

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Chan, Kristine
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 3:43 PM
To: Palaschuk, Jordan
Subject: FW: [EXT] LOc2018-0150(2212 Richmond Rd SW)

From: Li Shen [mailto:lishen601@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 6:08 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOc2018-0150(2212 Richmond Rd SW)

I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as "R2C". I chose to reside here as it supports a safe and family-friendly community. I do not support this proposed further densification of our community.

Yours truly,

Li
2324B Richmond Rd SW



Li Shen

Email:lishen601@gmail.com

Signature is customized by [Netease Mail Master](#)

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Chan, Kristine
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 3:43 PM
To: Palaschuk, Jordan
Subject: FW: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

From: Pat McDougall [mailto:p52@patrickmcdougall.ca]
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 7:33 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

To whom it may concern:

As a taxpayer one block from this address, I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as R2C. I believe unilateral changes to the ARP and the Land Use Classification as a breach of trust between ourselves and our councillor who did not run on a platform of unilaterally changing community standards as outlined above.

Best regards
Partick McDougall

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 8:11 AM
To: Council Clerk
Subject: FW: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

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

From: Jeana Carrington [mailto:JCarrington@arcresources.com]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 7:52 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are not in support of the proposed Land Use Reclassification in our neighbourhood of Richmond/Knob Hill. We already have parking challenges, traffic congestion and safety issues on our streets with the current number of cars on the road and increasing the density of housing in this area will make these problems much worse in addition to reducing our property values and putting a further strain on the utilities and roadways.

We are supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as "R2C". We chose to reside here as it supports a safe and family-friendly Community. We do not support this proposed further densification of our Community.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Yours truly,

Jeana & Devin Carrington
2605 21 Street SW
Calgary T2T 5A9

Sent from my iPhone

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2018 8:17 AM
To: Council Clerk
Subject: FW: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

Importance: High

From: Mary Shanahan [mailto:Mary.Shanahan@vantagefoods.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 1:04 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)
Importance: High

I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as "R2C". I chose to reside in this neighborhood as it supports a safe and family-friendly community. **I DO NOT** support this proposed further densification of our community. Parking and density issues are already in play...let's not make things worse.

Thank you.

Yours truly,
Mary Shanahan
1912 Tecumseh Rd SW
Calgary AB T2T 5C5

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Muir, Althea K. on behalf of City Clerk
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 2:22 PM
To: Council Clerk
Subject: FW: [EXT] LOC2018-0150

Please see below.

From: James Sumner [mailto:tailman@telus.net]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 2:16 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150

I am a resident of Richmond/Knob hill and I am not supportive of re-zoning lots along 26 Avenue and Richmond Road as it will add more traffic to the community and will result in impacting families safely riding their bikes in their community since there will be an increase in parked cars since if you allow this 4 row of houses to go through they will not be able to park within the foot print of there own property since there is a bus stop on Richmond Rd from the alley South to 22ave and then a stop sign west on 22 Ave so unless you are going to force a bus zone on another property and take away there parking (more appeals for the city) they are going to have to have those micro mini garages that can only fit a smart car because I don't want any extra vehicles parking around my property because they can't fit on there own besides you said no to the previous owners that wanted to build a Duplex on the property and now you want to ram a 4 row onto the property Mr Woolley , Mr Nenshi give your head a shake this is not right for our Neighborhood.

Regards,
James Sumner

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Muir, Althea K. on behalf of City Clerk
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 2:22 PM
To: Council Clerk
Subject: FW: [EXT] LOC2018-0150

Please see below.

From: James Sumner [mailto:tailman@telus.net]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 2:20 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150

I am a resident of Richmond/Knob hill and I am not supportive of re-zoning lots along 26 Avenue and Richmond Road as it will add more traffic to the community and will result in impacting families safely riding their bikes in their community since there will be an increase in parked cars since if you allow this 4 row of houses to go through they will not be able to park within the foot print of there own property since there is a bus stop on Richmond Rd from the alley South to 22ave and then a stop sign west on 22 Ave so unless you are going to force a bus zone on another property and take away there parking (more appeals for the city) they are going to have to have those micro mini garages that can only fit a smart car because I don't want any extra vehicles parking around my property because they can't fit on there own besides you said no to the previous owners that wanted to build a Duplex on the property and now you want to ram a 4 row onto the property Mr Woolley , Mr Nenshi give your head a shake this is not right for our Neighborhood or block.

