

# Applicant Outreach Summary

2024 August 15



As part of the Land Use Redesignation application for the addresses 115 & 121 21 Avenue NE (LOC2024-0135), our team conducted a community outreach campaign in the community of Tucedo Park from May 1, 2024 to July 12, 2024. Even though the feedback timeline for this outreach campaign has ended, we continue with signage on-site to allow for more constituents to express their thoughts on the proposed land use change. Any comments received after the end of the community outreach but prior to the Development Permit release of this project will be valued and accounted for throughout this project's design phase.

To ensure a broad number of participants reached, this campaign counted with online and on-site advertisement. In addition, our team has reached out to the Tucedo Community Association to better understand their concerns and thoughts. Below are detailed explanations of the methods utilized and the results collected through each of them.

## ONLINE ADVERTISEMENT

Throughout 39 days of online advertisement on Facebook and Instagram, 4,792 people were reached. The promoted post informed people of the land use redesignation of the addresses in question from M-C1 to M-C2 and the intention of developing a complex of 60 apartment style units, a rooftop patio, and one level of underground parking.

The ad also contained a link to a Google Form for participants to leave their feedback on the proposal, 222 people reached by the ad clicked on the link.

## ON-SITE SIGNAGE

On May 01, 2024, a sign advertising the proposed land use redesignation was posted at 121 21 Avenue NE, the sign is still on-site.

The sign includes information on the zoning change being proposed, on the future proposed development, and three ways constituents can submit their input - through the QR that takes participants to a Google Form, an email address, and a website where information regarding the project and feedback submission space can be found.

## POSTCARDS DISTRIBUTION

To ensure that those who live within a 200m radius of the site are aware of the proposal, postcards containing the same information and methods of feedback submission as the signage posted on-site were distributed on May 9, 2024.



**PROPOSED LAND-USE CHANGE**  
115 & 121 21 Avenue NE, Calgary, AB

**SCAN ME**

Questions?  
Email us at:  
projects@prohomesab.com

We are proposing a Land Use Redesignation at 115 & 121 21 AV NE to transition the land use from the existing M-C1 District to a M-C2 District.

The proposed land use change would enable a development vision that includes a total of 60 apartment style units within a 4-storey building, counting with one level of underground parking. The proposal would allow for a variety of unit layouts ranging from one bedroom units to two bedrooms + den units.

We want to hear from you! Please reach out via email, or take part in our survey at the QR code provided.

**Urban Avas**

### TUXEDO PARK COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Our team has reached out to the Tuxedo Park CA regarding this Land Use Change on April 23, 2024. On June 3, 2024, we heard back from Arnie Brownlees, the Director of Tuxedo Park Community Association.

On their email, they mentioned that the CA is generally supportive of higher density development in close proximity to Centre Street, as is the case with this proposal. However, the scale of this proposal is larger than what they would typically see at this location. They also shared some general comments, which are listed below.

1. "We expect adequate parking for all of the units proposed. Although a parkade is included in the concept, the number of parking spots could be increased or units decreased. People may have great intentions to use transit but ultimately cars will end up using already tight street parking."
2. "The height of the building will create shadow concerns from adjacent properties. We would expect a study done on this with engagement with the adjacent owners. The CA is generally sensitive to the concerns of adjacent property owners in these situations."
3. "We would expect some kind of communal black/blue/green carts for these larger developments. Numerous carts looks very disorganized as we have seen at similar developments."
4. "Wish to see some type of protocol for exterior maintenance, appearance and landscaping. Similar developments are often looking somewhat unkept and disorganized with no obligation of owners to arrange a condo board or combine efforts to cut grass or shovel snow, etc."
5. "Wish to see quality architectural design with concrete steps and practical landscaping. The red brick features on the conceptual drawing are appealing and would definitely add to the quality appearance."

The comments shared by the CA, alongside all comments received by members of the community, were extremely helpful to our design team to put the final details on the Development Permit plans submitted through the DP2024-04669. On June 17, 2024, our team got back to the CA with an item per item response, as listed below, and a Mass & Shadow Study to better illustrate the impacts of the proposed development on the nearby properties.

