



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 LOC 2023-0078 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 amendenment LOC2023 0078 Sep 10 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 31, 2024

ATT: City of Calgary Councillors
City of Calgary
800 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M'
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

RE: Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2023-0078, Location 3216 30 St SW

Dear Councillors,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed Land Use Amendments on the property listed above. I understand the rationale of bringing new housing development options to the neighborhood but the developer's land application is unclear in what they are asking for and, in fact, no more clear than it was when this was proposed in May 2023. I believe this application should be denied and re-submitted once a more firm plan is available for review by the community.

I have several concerns about R-CG rezoning in the neighborhood as follows:

1. Parking – this is a 50' lot, the maximum amount of reasonable parking that could be supported is 4-5 parking stalls. Any new build should be restricted to a size that supports 1 dedicated off-street parking spot per unit. I have noticed that there are already many people who park on the street in the community. Adding households without ample parking will increase the number of vehicles parked on 30th street and will reduce the amount of on street parking for the guests of current residents and the residents themselves.
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. The developer claims there are many bus routes along Richmond Road – this is not true, there are 2 buses that run, one that runs the length of Richmond Road and one that turns onto Sarcee Road, but they only service certain 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.
3. Difference of scale – the current properties in the neighborhood that sit on +/-0.070 hectare lots are bungalow and 2-story attached homes. It is unacceptable to expect to locate townhouse/row housing wedged in between two homes whether bungalow or 2-story attached. This type of proposed build belongs on a corner lot.
4. Housing at the back of the lots – Any proposed 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 backyards and backyard facing rooms, 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. Some of these residents have been in the neighborhood for decades and have earned their right to privacy.

5. Light pollution – the application references townhouse style housing. In the case that these types of developments have requirements for common lighting that would turn on in evening and shut off in morning, it would cause light pollution for neighbors into their back facing rooms.
6. Back alley – The back alleys where carports or garages will be located are busy and narrow. If the developer proposes a carport rather than garages, has the developer completed a study as to whether a vehicle can safely turn into a 5-vehicle carport based on the width of the laneways? I am concerned that the increased traffic will increase safety risks to drivers and pedestrians as residents go into the lane to access waste and recycling.
7. Waste and recycling – How does the developer propose to manage waste and recycling for a multi-unit development – there is not enough space in the back lane to put more than 2 sets of waste, recycling, compost bins. There is not enough space in the back lane for the vehicles required to pick up apartment style waste, recycling and compost bins if that is the route the developer goes. If the developer does not put large enough bins there will be garbage overflowing (I have found from experience that renters take less care than owners about overflowing garbage), making a mess of back lanes and causing scavenging animals to make further mess.
8. Old growth trees – There are a number of old, and beautiful trees on the property and the proposed build would remove many of these during construction, negatively impacting the neighborhood, privacy 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.

Overall, this applicant has provided no details or plan as to how they plan to develop this property and nothing meaningful for the community to comment on. Town/row house developments are too large for the location proposed and do 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 and thereby respecting privacy; are restricted to 2 storeys that may or may not include basement suites which will not block sunlight or change sightlines; and, minimize removal of old growth trees.

I respectfully request that the City reject this re-zoning proposal until such time as the developer provides more details about the style and scope of the development that community residents can comment on so that we can ensure that the development that takes into consideration and is respectful of the current structure of the community and current residents.

Thank you,

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 29th Street and now on 30th 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 29th 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 30th 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 30th Street property is kitty corner across the back alley from the 29th 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 29th 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 33rd Avenue and 29th 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 29th Street and 30th 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 26th 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