd St. NW, Calgary, Alberta T2L 1V3
Tel. (403) 284-3477 Fax. (403) 284-3951 office@brentwoodcommunity.com
www.brentwoodcommunity.com

Feedback from Residents:

To ensure that we accurately and adequately reflect the voices of our residents, our feedback includes some of their verbatim comments.

The 5 pages attached contain a summary of the feedback submitted by residents. The feedback is summarized into the following categories:

- Engagement and Process
- General Comments / Community Character
- Shadowing
- Privacy
- Safety
- Garbage and Recycle Facilities
- Parking
- Trees
- Massing
- Building Height
- Site Layout
- Density
- Affordability
- Traffic
- Property Value
- Infrastructure

BCA Review:

1. The Land Use Amendment (Redesignation) Process

The application engagement process seems to have been incomplete or flawed, with a lack of transparency.

As per the City's Community Outreach Roles, *"When it comes to outreach led by applicants there are no mandated requirements, but The City's general recommended minimum approach is for applicants to complete the Outreach Assessment tool which helps applicants assess and consider the potential impact of their proposal within the context of the community they are working in and provides guidance on high-level outreach considerations."*

The Outreach Assessment tool is attached (Appendix C) and shows a level of 3B, indicating High Impact and High Complexity. The score indicates that *"your project is of medium to high impact for the community, and of higher complexity. There are likely issues that will need to be mitigated and addressed and extra effort will be needed to educate and inform the community about your project. Consider a broader approach with the community and be open to an iterative process with multiple tactics where input would help inform better decisions."*

- There was no pre-application meeting or notice to the CA or nearby residents before applying.
- April 4 - The BCA was circulated on the application package from the City of Calgary via email.
- April 9 - Residents found out about the LOC when the City placed signage on the subject property.



Brentwood Community Association

Mailing Address 5107 – 33rd St. NW, Calgary, Alberta T2L 1V3
Tel. (403) 284-3477 Fax. (403) 284-3951 office@brentwoodcommunity.com
www.brentwoodcommunity.com

- April 9 - Occupants of the property (the rental dwelling upstairs and a secondary suite downstairs) found out about the LOC only after signage had been placed on the property.
 - April 12 (Friday) – First contact with the applicant (Horizon Land Surveys). An email was sent to the email address of a DTC member. It appears that the applicant had sent 2 previous emails to the incorrect address for the BCA: since those emails never arrived, there was no reply.
 - April 15 (Monday) – the BCA replied to the applicant noting that the email address was incorrect so no information had been received. The BCA asked for more details about what was proposed (number of units, if secondary suites were planned, parking details, etc.). The reply indicated that *"We are planning for cottage cluster style housing. Although the attached is for a different address, it would be similar style. A two storey duplex in the front followed by a shared yard and another two storey duplex and a four car garage along the lane is what we are thinking of. Each of them might have a basement suites. Let us know if you need any more info. Thanks."*
 - April 17 – The file manager provided information about the necessity of outreach to the community. The applicant indicated to her that a postcard had been delivered to neighbours. Unfortunately, when asked by the BCA, none of the neighbours recalled receiving a flyer or postcard.
 - April 19 – the applicant confirmed a booking for the BCA boardroom to be held on May 2nd.
 - April 22 – the applicant submitted some conceptual drawings to the BCA, along with the request that they be passed on to planning members and residents.
 - May 2 – the due date for comments on the application so the BCA requested an extension.
 - May 2 – meeting held by the applicant. Approximately 35 – 40 residents attended, and there were many upset or angry comments. There was one attendee who said they supported the proposal, although they did not live on Blakiston Drive. All other attendees were strongly in opposition. At the conclusion of the meeting, the applicant indicated to Melanie that he might pursue a concurrent application. Specifics were discussed including that the dwelling would be under 8.6 meters in height and 2 storeys, and that the overall size would kept to 2 bedrooms for each upper unit and 1 bedroom for the secondary suite (total 12 bedrooms on the site).
 - May 2 - The file manager confirmed that the application would be revised to an M-CGd85 designation, which would allow for a maximum of 4 + 4 units on the site.
 - May 13 – During a follow-up phone call, the applicant indicated that they would submit a concurrent application (DP and LOC). They indicated that they would need to create detailed drawings and submit those together with the Land Use Change application. They estimated that the timeframe would be for about the end of June for DP drawings. The applicant confirmed that they would not eliminate the basement suites and definitely wanted a total of 8 separate dwelling units. When asked, the applicant stated that they would accept feedback from neighbours regarding items such as AC locations, window placements, etc.
 - May 22 – new circulation package received, which confirmed the M-CGd85 designation.
 - The BCA has not received any updates from the applicant based on feedback heard at the meeting.
 - June 13 – deadline for CA and community comments
- 2. M-CG Zoning (M-CGd85 modifier)**
- The main question was "Why is this application for M-CG instead of for R-CG or a lower density of zoning?"
 - It is our understanding that based on the lot size, there could be a maximum of 6 dwelling units (3 main + 3 suites) on the property, but the applicant would like to build a minimum of 8 (4 + 4). To do so requires an increase to the M-CG land use.
 - M-CG would allow up to 10 (5 + 5) total units, so a modifier of density 85 was added.



