

Community Association Response



7541- 26 Ave SW
Calgary, AB, T3H 3X2
Email: info@springbankhill.org

July 4, 2025

TO: The City of Calgary, Community Planning, Planning and Development
Attn: Jarred Friedman
RE: LOC2025-0011 30 Elveden Drive SW

Thank you for the opportunity to provide an updated response on LOC2025-0011.

We have based the following comments on the initial circulation, DTR comments from the city, updated information from DMAP, as well as conversations had with the planning department and the applicant. Though requested, we were not provided the updated circulation, as well as the responses from the applicant to the cities' DTR.

Though we understand the city is not required to provide this, over the past 10 years we have received all documents requested from the planning department that they are legally allowed to share including DTRs.

As a Community Association, our role is to meet with affected residents gather and summarize the concerns.

In our review we are unable to support this application for several reasons.

1 : Density and Buildform

The Springbank Hill ASP is a recently completed document in terms of the lifecycle of an ASP. This parcel is currently in the standard suburban zone of the ASP:

Standard Suburban (7-17uph)

Standard Suburban areas represent a development pattern that existed prior to the adoption of the MDP. This includes a limited range of residential housing units, as well as institutional and recreational uses.

Visit us at www.springbankhill.org



Policies

- 1. Densities shall range between 7 to 17 units per gross developable hectare.**
- 2. Developments should accommodate single[1] detached and semi-detached housing.**
- 3. Institutional or recreational uses should be located on development sites larger than 2 hectares (5 acres) and in close proximity to corridors and nodes.**
- 4. Where institutional or recreational uses are proposed, the impacts of the use on the surrounding areas should be assessed when evaluating the application (e.g. traffic, parking, privacy, noise).**

The previous owner had rezoned the parcel from DC to R-1 with the stated intention of building single family homes within the 17 uph.

Was this their true intention or was this done strictly to take advantage of the blanket rezoning to R-G with allowed for massive density increases driving up the value of the parcel dramatically?

The current applicant originally requested the modification of the ASP from Standard Suburban to Medium Density and land use of M-G allowing up to a density of 80 uph.

It is noted from information available on DMAP this has been modified.

Existing land use district

Residential - Low Density Mixed Housing (R-G)

Proposed land use district

Multi-Residential - At Grade Housing District (M-Gd37)

Description

This application proposes to change the designation of this property to allow for:

- multi-residential buildings (e.g. townhouses, apartment buildings);**
- a maximum building height of 13.0 metres (an increase from the current maximum of 12.0 metres);**
- a maximum of 42 dwelling units;**
- the uses listed in the proposed M-G designation;**

An amendment to the Springbank Hill Area structure Plan is required to allow for the proposed redesignation; and

Visit us at www.springbankhill.org



It does not look like the above information is complete, but again the updated submission has not been circulated.

While we have received an email from the applicant, and been verbally told by the city planning department:

- What is the Springbank Hill Area Structure Plan amendment?
- What is the justification for this requested **117%** increase over the current ASP?
- Why did the applicant reduce the number of units from 56 units to 42?
 - While the applicant has stated that this was because they “listened” to the community, was this the case? Or was it always the intention to build 42 units, and
- this is being used as a ploy to make it seem like they are listening without really listening.

In the initial submission the applicant provided justifications :

Diversity of Buildform

- Given the massive changes to our community in close proximity to this development, we would suggest that there is there is a lack of single-family homes being developed. We have seen townhomes, rowhomes, 3 – 10 storey condominiums and apartments, and an 8-storey long term care facility. We no longer see is any single-family homes being constructed.
- Two 4-acre parcels at 26th Ave and Elveden Dr SW are for sale less than 300 meters away.
 - What will the impact of this application be on these two parcels?

Proximity to LRT

- The LRT is over 1 km away from this parcel.
- This development is autocentric with garages for each of the units.
- No TIA was requested in an area that has a k-12 school that has already experienced issues with student safety due to the abundance of traffic.

This land use request is 117% increase in density over the current ASP, with little to no justification.

Visit us at www.springbankhill.org



2 : Engagement

One virtual meeting was held after the close of the public comments.

The original proposal was reviewed, with some conceptual drawings.

Many questions and concerns were raised with the request to provide more concrete visions to be provided through:

- DC
- Concurrent DP

None of this was provided.

Once support from planning was obtained no further interaction with the applicant has happened.

3 : Information

As mentioned previously given our engagement with other developers, the amount of information provided is severely lacking. Though we understand that this is only a land use application we have requested:

- Updated Land Use Application
- Updated ASP Amendment
- Traffic Impact Assessment
- How flooding concerns will be mitigated
- Shadow study
- Updated Concept plan

None of the above has been provided and gives the community concern whether this applicant is truly planning to develop this property. They have admitted they have not done this type of development before, and we wonder, are they abusing the development process to flip the property at a future time.

Visit us at www.springbankhill.org



4 : Additional Development

The intent of the Springbank Hill ASP was to create a cohesive development pattern in our community.

The ASP significantly increased the density and diversity of buildform as noted above, and in the Springbank Hill ASP at great length.

By constantly allowing small parcels to supersede precedent of the ASP, a comprehensive development is no longer adhered, and a fractured fragmented pattern emerges leading to, and concerns raised in terms of traffic, and other infrastructure.

5 : Timing

While not regulated, we understand that unofficial policy was to not bring forward contentious applications to CPC and council over the summer the month prior to an election. We have no council representation, no vote at council, and no one to advocate for us during this process.

This puts the community in an extreme disadvantage to an applicant, who will have access to all council during the election period.

We wonder why there is this there is this desire of the applicant to push forward with the application at this time with:

- Little development of the actual development concept
- Little engagement with the community at large and adjacent residents

Based on the above 5 points we request that CPC refuse this application until transparent engagement from the applicant has happened and we can utterly understand what will be built.

Sincere regards,

Springbank Hill Community Association

Per: Stephen Carter-Edwards, Director Planning and Development

CC: Councillor Sonya Sharp

Visit us at www.springbankhill.org