



## 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] Pamela

Last name [required] Young

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] Sep 10, 2024

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

[required] - max 75 characters LOC2024-0101 Comments due Sep 3 yet agenda not available until Sep 5

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



## Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

---

ATTACHMENT\_01\_FILENAME

Opposition to land use amendment LOC2024-0101 Sep10 2024.docx

---

ATTACHMENT\_02\_FILENAME

---

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

---

---

Pamela Young  
3209 29 Street SW  
Calgary, AB T3E 2L2

August 30, 2024

ATTN: City of Calgary Councillors  
City of Calgary  
Calgary, AB

**RE: Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2024-0101, Location 3207 29 St SW**

Dear Councillors,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed Land Use Amendments on the property listed above based on the developer's current plan. I understand the rationale of bringing new housing development options to the neighborhood, but the developer's current plans are excessive compared with other developments in the community.

I have several concerns about the development based on the current plan as follows:

1. **Parking** – the proposed developments allow for 0.5 parking stalls per household and therefore does not include ample parking for the number of households considered in the development. The City's own data<sup>1</sup> shows an historical household automobile ownership rate of 1.85 per household as of 2011. Data does not support the proposition that smaller dwelling units have no need for parking and Calgary does not have adequate transit infrastructure which would impact the use of fewer vehicles. The number and size of these units indicate that there will likely be an additional 10 cars parked on the street. There are many rental bungalows across the street with people renting upstairs and downstairs units and the street is full of parked cars daily. Also, once the approved HGO development at 3206, 29 St SW across the street goes in there will be no parking available on the block. Adding households without ample parking will increase the number of vehicles parked on 29<sup>th</sup> street, will reduce the amount of on street parking for the guests of current residents and the residents themselves. This is unreasonable and this development should be restricted to the number of units that provide a minimum of 1 car parking spot per unit.
2. **Access to amenities** – While there are some amenities in the immediate vicinity of the properties, amenities like grocery stores, restaurants and recreational facilities are not within reasonable walking distance. For a person moving quickly it is a minimum of 20 minutes to grocery stores, that increases for people with armloads of groceries. Transit options are available but only service certain amenities and areas and can significantly increase travelling time for residents who do not own a vehicle. This will inconvenience these residents and impact their quality of life. Transit does not go to Killarney Aquatic & Recreation Centre, it is a 16 min walk, and does not go to hockey arenas nearby. Anyone looking to travel outside of downtown,

---

<sup>1</sup> Changing Travel Behaviour, October 2013

Lakeview or Westhills is looking at two or more buses. This development should be restricted to a size that provides a minimum of 1 car parking spot per unit.

3. **Affordability** – The application addresses “missing middle” housing and discusses affordability. I have reviewed EC Living’s rental rates online for similar units prices start at \$1,699 for one-bedroom units and increase to \$3,999 for 3 BR with garages. This unit will displace 2 families living upstairs and in the basement of the current bungalow and replace it with something that will cost even more in rent.
4. **Difference of scale** – the current properties in the neighborhood are bungalow and 2-story attached homes. The proposed height of the buildings in the proposed development is 12 meters/3 storey and will not only change the visual perspective of the neighborhood but will also impact privacy, block sunlight, and change sightlines for other residents in the neighborhood.
5. **Privacy** - The proposed 2-story housing units at the back of the lots will remove privacy for properties adjacent to and across the lane from these buildings. They will have a view directly into adjacent home backyard facing rooms and block sunlight in adjacent yards, in some cases looking into living rooms, kitchens and master bedrooms. This will impact privacy and quality of life for the residents in the adjacent properties. Buildings should be restricted to the front of the lot with enough parking allocated to 1 car parking spot per unit.
6. **Back Alley** – The back alley where the carport will be located are busy and narrow. Putting 5 parking spots on a 50-foot-wide lot is going to make it very difficult for vehicles to turn into those spots in a narrow back lane. With the added difficulty of snow rutted lanes in winter it is even more difficult to navigate into tight spots. I am concerned that the increased traffic will increase safety risk to drivers and pedestrians as residents go into the lane to access waste and recycling bins. If spots are too tight to turn into that will lead to parking on the street. This development should be restricted to the number of units that provide a minimum of 1 car parking spot per unit.
7. **Waste and recycling bins** – I don’t see how there is enough space allocated for 30 extra bins on the property. The drawings indicate that they are lined up beside the carport. How are those to be moved out to the lane on pick up days? With the lack of space I suspect, as is evidenced in other areas around Killarney, they will be lined up in front of carports and all cars will be parked on the street. Walk past many of the corner lot 4-row houses in the neighborhood and you’ll see that 12 bins are lined up in front of garages and all cars are parked on the road, not just on pick up days, every day.
8. **Strain on existing infrastructure and services** - The HGO designation assumes existing infrastructure can support increased density, but there will be impacts on sewer and water infrastructure, schools, parks, transit, and emergency services. A recent study conducted by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities found that \$1M per 100m will be required for infrastructure upgrades if single detached dwellings are replaced by 4-6 plexes This equates to 150K\$/per house replaced. Who will pay for the infrastructure upgrades needed to meet the needs of these oversized builds? Not the developer, I’m sure! This build should be restricted to the front of the lot with a minimum of 1 car parking spot per unit.
9. **Old growth trees** – There are old, and beautiful trees on the property and the proposed build would remove these during construction, negatively impacting the neighborhood and the wildlife that reside in them. While there may be a requirement to replace trees, new growth will take a long time to grow to the same standard. This runs directly counter to Calgary’s stated climate change goals.