Brentwood Community Association

Mailing Address 5107 – 33rd St. NW, Calgary, Alberta T2L 1V3
 Tel. (403) 284-3477 Fax. (403) 284-3951 office@brentwoodcommunity.com
 www.brentwoodcommunity.com

3. **The density proposed is simply too high for the site.**
 - This site is not suitable for what is proposed, which requires a density of even higher than the 75 units per hectare that would be allowed under R-CG.
 - There is no justification for increasing an R-C1 land use to a multi-unit zoning, when there are nearby options that have been identified as desirable locations for rezoning at the TOD site.
 - The scale of density proposed would be more suitable for the Brentwood TOD site. There is a Station ARP which remains as the statutory document guiding redevelopment in the area. Page 47 specifically references "Stable Residential Communities" which will "*remain relatively unchanged as redevelopment of the station area happens over time*". Further down the street, a cluster of existing apartment blocks on Blakiston Park, "*could potentially be rebuilt over time*" while maintaining a sensitive interface between redeveloped and established areas.

4. **All of the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill cannot be met on the site.**
 - The criteria which can be met are within 400m of a transit stop, within 600m of an existing primary transit stop, direct lane access, across from a park and in close proximity to an activity centre (mall).

The criteria which cannot be met are:

 - The site is not on a corner parcel. This is a mid-block location on a street consisting mainly of bungalows.
 - The site is not on a collector or higher standard roadway on at least one frontage. Blakiston Road is a local road that does not lead anywhere other than local housing. It is not a short cut or collector route. Since it is mid-block, the site does not have a second frontage.
 - The site is not adjacent to existing or planning multi-unit development. There are R-C1 homes surrounding this site, but no multi-units.

5. **There is already a Registered Secondary Suite on the subject property.**
 - The current site houses multiple tenants who would be "renovicted" and would, in all likelihood, lose their affordable housing or at least be faced with higher rental costs.
 - Brentwood has had over 154 applications within the past 6 years for secondary suites. These suites house many students from the U of Calgary and they provide affordable housing options, especially with multiple students sharing the suites. Removal of those suites and replacing them with more expensive units would increase housing costs for students.

6. **Infrastructure, servicing and site requirements have not been addressed.**
 - Parking requirements are for .5 spaces per unit, a total of 4 parking spaces for 8 units. There is restricted parking in the area, including 2-hour parking along Blakiston Drive. Concern has been expressed about spillover parking or parking in the alley.
 - Garbage concerns. Currently there are 2 rental units on the property, and there often appears to be excess garbage that does not fit into the black bins. While this is a bylaw, not a planning issue, there has been no indication that bylaw services will enforce garbage concerns expressed to 311. Photos submitted to the BCA show excess garbage lying in the alley, with overflowing black bins.
 - Property maintenance. Photos submitted show an old washing machine that has been stored outside in the backyard for the better part of a year.
 - Infrastructure pipes / sewer. Site servicing is to be determined at the DP stage, but recent events in Calgary have demonstrated that perhaps preventative measures should be taken instead of waiting for a failure.



Brentwood Community Association

Mailing Address 5107 – 33rd St. NW, Calgary, Alberta T2L 1V3
 Tel. (403) 284-3477 Fax. (403) 284-3951 office@brentwoodcommunity.com
www.brentwoodcommunity.com

7. Permeable versus impermeable surfaces / Landscaping

- M-CG does not have a maximum lot coverage, instead relies on the setbacks to calculate the maximums allowed. Since the existing R-C1 has a 40% maximum, and even R-CG allows for 60%, there is a valid concern that most of the property will be covered with concrete sidewalks, parking spaces, garbage pads and other impermeable surfaces.
- The site proposal seems to be overdeveloped, especially in relation to other properties in the area. Brentwood is known for its large, mature trees, and covering most of the property will eliminate the possibility of replanting trees that reach a large mature span. There are also two City-owned Green Ash trees in front of the property which must be maintained and must have a Tree Protection Plan during any potential construction.
- The Infill Guidelines encourage development to respect and enhance the overall quality and character of the street/community in which it takes place. To achieve this objective, the guidelines deal with the following design elements: context, parcel layout, building mass, privacy, and landscaping. Those aspects cannot be met if the building is out of scale and size for the area.

