

Hello Mayor Nenshi and council. Forgive my fast speech. I have a lot to say in 5 minutes. I'm Ellen Liguori of 40 Granlea Place SW. My home is behind and shares the alley of the properties proposed for redesignation and the Carlisle project.

I am NOT opposed to fair and moderately stepped density increase, but I am staunchly opposed to this redesignation. First, I'd like to mention some discrepancies that occur in associated documents.
SEE PHOTOS 1, 1A, 1B, 2



~~First~~, the small triangle of city B
owned land in front of the
homes requesting redesignation,
is not a park, ~~as referred to in~~
~~documents~~. ~~2nd~~, the (B)
Residential section of 17th Ave.
SW is NOT a main artery and *placement*
therefore ^a much less harmful
parking entry and exiting, than
the alley behind single family
and suited homes. And ^{I believe} ~~3rd~~, the
proposal refers to one of the
properties for redesignation
being a corner lot. From my
knowledge this is inaccurate.
One property abutts a
pedestrianwalkway, not a street
corner.

1. A very broad range of potential development is allowed within the requested land use.

See Photo 3

The extreme end of this range is the 92-dwelling unit, 5 storey building, proposed by the Carlisle Group. Some context, this building has the possibility of being built on a lot within approximately 15 metres of my back deck.

4. The quiet enjoyment that we are able to experience in our backyards would be dramatically damaged by the entry and exit of vehicles transporting the residents of an additional 92 dwelling units. Perhaps the context of that might be perceived by the following conservative estimation. Assuming many occupants commute to work using the LRT, 92 units, averaging 1.5 occupants each, and an average of 2 non-LRT related errands or drives to non-LRT route locations, times 365 days, will realistically have the potential of 50,370 drives in the alley behind our backyards annually. That is a conservative 140 daily drives, 2 metres from my backyard per day. Of course, the resulting noise and air quality will significantly deteriorate the usability of these yards, and the homes themselves, as the desire to open our windows to the light and air that we currently enjoy will no longer be available to us.



See Photos 4, 4A, 4B

5. It is important to note, that approval of this re-designation will be without formal study of even consideration, of an additional major traffic increase. Already approved is a doubling of the student base of a school directly in front of the only road egress and ingress point, to the cul-de-sac whose homes back the proposed re-designation. There is a documentable increase from 250 to, up to, 519 students, on the bottle neck entry to Granlea Place, and no assessment of the combined and potentially exponential traffic effect caused by the addition of a project such as that proposed by the Carlisle group. Unlike schools throughout the city, this school location occurs directly in front of a closed loop cul-de-sac, not simply a thoroughfare road, as is typical for a school location.

Combined
Impact

Carlisle's

The Calgary Arts School which formerly occupied this site, informed me that 40% of their average of 250 students used buses to commute. The new school will house up to 519 students, with the realistic potential to add to 2 daily car drives and drop offs for 60% of a 269 populace increase. This would over double the numbers to be transported to and from school, at the only entry/and exit road point to Granlea. An approximate 250 metres exists between the school road and the alley where 92 units' occupants will come and go, affectively hemming in residents between these two high traffic zones. This context would seem critical when assessing the viability of any land use re-designation within those 250 meters. Residents of Granlea will have large increases in traffic from road to alley. The impact of ~~combining these~~ these two projects, ~~on the community~~ will have a meaningful, negative effect on the daily lives of homeowners in this community. ~~never both.~~

Combining
these
two

The residents of Granlea Place have sustained ~~several years of noise and traffic delays due to~~ ~~the construction of~~ and permanent increase in traffic noise from the Sarcee overpass. It seems an unreasonable burden to further approve a very broad land use re-designation that has genuine potential to prevent quiet and peaceful enjoyment of our homes. Going from a 1 to 2 dwelling unit per lot designation, to an 18 plus dwelling unit per lot designation within meters of their property, seems an unreasonable and punitive change for those directly affected and their neighbours. The proportional burden of this increase in density seems inappropriate. The merits and challenges of increased density might be efficiently served by being distributed and shared with less extreme concentration. The net effect of this



height and quantity of ^{number of} 92 dwelling units puts myself, and the other property
d, under extreme duress, not knowing whether the following might affect on
id property. Approval of this, subjects homeowners to, quite possibly, years
etter writing, meetings, worry, stress, decision making regarding leaving their
absence of peace of mind, degrading the peaceful enjoyment of both their
community.

knit community, of Granlea Place, most of whom have raised their families
more than 30 years, this degrading of community has already begun, as over
ry residents have moved, to avoid the battles to come.

ly
summer light that allows us to enjoy sunny evenings in our backyards, will likely
height and location of the structure allowed within this designation.

o way to protect the privacy of rear yards from a 5-storey structure directly
. No tree will be tall enough, and the potential vision is of dozens of balconies
looking our backyard sanctuaries.

he impact is that a small community is disproportionally bearing the burden of the negative
aspects. 1 of density.

Density increase has many potential benefits which needn't be achieved at the grievous
expense of residents and communities. The time frame in which the benefits of increasing
density can become a reality, seems best served by working together with communities,
sharing the detriments more evenly, by considering fairer, less egregious development,
that affected communities will be able to support.