Overall, the proposed development is too large for the location proposed and does not take into consideration the current structure of the community. A more realistic development would provide a minimum of 1 off street parking spot per household; consist of buildings that are at the front half of the lot only thereby respecting privacy of current residents; are restricted to a size that may or may not include basement suites which will not block sunlight; address ample waste removal space; and minimize removal of old growth trees.

I respectfully request that the City reject this re-zoning proposal and look at a more suitable development that takes into consideration and is respectful of the current structure of the community.

Thankyou,

Pamela Young





## 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]

Shaun

Last name [required]

Alsford

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]

Sep 10, 2024

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

[required] - max 75 characters

Notice of Public Hearing on Planning Matters

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

In opposition



## Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

---

ATTACHMENT\_01\_FILENAME

03 septembre 2024 City Council.docx

---

ATTACHMENT\_02\_FILENAME

---

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

---

---

Shaun K. Alford  
625 Killarney Glen Court SW  
Calgary AB T3E 7H4  
Email: [REDACTED]

Attention: Calgary City Council

Re: Objection to Land Use Redesignation for:

1. LOC2023-0078 (Bylaw 242D2024)  
3216 – 30 Street SW (Plan 978GN, Block C, Lot 13)
2. LOC2024-0101 (Bylaw 241D2024)  
3207 – 29 Street SW (Plan 5435AV, Block 3C, Lots 3 and 4) from Direct Control (DC)  
District to Housing – Grade Oriented (H-GO) District)

Good morning, Members of Calgary City Council.

I am writing to you once again to state my objection of the above-mentioned Land Use Redesignation requests. My major concern remains the attempts by developers to place too many residences on the single, mid-block lots along 29<sup>th</sup> Street and now on 30<sup>th</sup> Street SW, which do not reflect the family oriented style and design of my neighbourhood. There are simply too many unknowns that could adversely affect my neighbourhood for me to be comfortable with any land redesignation that would allow more than the current use for single family, semi-detached or duplex constructions that observe a maximum height of ten meters.

The current development guidelines for Land Use Redesignation state a maximum height of 11 meters, or one meter taller than exists currently in my neighbourhood, and with a maximum density of FIVE units for the 0,7 hectare lots. The challenge I have with this is what is considered a UNIT? The developer for the lot on 29<sup>th</sup> Street, has re-submitted an application with very little change to their first proposal which has already been denied once. They hope to place five rowhouses (three front and two at the back of the lot), plus lower suites for each with 0,5 parking available, all on a lot in the middle of a residential block that backs onto an unpaved back alley. By my count, this amounts to TEN residences., but only five units? The same applies to plans for the property on 30<sup>th</sup> Street, again, mid-block, although what exactly is planned for the property is not clearly outlined, and this is where the problem for my neighbourhood resides. Not knowing. Furthermore, the 30<sup>th</sup> Street property is kitty corner across the back alley from the 29<sup>th</sup> Street property. This could mean a crowded potential of TWENTY residences barely a hundred meters apart. Again, looking at the potential that we face when confronted with the maximums of the plan.

When applying the maximums to community development, they should be used judiciously as guidelines as to what is appropriate for any given area rather than hard fast rules. This is practical and respectful. We do not drive the maximum of 80 km/hr. on Crowchild after a first major snow storm. The maximum is a maximum only when conditions are ideal and needs to be adjusted when they are not. The same principle needs to be applied when making decisions on community development. Now, I did read on the city website that if an application is approved, the overall building mix, design, size, site layout and other details such as parking, site access and landscaping would be determined at the development permit stage. Again, who decides this? The community members, someone downtown, or the developers themselves? My end of 29<sup>th</sup> Street is far from a main street despite many efforts to convince us otherwise. It is a residential street where row housing simply does not fit. Furthermore, a mere block or two away, on the south side corner of 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and 29<sup>th</sup> Street, there is a proposed development that will entail hundreds of residences, at another cost to the green space in my community, I might add, and another a few blocks east of here, again with hundreds of residences proposed. Is it really necessary to allow developers to over develop single, mid-block lots in the meantime?



Redesignation opens the door to this possibility, that developers will more than gladly take advantage of, simply because they can regardless of the impact on my community.

Finally, my neighbours and I are fully cognizant of the need for increased housing in this city, however, it cannot be at the cost of a community or a neighbourhood. My community of Killarney has been proactive for more than a decade in focusing on gradual and sustainable densification. I would like to see this trend continue, of course, with the caveats being gradual and sustainable. Gradual ensures that our aging infrastructure beneath the streets can sustain the increase without issue. Case in point, within months of the H-GO plan being passed, my community had a significant sewer break between 29<sup>th</sup> Street and 30<sup>th</sup> Street that took three weeks to repair due, I suspect, to the rabid development being undertaken on both of these streets as well as along 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue. We were the canary in the coal mine for what I suspect is our current issues with our water mains. Too much and too fast, something that I, and many others, have already brought to City Council's attention in previous submissions. Since the city has planned two massive developments within a kilometer or two of each other already in my neighbourhood, there really is no need to over reach on the two properties currently being considered for redesignation, and certainly not to open the door to a potential ten residences per lot. Please, deny the redesignation application, H-GO district or not.

Sincerely,

Shaun K. Alford