For all of these reasons, plus based on the overwhelming opposition from residents, including a petition with 103 signatures, the BCA opposes this rezoning application.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

Sincerely,

Melanie Swailes
 Peter Johnson
 On behalf of the Development and Transportation Committee
 Brentwood Community Association

Setara.Zafar@calgary.ca -- Planning File Manager
dp.circ@calgary.ca -- City's document circulation controller
office@brentwoodcommunity.com -- Brentwood Community Association
CLWARD4@calgary.ca -- Ward 4 Councillor Sean Chu

Attachments:

Appendix A – petition
 Appendix B - summary of resident feedback
 Appendix C – the Outreach Assessment Tool



Brentwood Community Association

Mailing Address 5107 – 33rd St. NW, Calgary, Alberta T2L 1V3
Tel. (403) 284-3477 Fax. (403) 284-3951 office@brentwoodcommunity.com
www.brentwoodcommunity.com

Appendix A – Petition

A petition against the M-CG re-designation at this property was received by the BCA. It contained 103 signatures from residents who live close to the proposed development.
Due to FOIP, the signatures from the petition are not included here although a copy of the petition is on file at the Brentwood Community Association.

The petition was completed by May 1, 2024 in time for the original deadline for comments, which had been May 2nd. Subsequently, there was a change to the Land Use, with the addition of a modifier: the new designation was for M-CGd85. This was not known at the time of the petition and hence is not reflected on the petition.

The petition included objections based on the following: Height, Size (number of dwelling units), Aesthetics, Affordability and alignment with surrounding properties.

Copy of the petition statement:

To: Mayor and Council of the City of Calgary
800 Macleod Trail SE Box 2100 Postal Station M
Calgary AB T2P 2M5

Re: Application for Land use amendment LOC2024-0089: R-C1 to M-CG
Street Address: 2998 Biskison Drive NW Calgary T2L 1L8

We, the undersigned, want to bring to your attention our objection to the proposed re-designation of the current R-C1 single family dwelling to a Multi-residential-Contextual Grade-oriented development (M-CG).

The objection to this M-CG Land Use Amendment application is based on the following:

- **Height**...M-CG development could be a maximum of 12 metres (40 feet). This type of property will tower over the neighbouring properties and infringe on their privacy and quality of life.
- **Size**...M-CG development could increase the existing 1 Unit/1 Suite home (2 Dwellings Units) to a maximum 5 Units plus potentially 5 Suites, which could total 10 Dwellings Units.
- **Aesthetics**...M-CG will increase density and effect the character of street. The increased population causes the loss of the sense of community and camaraderie that currently exist on this block.
- **Affordability**...Further, affordability is at the core of the city's re-zoning plan. Currently, this property is rented to students. This property is very affordable for them. Should a M-CG designation be allowed, there is a greater likelihood this property will be unaffordable for students or the majority of Calgarians.

The city has indicated repeatedly that housing is critically necessary but, M-CG designation on this mid-block property, does not align with surrounding properties and is concerning from a planning rationale prospective.

On separate attachments:

- Appendix B - summary of resident feedback (10 pages)
- Appendix C – the Outreach Assessment Tool (1 page)

Application: LOC2024-0089
 Application Type: Land Use Amendment to accommodate M-CGd85
 Address: 2936 Blakiston Dr NW

