



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] Darrel

Last name [required] Purdy

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] Feb 4, 2025

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

[required] - max 75 characters Opposition to LOC2023-0257 Redesignation of 11 Block of 8 St SE to H-GO

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



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

Letter to Council & City Planning Regarding H-GO Application on 8 St & Maggie St SE.docx

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

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

We ask that City Council review the attached letter and take this into consideration when making a decision regarding Land Redesignation to H-GO for portions of the 1100 block of 8 St & Maggie St SE as per LOC2023-0257

Re: Proposed Redesignation of Lots 1115 to 1125 8 St SE to H-GO Land use redesignation – (shown on city development as LOC2023-0257 for lots 1111 to 1125 8 St SE & 1120 Maggie St SE)

My wife and I attended an information open house regarding a change of land use application for Lots 1115 to 1125 8 Street SE on September 26, 2024. The presenter stated that the current application was to redesignate the lands to H-GO allowing for greater density and taller structures than what would be allowed under the city-wide R-CG designation. We are writing to state we are strongly opposed to the redesignation to H-GO for these lots, or any lots on this block of 8 Street and Maggie Street SE.

The presenter indicated that the current land owners would like the H-GO designation to allow for 12-meter-high buildings compared to, what we understand, is an 11-meter constraint under the R-CG designation. From a brief review of the drawings posted at the open house it would appear this proposed 12-meter height was relative to Maggie Street, but 8 Street is 2-4 meters lower than Maggie Street (depending where on the block the elevations are taken) and thus the proposed building height, relative to 8 Street would be ~3-5 meter above what is allowed under the R-CG designation! While the revised proposal is a significant improvement from the previously proposed monstrosity, it still feels out of context with the surrounding dwellings. Permitting the construction of what could be 13-15 meter tall buildings (relative to 8 Street) in the heart of a heritage community of mostly single-family dwellings will, in our opinion, have significant negative impact on the enjoyment of peoples properties near this development in terms of loss of privacy, garden shadowing, significant increased parking congestion (given the relaxation in parking requirements for developments near LRT stations) traffic congestion and noise to offsetting homeowners, some of whom have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in restoring and upgrading their homes in keeping with the beautiful historical character of the neighborhood. It is also unfairly punitive to and shows little regard for those early adopters, who took the risk of investing in Ramsay well before the current level of gentrification or the Green Line was conceived.

The drawing at the open house indicated a plan, on what is currently just two single family homes, to develop 28 units but with only 14 parking stalls under the buildings. Maggie Street is very narrow (essentially a back lane) with very limited parking and the parking on 8 Street is already very limited with the single-family homes on the street (see the attached photo). It is not realistic to expect half of the units will go without at least one personal vehicle and so the negative impact on parking will be felt well beyond the frontage associated with the proposed development. We urge the city to require a much higher percentage of parking stalls per units developed. Without additional required parking by the developer this will again negatively impact the neighborhood and the associated value of our properties.

It is our belief that the existing land owners will still have the opportunity to realize a significant profit in redeveloping these lands under the city-wide R-CG designation without excessive negative impact to **their neighbor's** home value and quality of life. This is demonstrated given the "Black and White" townhouse development on the 1700 block of 8 Street SE, which are currently under construction. These units will be just 2½ stories tall (2 stories with shallow basement to allow for larger basement windows). We therefore urge to city to NOT allow for these lands to be redesignated to H-GO.

We would also like to point out that the September 26, 2024 open house presentation was for the replacement of just two single family homes with a 28-unit development. Yet we understand the proposed land use designation application is for a total of 8 lots (1111, 1113, 1115, 1117, 1121, 1123, 1125 – 8 Street SE & 1120 Maggie Street SE). Obviously, if the 8 lots in the redesignation application are approved this could result in significantly more development with the impacts noted above multiplied further. From our perspective the open house presentation for two lots appears to be a ploy by the land owners to suggest the redesignation and H-GO development was regarding just two lots but clearly the plan is for a much larger development. We further suspect that this is a ‘foot in the door’ approach, given that once a portion of the lands are developed to H-GO density, its much easier to recommend a step up to higher density for the remaining offsetting land parcel.

While we understand City Council’s desire to increase density, there are many more thoughtful ways to go about accomplishing this objective without such deleterious impact to offsetting property owners, who for the most part, are low-rise single-family homes interspersed with 2 – 3 level multi- family dwellings. Larger plots of land such as the recently demolished Lilydale facility coupled with the space provided by the Shamrock offer a much more harmonious option to have higher density street side on 11th St., stepping down to medium and lower density at the perimeter of the space thus allowing friendlier neighborhood integration. Such an opportunity will also exist in and around the bus barns at the end of the McDonald Street bridge as changes are made for the green line development or the proposed redevelopment of the Brewery Lands. It’s not like the current zoning is inhibiting densification, as demonstrated by the 2½ story tall re-development of the Black and White convenient store site (on the SE corner of 8th St. and 17th Ave.). The city-wide blanket R-GC rezoning will also gradually bring up the baseline density for the rest of the neighbourhood. Finally, based on previous community consultations regarding redevelopment in the area, we were under the impression, that it was intended that 11th Street would be the “main street” of Ramsay and that higher intensity development would be encouraged along this corridor, closer to the green line station. Is it really necessary that the single family homes of 9th and 10th Streets become an island sandwiched between the high-density plans of 11th (new firehall with apartment style housing) and potential 12-14-meter-tall condo/apartment blocks on 8th Street?