1. "Our team understands how parking has been a challenge in the City of Calgary lately. We are working on a DP for these parcels (I'll share the DP number as soon as I have it) and the drawings include the amount of parking stalls and bike storage required as per bylaw. At this moment, we

- do not seek any relaxation on parking or bike storage.”
2. “The building we are working on proposing on a DP will be 4 stories high with a rooftop amenity space. Which is one story lower than the building on the corner of Centre St and 20 AV, about 1.5 stories higher than the building across from the back alley from our properties, and about 2.5 stories higher than the building on the corner of Center St and 21 AV. We have requested a massing study and we can share it once it is ready.”
  3. “For this project, we have on the plans the Molok system being proposed. We have used this system before and we really like how clean, organized, and odor-free the system is. It’s a semi-underground system and the bins would be located on private property (nothing in the back-alley) and a private collection company is used for the collections. Please see links below for more reference on what these bins look like.  
<https://www.molok.com/molok-products/molokdomino>”
  4. “Ensuring developments are well maintained is a key element for neighbourhoods! We are 100% on board. Our team works with cementitious board materials and other exterior finishes that are low maintenance and have their quality look maintained for longer, to ensure that the building looks good for longer and that we are able to cope with maintenance. Also, landscaping is designed within the draught resilient guidelines from the City to ensure all plantings are in good shape throughout the year.”
  5. “The conceptual drawings we provided are very close to what we are working on in the DP drawings. In all our developments practically ensuring the building maintenance can be coped with during the life of the building is a key element for our team. We believe low maintenance costs and longer life-span of construction are vital for affordability and sustainable building.”

#### COLLECTED FEEDBACK SUMMARY

With the outreach strategies in place, our team managed to collect great information from the community in regards to the land use change and the future development. Below is a summary of the key points raised by participants.

- 81.8% of all participants live in Tuxedo Park;
- Participants were asked if they are familiar with the current zoning (M-C1) and the proposed one (M-C2), to which 72.7% of participants answered “Yes, I understand what kind of development they support and the differences between zoning” and 27.3% answered “No I’m not quite sure what they mean”;
- Concerns regarding the amount of on-site parking were mentioned by 9.09% of participants, and 27.28% had concerns regarding adequate parking within the new proposed development;
- 31.82% of participants mentioned the density increase as a non-fitting aspect of the proposal within the neighbourhood;
- During the outreach, 9.09% of participants rose concerns regarding the potential new development blocking sunlight on adjacent properties, other 9.1% had concerns regarding blocking the view of adjacent properties, and 4.55% had concerns with noise increase;
- 13.64% of participants mentioned traffic increase as a concern;
- Some participants, 4.55%, have also brought up devaluing surrounding neighbourhoods as a concern.
- Comments on how the concept shown looks commercial and very standard by 9.09% of participants;

A map contextualizing the surroundings for the parcel in question was provided, please see map



below for reference, and the following feedback was collected.

- 54.54% thought the proximity to a Main Street (Centre St) was very fitting to the land use change proposal, 27.28% thought that the proximity was not quite fitting for the land use change proposal, and 18.18% were not convinced it was neither very fitting nor not quite fitting.
- 54.54% thought the proximity to shops, restaurants, etc was very fitting to the land use change proposal, 22.73% thought that the proximity was not quite fitting for the land use change proposal, and 22.72% were not convinced it was neither very fitting nor not quite fitting.
- 59.09% thought the proximity to bus routes/stops was very fitting to the land use change proposal, 27.28% thought that the proximity was not quite fitting for the land use change proposal, and 13.63% were not convinced it was neither very fitting nor not quite fitting.
- 27.28% thought the streetscaping on 3 AV NW was very fitting to the land use change proposal, 59.09% thought that the streetscaping was not quite fitting for the land use change proposal, and 13.63% were not convinced it was neither very fitting nor not quite fitting.
- 31.82% thought the nearby residential developments were very fitting to the land use change proposal, 59.09% thought that the nearby residential developments were not quite fitting for the land use change proposal, and 9.09% were not convinced it was neither very fitting nor not quite fitting.
- 27.28% thought the City's infrastructure is very fitting to the land use change proposal, 50% thought that the City's infrastructure is not quite fitting for the land use change proposal, and 22.72% were not convinced it was neither very fitting nor not quite fitting.

During the outreach, questions regarding the concept of the proposed development - items asked are listed below - were also asked and, in average, 22.75% were pleased, 27.26% had neutral feedback, and 49.99% were not so happy with the aspects shown in the rendering.



Aspects asked to participants were:

- Façade Look
- Overall Height
- Colour Selections
- Exterior Finishing Materials
- Landscaping

The inputs received during this community outreach advertisement period brought a lot of insightful and valuable comments to our team. Based on the feedback received, our team has ordered a parking study for the project to better understand the effects the proposed development in the neighbourhood.

Our team will also remain in touch with participants that accepted to receive communication from us regarding this LOC through follow up emails that outline the feedback received and changes the project went through based on them.

### CONTEXTUAL MAP PRESENTED TO PARTICIPANTS