Summary of Feedback Received by the Brentwood Community Association

| Subject Area | Verbatim Comments received |
|--|--|
| Engagement & Process | I am also concerned that the surrounding home owners on adjacent streets were not advised on a development permit that has repercussions on the Brentwood community as a whole. I only happened to come across this development permit because it was warm and I happened to walk by the sign. |
| | We were not notified of this possible "land use change" by the owner prior to the sign going up. No communications, flyers, door knocking and consultation happen. The Brentwood community centre had not even heard anything about this until mid April, almost a week after the sign was put up. |
| | We were surprised to see the sign go up as we have NOT had ANY conversations with the owner of the property and did not know of any intent on behalf of him to change the land use beside us to allow for a 12 metre, 10 dwelling property. |
| | Is he not responsible to at least notify us before putting the sign up and see what he might think about the proposal? If not, I believe this should change in the future so that all neighbouring land owners know that significant changes are being proposed before signs are posted. That would be courteous and helpful. |
| | I have spoken to his tenants that we know, and they were not informed by the property owner either and only found out once the sign went up. |
| | I'm also curious as to whether the current property owner is required to inform any neighbouring properties about this as we have not heard anything from them and were quite surprised to see the large sign go up next door. Currently 2936 is a house with a secondary suite in the basement. We often talk to the tenants in the basement suite and they also had not been informed by the property owner regarding the land use change request. |
| | |
| General comments / Community Character | I hope that the Brentwood Community Association gets involved in this application for rezoning on Blakiston Drive. I believe this application if approved has repercussion on the whole community of Brentwood and could be prescient (sic) setting to the detriment of our community. |
| | Please be reasonable here. A duplex or triplex would be acceptable but anything more would be ridiculous. Letting a few high density applications slip by opens the door for the city to do whatever it wants in any neighbourhood. Most people would support some balanced densification as opposed to urban sprawl, but please be sensible about it to maintain attractive neighbourhoods. Listen to the people, that's all I ask. |
| | This development M-CG (High Density) is not in keeping with the character of this neighbourhood. The homes adjacent to this development are bungalows or split levels, and a building that may be up to 40 feet high is way too high. |
| | This re-zoning proposal is a very insensitive approach to city planning and as a resident living nearby I am strongly against it. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | No one in our household wants to see a building like this in our neighborhood. |
| | It's a travesty that the city wants to do this re-zoning thing, I am against this! I love our Brentwood community; I have lived in Brentwood for 8 years, and I really believe that row houses and/or other tall residential apartment buildings would totally de-face our community. |
| | Yes, I am saying NO! To this proposed development at 2936 Blakiston Drive NW. This is my street, and I would hate to see this type of structure (row houses) built! |
| | It is troubling to see survey crews in our area, possibly sizing up similar homes for future requests to change zoning. Our communities are under attack from developers who are out to make a quick money and change the future of our older communities. |
| | While I very much support the idea that more affordable housing is required, I believe that the move from burdensome and bureaucratic zoning decisions has switched to be too fast and enable too broad changes. In my view the pendulum has swung too far and there needs to be a solution in the middle. A solution that is more nimble and efficient in increasing affordable housing stock than the past but also has more checks and balances in place to permit housing that fits neighbourhoods' histories than is currently proposed for this specific application and for the broader housing strategy currently before City Council. |
| | The re-designation of this property is the 'thin edge of the wedge' which aims to increase the population density and destroy our single family dwelling communities. The single family dwelling is the backbone of our city! Single family dwellings provide for space for families to grow gardens (in a time where food prices are out of control) without a large building blocking out the sun. We know our neighbours and can count on them if problems (such as break-ins or other crimes) occur. Our homes are a safe place for our children to play, a place to relax and share time with family and neighbours in the privacy of their own backyard, free from the prying eyes of someone in a 3 or 4 story apartment next door. |
| | I just don't understand how suddenly they are pushing against 'city sprawl' at a time when those new areas could be developed for affordable housing for all. What has changed and why should the good people who have been paying taxes, mortgages, enjoy backyard privacy, sunlight, gardening in their own spaces and communing with their neighbors be forced into such an invasive proposal? People who move into these single family dwelling neighborhoods tend to stay and become part of a vital community with a great sense of unity and family. That is the backbone to any city in my opinion. |
| | The city pushes that by putting in these types of structures, it will help foster a 'sense of community'. There is already a real sense of community in place. I feel these buildings will have the opposite effect on these areas. It will change the whole feeling and energy and these beautiful old neighborhoods will become unrecognizable. |
| | I appreciate the current housing situation in Calgary, but the proposed development, and others like it, are not the way to solve the availability and affordability issues we face. This development is based upon greed, not need. It has absolutely nothing to do with the character of Brentwood community and why people are attracted to, and are loyal to, this area. As consecutive years of the Avenue magazine survey attest, Brentwood is valued for its 1960's-era homes and low density. Yes, we have higher density housing already, in the older apartment buildings on Blakiston Drive and in the newer University City development, but those are not wedged in between existing houses. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | The proposal does NOT fit into the aesthetic of the neighbourhood for reasons checked above. - Size, height, parking, shadowing. Simple question for the developer and planning committee - how would you feel as a neighbour living next to this proposed building? It is beyond the scope of the rezoning proposed by the city. |
| | |
| Shadowing | Proposed height of 3 stories (12 m), this would make the development stand out in a sea of single storey houses. While I am not opposed to two stories, a 3 storey building casts a long shadow on its neighbors. |