With the assumption that the Green Line LRT will eventually be built via the currently proposed routing through Ramsay, when you are making your decision, please keep in mind that having an LRT station in your backyard perhaps isn’t the “be all, end all” dream for residents that Council contends it is. Many inner -city residents chose their communities because they were already motivated to walk/cycle to work and recreation and comfortable sourcing their needs within their community. They see the convenience of the LRT mostly benefiting those commuting from suburbia while inner city neighbourhoods are the first to be burdened with densification targets whilst shouldering higher relative property taxes with older infrastructure and navigating the safety issues associated with intensifying social problems spilling out of downtown.

We need to strike a compromise between the need for increased housing density and wiping out the fabric and character of neighborhoods. When we walk through our neighborhood, we can tell by the numerous basement and secondary suites, the over garage developments, the multifamily

developments and the development of the Black and White and Penguin car wash sites that we are doing our part.

As stated above, we urge to city to NOT allow for these lands to be redesignated to H-GO.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lisa Moffat and Darrel Purdy

Photo of west side of 1100 block of 8 Street SE in front of proposed redevelopment





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]

Raissa

Last name [required]

Espiritu

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]

Feb 4, 2025

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

[required] - max 75 characters

Land Use Amendment Application LOC2023-0257 - 8 St. SE and Maggie St. SE

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

In opposition



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

Gmail - RE_ Land Use and Policy Amendment at 1117, 1121, 1123, 1125 - 8 Street SE and 1120 Maggie Street SE (LOC2023-0257).pdf

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

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

I am writing to provide feedback regarding the proposed land use amendment for the site at 8 Street SE and Maggie Street SE and the revised application, including its transition to a Direct Control (DC) District based on the Housing – Grade-Oriented (H-GO) District. While I appreciate the adjustments made to reduce height and density compared to the original Multi-Residential – Medium Profile (M-X2) proposal, I have several concerns regarding the flexibility that a Direct Control District introduces and its potential impact on the community.

Key Concerns:

Potential Ambiguity in Guidelines - The revised DC District mentions encouraging pedestrian-friendly design and maintaining the historical character of the neighborhood. However, terms like "encourages" can lack enforceability. I urge the City to include binding and measurable requirements for design elements, such as specific building materials, landscaping, setbacks, and other features that ensure alignment with the community's character.

Community Input at the Development Permit Stage - The email indicates that this is a land use amendment application only, and a development permit will follow if the amendment is approved. To address community concerns effectively, I request that the City ensures ongoing consultation with residents during the development permit review process to address design, parking, traffic, and landscaping issues comprehensively.

Alignment with the Municipal Development Plan - While the proposal aligns with the Municipal Development Plan in terms of density and infrastructure use, it is essential that the specific characteristics of this site—such as its historical significance and its context within a low-density residential area—remain a priority during the final design review.

Recommendations:

- Include clear and enforceable design requirements in the DC District guidelines to minimize ambiguity and ensure compliance.
- Require the developer to conduct further engagement with the community during the development permit stage.
- Ensure that future developments do not set a precedent for inappropriate intensification in the area without adequate consideration of neighbourhood compatibility.

I appreciate the City's efforts to balance development needs with community interests, and I hope that this feedback will be considered in both the current review and the subsequent development permit process.



Raissa Espiritu [REDACTED]

RE: Land Use and Policy Amendment at 1117, 1121, 1123, 1125 - 8 Street SE and 1120 Maggie Street SE (LOC2023-0257)

Raissa Espiritu [REDACTED]
To: "Leung, Wallace C." <Wallace.Leung@calgary.ca>

Thu, Dec 5, 2024 at 3:00 PM

Hello Mr. Leung,

Re: Land Use Amendment Application LOC2023-0257 (8 Street SE and Maggie Street SE)

I am writing to provide feedback regarding the proposed land use amendment for the site at 8 Street SE and Maggie Street SE. Thank you for your detailed update on the revised application, including its transition to a Direct Control (DC) District based on the Housing – Grade-Oriented (H-GO) District.

While I appreciate the adjustments made to reduce height and density compared to the original Multi-Residential – Medium Profile (M-X2) proposal, I have several concerns regarding the flexibility that a Direct Control District introduces and its potential impact on the community.

Key Concerns:

- **Potential Ambiguity in Guidelines**

The revised DC District mentions encouraging pedestrian-friendly design and maintaining the historical character of the neighborhood. However, terms like "encourages" can lack enforceability. I urge the City to include binding and measurable requirements for design elements, such as specific building materials, landscaping, setbacks, and other features that ensure alignment with the community's character.

- **Community Input at the Development Permit Stage**

The email indicates that this is a land use amendment application only, and a development permit will follow if the amendment is approved. To address community concerns effectively, I request that the City ensures ongoing consultation with residents during the development permit review process to address design, parking, traffic, and landscaping issues comprehensively.

- **Alignment with the Municipal Development Plan**

While the proposal aligns with the Municipal Development Plan in terms of density and infrastructure use, it is essential that the specific characteristics of this site—such as its historical significance and its context within a low-density residential area—remain a priority during the final design review.

Recommendations:

- **Include clear and enforceable design requirements in the DC District guidelines to minimize ambiguity and ensure compliance.**
- **Require the developer to conduct further engagement with the community during the development permit stage.**
- **Ensure that future developments do not set a precedent for inappropriate intensification in the area without adequate consideration of neighbourhood compatibility.**

I appreciate the City's efforts to balance development needs with community interests, and I hope that this feedback will be considered in both the current review and the subsequent development permit process.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to staying engaged and participating in the public hearing on February 11, 2025.

Sincerely,
Raissa Espiritu

[Quoted text hidden]

1/24/25, 4:30 PM

Gmail - RE: Land Use and Policy Amendment at 1117, 1121, 1123, 1125 - 8 Street SE and 1120 Maggie Street SE (LOC 2024-0257)

CP 2024-1311
Attachment 8

--
Raissa Espiritu

