

**Rowe, Timothy S.**

---

**From:** caseypeterson54@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 05, 2018 5:48 PM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Subject:** July 23, <web submission> LOC2018-0063

July 5, 2018

Application: LOC2018-0063

Submitted by: Casey Peterson

Contact Information

Address: 1427 15 Street SE

Phone: (403) 560-1460

Email: caseypeterson54@gmail.com

Feedback:

I fully support my neighbor in having the designation of his property changed to R-CG and look forward to a tastefully designed rowhouse structure at that location.

**Rowe, Timothy S.**

---

**From:** Chan, Kristine  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 10, 2018 7:59 AM  
**To:** Council Clerk  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] LOC2018-0063

Good morning,

Are you able to assist with this email?

Thank you,

Kristine Chan  
Business & Logistics Liaison, City Clerk's Office  
313 – 7 Ave SE  
P.O. Box 2100, Stn M, MC #8007  
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5  
P: 403-268-5862  
E: kristine.chan@calgary.ca

-----Original Message-----

From: Casey Peterson [mailto:caseypeterson54@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 7:12 PM  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>  
Cc: Loria, Stephanie A. <Stephanie.Loria@calgary.ca>  
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0063

Good day,

I'm unable to attend the council meeting in regard to this rezoning application from R-M2 to R-CG so wish to submit my viewpoint.

I'm a resident located exactly one street west of the said application, my address being 1427 15 Street SE. My partner and I also own 1429 15 Street SE which we maintain as a rental and future development potential.

We would like to state that we fully support the applicant and application to R-CG and look forward to the applicant Mr Burke, submitting a tasteful and suitable rowhouse proposal for this site.

Per: Thomas M Materi &  
Casey Peterson

Regards,  
Casey Peterson  
403.560.1460  
Sent from my iPhone

## **Neighbourhood Response to the Re-zoning Proposal 1421 – 16<sup>th</sup> St SE (LOC2018-0063)**

This document is a response by residents of the surrounding neighbourhood to James Burke's re-zoning application for this property.

### **Executive Summary**

Inglewood is a historically distinctive, attractive community with a strong sense of place. Part of the City of Calgary's Principles of Great Communities is a stated sensitivity to such local character. The Inglewood community has a high level of engagement relating to the preservation of the neighbourhoods that make up the community. Although we are opposed to this application for the reasons set out below, it's also our position that this re-zoning application is, at a minimum, premature. It should be deferred until after the Inglewood Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) has been published, and after the Airport Vicinity Protection Area (AVPA) changes have either been approved or denied.

As you are aware, this developer has been granted a similar application in LOC2016-0192, across the street from the location of the current re-zoning application. The previous application was granted despite widespread opposition by surrounding neighbours and the Inglewood Community Association. The current application exacerbates the problems associated with the developer's project across the street due to a cumulative effect in a localized area.

It's our position that this application is inappropriate for the location for the following reasons:

- Excessive density for single-family area
- Potential for zone "creep"
- Parking and traffic considerations
- Large shadowing configuration
- AVPA regulations
- Heritage trees

## **Density and Location**

Although Inglewood does indeed as a whole have a diversity of zoning, the areas which have been densified and which are appropriate for densification are the areas on the corridor of 9<sup>th</sup> Ave and 17<sup>th</sup> Ave SE, not internal locations such as this site.

We submit that this site is not “on the edge of a lower density area” as has been claimed by the applicant. We suggest this site is very much in an internal location, which is inappropriate for a potential fourplex. The proposed development location is over a kilometre away from the future Green Line station, not “proximate” for the purposes of re-zoning.

The applicant has indicated in his previous application that his developments will provide housing that will be “affordable to young families.” There is no evidence put forward that the very small footprint of these dwellings with little to no usable outside space will be attractive or affordable for young families; we suggest that this is mere speculation.

To the developer’s previous assertion that such developments are characteristic of the neighbourhood, we submit that Inglewood Cove and existing row houses are exceptional developments that are not characteristic of the neighbourhood, and in fact, Inglewood Cove presents traffic and parking problems to the residents of 16<sup>th</sup> St., which would only be exacerbated by increased densification.