| | landscaping and garden beds will be impacted by the shading of our yard |
| | We grow vegetables and have a garden plot and other square foot planters that we use to supplement our own increasingly high cost of food for a few months out of the year. The shade might also affect other neighbors' quality of life outdoors as it would change the amount of sun they have or take it away all together. |
| | shadowing concerns for all involved |
| | property to the left (west) will be shaded completely; affects trees and backyard |
| | The shadow effect also must be considered. The property left of the proposed build will be shaded completely if the building is approved at 12 meters instead of a 2-story building. It has mature trees that we will no longer be able to see and how will this affect their back yard. We grow vegetables and have a garden plot and other square foot planters that we use to supplement our own increasingly high cost of food for a few months out of the year. The shade might also affect other neighbors' quality of life outdoors as it would change the amount of sun they have or take it away all together. |
| | opposed to a building up to 10 units and up to 40ft; cast a shadow on those behind it |
| | increased shadowing |
| | large building blocking out the sun |
| | |
| Privacy | The proposed M-CG zoning allows for a height of 12 meters which is approximately 40 feet high and or up to 3 stories. This will impact the privacy and quality of life of all surrounding houses on the street as well as across the back lane from the parcel. |
| | Privacy will be gone with 12m walls and multiple windows looking down into our yards |
| | We have spent decades creating outdoor living spaces front and back. We have extensive landscaping and garden beds that will be hugely impacted on by the shading of our yard. |
| | Along with possible shading from proposed land use change, loss of privacy due to the increased proximity to taller multi-residential building. If the height is approved, all surrounding neighbors will now have others looking into their back yards and it will affect their quality of life outdoors. This will affect the mental well-being of individuals who garden, like to hang out in the backyard, like my husband and I. |
| | No privacy for those established homes. No, it must not happen. |
| | Inserting row housing/townhomes into a street of bungalows, split levels and two-storey homes would be an eyesore, not to mention the privacy and noise issues for the neighbouring homes. |
| | privacy concerns for all involved |
| | negative affect on other residents' rights to privacy |
| | other property owners will have virtually no privacy in their backyards with a large structure looking down on their yard |
| | reduced privacy |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| | neighbours who have enjoyment of backyard privacy, sunlight, gardening forced into invasive proposal |
| | inserting row housing/townhomes into a street of bungalows, split levels and two-storey homes would cause privacy and noise issues for the neighbouring homes |
| | |
| Safety | Across the street is a lovely park (Blakiston Park). The park is surrounded by high density housing and is a pocket park that acts as a smaller use community park. The street has a playground zone. The proposed zoning would bring more vehicles to the street which potentially could create safety concerns and parking issues. Blakiston Drive NW had parking issues in the past which led to it being designated as a "Residential Parking Zone" street. |
| | prying eyes of someone in a 3 or 4 story apartment next door |
| | traffic will increase which will put children and people walking dogs at risk |
| | |
| Garbage & Recycle Facilities | more garbage with the potential of junk being left around |
| | (Photos of excess garbage outside of black bins on the existing site were received by the BCA. Secondary suites that share a bin with the main dwelling seem to create more garbage than can be handled by one bin.) |
| | |
| Parking | Lastly, we fear the zoning designation would create unaffordable housing on a property which currently has affordable housing in place. The rent or sale of any potential multi unit property at this site would not be affordable for the average Calgarian. |
| | Parking is a big concern. We have rental houses on either side of us. At times we've had to compete with as many as 7 cars in each. |
| | With MCG zoning the potential for the number of units would mean that many more vehicles with limited parking in relation to the size of the lot. Where are all these people going to park their vehicles? At the moment, there are tenants in the property both up and down. Between all of them, they have 5 vehicles. How does this land use address this concern? Will they be required to have parking for all units on the land? |
| | proposed M-CG will have no room for parking |
| | With MCG zoning the potential for the number of units would mean that many more vehicles with limited parking in relation to the size of the lot. Where are all these people going to park their vehicles? At the moment, there are tenants in the property both up and down. Between all of them, they have 5 vehicles. How does this land use address this concern? Will they be required to have parking for all units on the land? We have a beautiful park across the street, that is used constantly in the spring and summer months and throughout the winter on our nice days. Children from nearby daycares come and use it regularly along with other outside the community as it has a number of age appropriate playgrounds now. Parking can get congested, and if this land use goes through, and if parking is not part of the design and new owners or renters have vehicles, it will now be harder for people to access the park they love. As stated earlier, we are not opposed to further densification in the community however we feel that this should and can be done collaboratively and tastefully with respect to the current look of the neighbourhood. A 12-meter-high building/ 40 feet is not what we need mid-block in an already busy area. |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| | development will increase parking congestion |
| | negative affect on other residents rights to parking |
| | |
| Trees / Landscaping | What will happen to the city trees that have been here for over 60 years? We are in a climate crisis and a housing crisis. Cutting down the tree canopy and building multi family homes that will NOT be affordable are not what we need here. |
| | proposed M-CG will have no room for green space |
| | Environmental Impact |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Mature Trees: The proposed development would likely necessitate the removal of many mature trees. These trees, some of which could be hundreds of years old, provide vital ecological benefits. They absorb air and water pollution, regulate temperatures, and provide habitat for a wide variety of birds, animals, and insects. Their removal would significantly degrade the environmental quality of the neighborhood |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced Aesthetic Appeal: Mature trees are a defining characteristic of Brentwood and contribute significantly to its aesthetic appeal. Their loss would drastically alter the character of the neighborhood, making it less desirable for residents. |
| | (Several legal cases were cited by this resident. This is an excerpt:) the court ruled that the importance of preserving mature trees with historical significance must be weighed against the potential economic benefits of development. This case, while specific to historical trees, establishes the principle of balancing economic gain with environmental value. In our case, the mature trees in Brentwood, even if not historically significant, provide substantial environmental benefits that should be weighed against any potential economic gains from the rezoning. |
| | Preserving mature trees with historical significance must be weighed against the potential economic benefits of development. This case, while specific to historical trees, establishes the principle of balancing economic gain with environmental value. In our case, the mature trees in Brentwood, even if not historically significant, provide substantial environmental benefits that should be weighed against any potential economic gains from the rezoning. |
| | reduced tree canopy |
| | |
| Massing | The scale of building allowable through the proposed rezoning will be at odds to what is currently along the street and does not support the 'contract' of low-scale residential that the owners bought into. |
| | We can only visualize the impact of a building with 10 units on a normal city lot, the area covered by this building will have a significant impact on the neighbouring homes and cast a shadow on those behind it on Brentwood Blvd. |
| | row houses and/or other tall residential apartment buildings will totally deface our community |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| | <p>We are concerned when we go into our back yard, work in the garden, sit on our deck and use our hot tub, that all we will see is a building wall instead of the 60-year-old trees and skyline. It is not reasonable to put a 40-foot building beside a bungalow in a neighborhood that has been "crowned Calgary's best neighbourhood for 2 years running". https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/brentwood-northwest-calgary-best-neighbourhood-avenue-magazine-1.5702681</p> <p>The proposed land use change would mean the building beside my house would be taller than the apartment complexes to the right of my house and across the street that run along Blakiston Park and across from the potential development.</p> <p><i>"For the second year in a row, the northwest community of Brentwood has claimed the No. 1 spot on an annual list of Calgary's best neighbourhoods. The City of Calgary's recent renovations to Blakiston Park have made it a draw for people around the city, and McCurry said that Brentwood's smaller green spaces are attractive to dog owners".</i></p> <p>We would like to continue to have a character that draws young families into the neighborhood.</p> |
| | opposed to a building up to 10 units and up to 40ft; impact neighbouring homes |
| Building Height | <p>Also, when the 3 towers went up in Brentwood one of the issues was the height of the buildings facing the residential side of the street, and hence we have the 3 storey townhouses on the commercial side of Blakiston Drive. On the residential side of Blakiston Drive, the height limit should continue to be restricted to 2 stories, keeping with residential feel of the neighborhood. Three stories are inappropriate for a residential community, and is more appropriate for a high density block.</p> <p>concerned with the type and height of the proposed structure</p> <p>40' high is way too high</p> |
| | <p>We think this land use proposal will not look good on our street and in our neighborhood as it will look out of place between two single detached bungalows. Typically, developments proposed for this zoning designation happen on corner lots with greater accessibility. Potential for proposed developments under MCG that do not take into consideration the compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, may detract from the overall appeal of the area and contribute to property value depreciation.</p> <p>There are accessibility concerns depending on the proposed size development with regard to the property being mid-block.</p> <p>The look of the neighborhood will change drastically if a 3-story building is put mid-block between bungalows. Down the street the 3 story town houses were built near the high-rise apartment buildings across the street, to keep the densification in one location. Have a building this tall on this side of the street will be ridiculous.</p> |
| Site Layout / Location | <p>A multi-residential development in the middle of a residential block would be prescient setting, I have driven through other inner city communities and multi-residential dwellings (2 stores) are usually reserved for corner lots or lots that face commercial buildings or look onto busy roads. This lot is neither a corner lot or faces a busy street or a commercial building. In fact, it is close to other apartment buildings that are ONLY two storeys.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | The current zoning for this area would not allow for this development and on that fact alone this development permit should be denied. If the proposed city wide zoning change (RC-G) is passed, I believe that this development as it now sits would and should raise as few eyebrows and be denied. |
| | The existing context is a neighbourhood of bungalows. The property for proposed re-zoning is mid-block along the street. To up-zone this property to M-CG would result in a structure that is out of context with the surrounding bungalows. This flies in the face of the Infill Guidelines which call for sensitive redevelopment in established neighbourhoods such as Brentwood. |
| | Typically, developments proposed for this zoning designation happen on corner lots with greater accessibility. Potential for proposed developments under MCG that do not take into consideration the compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, may detract from the overall appeal of the area and contribute to property value depreciation. |
| | This property is mid block with bungalows on either side thus it is not the right parcel for M-CG zoning as typically development proposed for M-CG zoning designation are more conducive to corner lots that have multiple access points |
| | The application from the property owner is concerning when it comes to planning rational as M-CG designation does not align with the surrounding properties on the street. |
| | We have a Transit Oriented Development plan in place in our Brentwood community. There are multiple forms of housing in the TOD area such as high-rise condos, rental units, townhouses and rowhouses. This M-CG designation is a good fit in the TOD zone. This TOD is at the end of Blakiston Dr across the street from our residential |
| | Also, a 12 meter or 3 story building would replace a secondary suite bungalow and change the aesthetics of the street and character of the neighbourhood. |
| | Large multi-dwelling buildings are more suitable for corner lots, but this development is in the middle of the block which will present shadow and privacy concerns for all concerned. |