It’s also our position that planning authorities and Council should consider other permitted projects, specifically the developer’s project across the street in making its decision for the current application. This would mean taking into account two R-CG lots across from one another, instead of one, in an area that already has access and parking issues. The fact that one has been zoned should not mean the second is appropriate – in fact we would argue that its existence is an argument against it. Considering the impact of other approved buildings could prevent the potential for zone “creep” and dramatically increased density.

## **Traffic and Parking**

Parking and traffic are important factors for the neighbourhood because we already have issues with traffic due to the fact that 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> streets provide the only egress to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, not only for the surrounding streets but also for the large multi-family development, Inglewood Cove. If there has been a traffic analysis by the applicant or the City, it has not been shared with the residents of the neighbourhood. The applicant’s statement that 16<sup>th</sup> street has “minimal” traffic is not supported by any evidence and would be strongly refuted by neighbours.

Parking is a fundamental concern of the residents as we already have parking pressures as a result of overflow parking from the Inglewood Cove. Additionally, there is a parking issue

on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue and on 15<sup>th</sup> Street due to the historic rooming house directly across the alley from the proposed site.

The residents of the handicapped housing on 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, and 16A streets require frequent, easy access and parking for emergency vehicles.

The only way to get out of the neighbourhood is to drive “within the block” down 16<sup>th</sup> St towards 17<sup>th</sup> Ave, which is what Mr. Burke indicates his previous development would avoid, and this development exacerbates these parking and traffic issues even further.

Finally, the opening of the new YWCA at the end of 16<sup>th</sup> Street, just one block away, has the potential to dramatically worsen the parking situation, depending on the availability of parking on that site.

## **Orientation and Shadowing**

While we recognize the current application is for re-zoning, we wish to comment on the development design in order to respond fully to the applicant’s proposal. The proposed design is to put a fourplex with a total site area of 605.36 m<sup>2</sup> (6,512.75 sq. ft.) The distance from the existing sidewalk facing 14<sup>th</sup> Ave SE would be less than 11 feet and the setback on 16<sup>th</sup> St would be just less than 19 ft. The planned development is two stories. It is our submission that this building does not complement the massing patterns, character or context of the neighbourhood.

Because of its location on the north side of the avenue, the quality of life of the neighbours to the north will be significantly affected by the shading created by this large unbroken mass.

The proposed fourplex across the street will create shading on the road that will increase the number of frozen piles of snow in the winter. This will impact parking and emergency vehicle access.

## **AVPA Regulations**

We agree with the interpretation that the proposal would be in contravention of the AVPA Regulations and disagree with the applicant’s request for an application to the Minister for an exemption.

## **Heritage Trees**

Finally, although this is an issue for a development permit, residents are alarmed at the wholesale destruction of many heritage trees in our neighbourhood at the hands of developers. In this case the concern is with a mature, mountain ash, on the SE corner of the lot. It is one of the finest in the neighbourhood and adds greatly to the streetscape. This tree should be protected during **any** redevelopment on this lot.

## Conclusion

Development of the subject location WITHIN the current R-C2 zoning (e.g. duplex, 2 single family homes, a suited development) would be acceptable and in character.

This proposed fourplex development is not appropriate for this inner location in the community. Such developments are more appropriate for boundary roads and areas.

This re-zoning application would give rise to the potential for significant changes in the existing dwelling pattern that would not complement the massing patterns, character or context of the surrounding streets. The potential for creating a very different and unwelcome streetscape is very real and, with the approval of the developer's identical application across the street, presents the potential for zone "creep" on established single-family dwelling or duplex lots.

Yours Sincerely:

Dann McCann 1615 - 16 Street S.E.

Justine Cooke 1615 - 16 Street S.E.

Ethne Dickinson 1617 - 16 Street S.E.

Geoff Dickinson 1617 - 16 Street S.E.

Mary Ross 1417 - 16 Street S.E.

James O'Keefe 1417 - 16 Street S.E.

Todd Frankel 1411 - 16 Street S.E.

Theresa Frankel 1411 - 16 Street S.E.

Corinne Dickson 1414 - 16 Street S.E.

Denise Jones 1413 - 16 Street S.E.

Dean Jones 1413 - 16 Street S.E.

Pat Magnan 1420 - 16 Street S.E.

Catherine Magnan 1420 - 16 Street S.E.

Jeanine Robinson 1612 -16 Street S.E.

Allan Boyartchuk 1612 -16 Street S.E.