| | not the right parcel for M-CG; M-CG are more conducive to corner lots with multiple access points |
| | M-CG does not align with the surrounding properties |
| | M-CG designation is a good fit in the TOD zone |
| | would replace a bungalow (with suite) and change the aesthetics of the street and neighbourhood character |
| | M-CG is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood (bungalows , split levels) |
| | large multi-dwelling units are not suitable for mid block; more suitable for corner lots |
| | mid block M-CG is out of context with surrounding bungalows |
| | is out of place between two single detached bungalows; will change the character |
| | a condo style 3 storey 12 metre highbeing built on a single detached lot is ridiculous |
| | unacceptable and inappropriate - intends to demolish a single family home under the guise of urban density and housing shortages, profit at expense of community and its people |
| | M-CG zoning approval is not acceptable; R-CG zoning would perhaps be acceptable |
| | proposed development does not fit with the developments on the street - single family bungalows |
| | M-CG development would be better suited in an appropriate area on a corner lot |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | not aligned with the character of the surrounding homes |
| | balance between the availability of housing and existing environment is already achieved by availability of R-C2 for Brentwood |
| | need to permit housing that fits neighbourhood's histories than is currently proposed for this application |
| | inserting row housing/townhomes into a street of bungalows, split levels and two-storey homes would be an eyesore |
| | M-CG could be up to 40 feet high with 10 dwelling units between 2 bungalows - destroy the character of the neighbourhood |
| | |
| Density | The city is now exploring R-CG blanket zoning so the application for M-CG on 2936 Blakiston Dr NW does not make sense as this parcel is suitable for the current secondary suite or perhaps a duplex. |
| | Brentwood has played its role in helping to densify the city (5 towers at Brentwood Mall) |
| | do not want a high density building between two homes |
| | We are not opposed to increasing density such as through secondary suites, but we are a RC-1 designated zone. |
| | We are densified in Brentwood and we have multiple apartment complexes, secondary suites, 3 story town houses and 4 large condo complexes that were built within the last 8 years. |
| | Duplexes and basement suites are fine, but high density in this area is not. |
| | We have multiple apartment building complexes to the West of our property across the street near the park that are 2 story buildings. We are NOT against densification and secondary suites in homes. We are against the proposed land use as it would mean there would be a possibility of 10 dwelling units on a property that now has 2 dwelling units. |
| | negative affect on other residents by overpopulating such a small area |
| | increased noise |
| | our residential neighbourhoods do not have the infrastructure of roads and services to accommodate the higher population density |
| | a duplex or triplex would be acceptable but anything more would be ridiculous |
| | |
| Affordability | While affordable housing is a goal of all cities in Canada, creating a multi-residential dwelling in the middle of an inner-city community close to its university does not help this goal, all it creates is an expensive dwelling affordable by only a small portion of the population, the opposite of what affordable house means. If this development is allowed to be built, it displaces housing that many students rely on to be close to the university in basement suites and rented rooms/dwellings. |
| | This property currently holds a secondary suite which meets the City's criteria for affordable housing. We are very supportive of and embrace affordable secondary suites in the Brentwood community such as the proposed #DP2024-02037 at 3711 Bell St NW just around the corner from Blakiston Dr. We have many secondary suites on our street that house University students. |
| | may detract from the overall appeal of the area and contribute to property value depreciation |
| | |
| Traffic | Brentwood Blvd already a very busy cut through street |
| | development will increase traffic |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | more traffic |
| Property Value | concerned with what the effect on our property value may be with high walls tight to bungalows |
| | With the building of a possible 40-foot structure beside our home, which is a bungalow, we are concerned about our resale value. The owner's decision to develop his property should not be allowed to impact the value of the home within the vicinity of his development. Adjacent property owners are concerned that having a 40 foot or 12-meter-high building beside their bungalow will negatively impact the value of their homes. |
| | This project is inappropriate in this location and likely would result in a decrease in value of the neighbouring properties. |
| | <p>With the building of a possible 40-foot structure beside our home, which is a bungalow, we are concerned about our resale value. The owner's decision to develop his property should not be allowed to impact the value of the home within the vicinity of his development. Adjacent property owners are concerned that having a 40 foot or 12-meter-high building beside their bungalow will negatively impact the value of their homes.</p> <p>Having a 40-foot building/12-meter-high potentially 10 dwelling unit building will negatively impact their ability to sell in the future as who will want to live beside that large of a building in a neighborhood that is not developed in that way.</p> <p>We planned on retiring in Brentwood as it is a community that values families, neighbors and</p> <p>Now we are concerned that if we may have to sell our property, we won't be able to because we will have an apartment style building next to our lot.</p> |
| | ... the presence of mature trees in a neighborhood is associated with increased property values. Preserving trees could not only benefit residents' well-being but also potentially maintain or even increase property values. |
| | development should not be allowed to impact the value of a nearby home |
| | development will affect property values |
| | property value and curb appeal for other residents will be compromised |
| | decrease the value of the neighbouring homes; would not want to live next to this proposed M-CG development |
| | inappropriate location and likely would result in a decrease in value of the neighbouring homes |
| Infrastructure | There are already 6 high rise apartments with no additional infrastructure |
| | Our residential neighbourhoods do not have the infrastructure of roads and services (including schools) to accommodate the increased population. There are numerous new areas that can be properly planned and serviced to accommodate higher population density. |
| | They will create so much congestion, overcrowding in schools. Also overcrowding of public transportation with the possibility of even more nefarious activity, more traffic (we already are seeing traffic snarls on side roads). |

**Legal Precedent and
Relevance**

Several legal precedents support the protection of mature trees and established neighborhoods during the rezoning process:

- **Balancing Economic Benefits vs. Tree Preservation:** In *City of Piedmont vs. Piedmont Residents Association* (1980), the court ruled that the importance of preserving mature trees with historical significance must be weighed against the potential economic benefits of development. This case, while specific to historical trees, establishes the principle of balancing economic gain with environmental value. In our case, the mature trees in Brentwood, even if not historically significant, provide substantial environmental benefits that should be weighed against any potential economic gains from the rezoning.
- **Protecting Neighborhood Character:** In *San Mateo County Coastal Land Use Commission vs. Nollan* (1987), the Supreme Court of the United States limited the government's ability to impose conditions on development approvals that are not directly related to the impacts of the development itself. This case highlights the importance of ensuring that the proposed rezoning addresses a legitimate governmental interest and does not unfairly burden existing residents. Here, the City should demonstrate how the rezoning proposal directly benefits the community and how any potential negative impacts, like loss of trees, will be mitigated. These legal precedents establish a framework for considering the environmental and social costs of development alongside economic benefits.

Additional Supporting Arguments:

- **Mental and Physical Health Benefits of Nature:** The book *"The Nature Fix: Why Nature Makes Us Happier, Healthier, and More Creative"* by Florence Williams highlights the numerous mental and physical health benefits associated with access to nature, including mature trees. Residents' well-being should be a significant factor in the rezoning decision.
- **Property Value Impact of Trees:** A study published in the journal *"Landscape and Urban Planning"* titled *"Impact of Urban Trees on Rental Prices of Apartments"* (2010) found that the presence of mature trees in a neighborhood is associated with increased property values. Preserving trees could not only benefit residents' well-being but also potentially maintain or even increase property values.



Community Outreach Assessment Tool

The City has created this optional assessment tool which is designed to help you navigate the decision to undertake outreach and provides guidance on high-level outreach considerations based on the impact of your proposed project and the community complexity.

When filling this out, it can be helpful to do some initial research into past projects in the area as this will help inform your answers for more accurate results. Also, ensure when you are answering these that you are putting yourself in the shoes of the community. Remember that how you answer today, is reflective of the context of today and isn't a guarantee that no issues will arise in the future as you move through your process.

| COMMUNITY IMPACT | 1 Point | 2 Points | 3 Points | Enter Values |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| How similar is your project to what already exists in the community? | Similar projects exist in the community and is a low level of change for community. | Community is not that familiar with this project type and will be a moderate change. | Major change or redevelopment being proposed and likely a big change for the community. | 3 <input type="text"/> |
| What is the duration of your project (to occupancy)? | Under 2 years | 3 - 5 years | 5 + years | 1 <input type="text"/> |
| How broadly will this project impact the surrounding community? | Likely to affect immediate neighbours. | Could have an impact within a few blocks. | Likely to have an impact community - wide. | 3 <input type="text"/> |
| How common is redevelopment within the community? | Redevelopment is common in community. | Moderate redevelopment has occurred. | Little to no redevelopment has occurred. | 3 <input type="text"/> |
| TOTAL | | | | 10 |
| COMMUNITY COMPLEXITY | 1 Point | 2 Points | 3 Points | Enter Values |
| How do you anticipate the community will react to this project? | Little attention - project unlikely to be a public issue. | Anticipate there will be some attention. Disagreement or differing opinions are expected. | Anticipate this to be a highly sensitive issue. | 3 <input type="text"/> |
| How inclined will the community be to accept this project? | Likely minimal to no issues anticipated. | Some issues anticipated. | Many issues are anticipated. | 3 <input type="text"/> |
| What level of influence does the community have over project decisions? | No decisions open for input, willing to inform the community of project details. | Willing to listen to community and learn about their ideas and respond where possible | Willing to collect input to influence specific project decisions. | 3 <input type="text"/> |
| TOTAL | | | | 9 |

IMPACT SCORE

| | |
|----------|---|
| 4 to 6 | 1 |
| 7 to 9 | 2 |
| 10 to 12 | 3 |

COMPLEXITY SCORE

| | |
|--------|---|
| 3 to 5 | A |
| 6 to 9 | B |

| COMMUNITY IMPACT | COMMUNITY COMPLEXITY | |
|------------------|----------------------|----|
| | 3A | 3B |
| 2A | | |
| 1A | | |

Your Project's Score:

3 B

| Outreach Approach Assessment | |
|---|--|
| Direct approach (1A, 1B) | Your project is likely of low impact to the community and is not proposing a major change or disruption. For higher complexity, you may have to put a bit more effort in developing content to educate and inform The community about your project details. Consider choosing 2 - 3 tactics suited for a targeted audience*. |
| Moderate approach (2A, 3A) | Your project is of medium to high impact for the community, but is not very complex and likely little attention and/or issues are expected. Given the level of impact consider expanding your reach beyond the immediate neighbours to inform them of the project details and collect input if needed. Consider choosing 4 - 6 tactics for a range of targeted and broader audiences* |
| Comprehensive approach (2B, 3B) | Your project is of medium to high impact for the community, and of higher complexity. There are likely issues that will need to be mitigated and addressed and extra effort will be needed to educate and inform the community about your project. Consider a broader approach with the community and be open to an iterative process with multiple tactics where input could help inform better decisions*. |

*For an overview of outreach tactics and techniques you could consider, click [here](#).

calgary.ca/planningoutreach

19-00155896