Regards,

Sarah Sumner

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Oosterhuis, Jessica on behalf of City Clerk
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 7:50 AM
To: Council Clerk
Subject: FW: [EXT] RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

From: Rick Cooke [mailto:genmgr99@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 9:28 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

Dear City Clerk and Evan Woolley,
I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as R2C. I have chosen to reside in this community as it is safe and family friendly. I do not support this proposed further density classification of our community.

--

Thank you,

Rick

Rick Cooke, CPA, CGA, CIM, C.Mgr
2115 21 Ave SW, Calgary, AB T2T 0P1
EMAIL genmgr99@gmail.com

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2018 8:17 AM
To: Council Clerk
Subject: FW: LOC2018-0150 2212 Richmond Road

From: Michael MacDougall [mailto:michael@rockymountainwine.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 1:27 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 2212 Richmond Road

To City Clerk and Evan Woolley,

I am a 17 year home owner in Richmond/Knobhill in Calgary. I understand Calgary's need to densify the city and I'm quite alright with the single homes that are being replaced with semi detached homes as per the R2C land use classification.

I do not however support further densification of replacing single homes with four homes and an explanation on how its been allowed in the first place I think is fair to request.

Thank you for your time and consideration and I look forward to hearing from you,

Yours truly,

Michael MacDougall

2013 22nd Avenue SW
2009 22nd Avenue SW
Calgary, AB T2T 0S4

Office of the City Clerk
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station M
Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5

Proposed BYLAW 270D2018

To redesignate the land located at 2212 Richmond Road SW (Plan 8997GC, Block 10, Lot 10) from Residential – Contextual One / Two Dwelling (R-C2) District to Multi-Residential – Contextual Grade-Oriented (M-CGd81) District.

General Objection and Request for Changes

I, Mike J Hegedus, am a joint owner of 2137 - 21 Ave SW (“**My Property**”). My mailing address is 2137 – 21 Ave SW, Calgary, Alberta, T2T 0P1, and my e-mail address is mhegedus@telusplanet.net. My Property is adjacent to 2212 Richmond Road SW (“**Applicant Property**”). Although Sarina Developments’ (“**Applicant**”) has made significant effort to address my concerns, I still oppose the Applicant’s proposal to: (i) rezone the Applicant Property from R-C2 to M-CGd81, and (ii) build a four unit townhouse complex with a large detached garage. I ask that the City of Calgary (“**City**”) reject both applications for the following reasons. In the alternative, I ask the City to adopt the suggested changes that are detailed below.

Increased Risk of Flooding

The intersection of Richmond Road SW and 21st Ave SW is at the bottom of three hills. One to the south on Richmond Road SW, one from the east on 21st Ave, and one from the west from 21st Ave. Accordingly, whenever there is a thunderstorm, extreme flooding occurs as water enters the intersection from three different directions. The gutter is overwhelmed at the intersection of Richmond Road SW and 21st Ave SW. Water goes over the sidewalk and, typically, reaches 3 to 6 feet onto the lawn of My Property. Moreover, significant debris is left behind after each storm. This flooding occurs six to twelve times each year.

Rezoning the Applicant Property to allow for higher density development (i.e., 4 townhouses and detached garage) may exasperate this flooding. This site is one-half block away from the overwhelmed gutter/intersection and is along side the main flood path. A four unit town house complex with a large garage will reduce the amount of ground available to absorb and hold rainfall. Although the Applicant has walked me through the City mandated water drainage containment systems for the proposed development, I remain concerned that the proposed development may result in severe flooding of My Property. Mechanical systems like the proposed water containment system eventually fail, and the typical property owner is not mechanically inclined or maintenance conscientious. At some point this system will fail, and My Property will be severely damaged. The same cannot be said of the absorption capability of the Applicant property’s existing lawn. Therefore, both applications should be rejected.

Increased Erosion

The back alley between 21st Ave SW and 22nd Ave SW is at a very steep angle. The bottom of this hill is on Richmond Road SW (adjacent to the Applicant Property and My Property) while the top of the steep

hill is on 20th Street SW. Every time it rains, this back alley becomes a river and erodes the material comprising the top layer of the back alley. This material is typically deposited on Richmond Road SW.

To minimize erosion at the base of the hill (and thereby prevent debris and water from being channeled into the backyard of My Property, which is at a significantly lower elevation than the back alley), the City planted caragana bushes on the north side of the back alley adjacent to the property line with My Property (but not on My Property). The caragana bush's root system provides stability to the soil. Without this root system in place, more of the back alley would erode away, likely leading to rain and debris being diverted into the backyard of My Property.

The proposed development has a four car garage that runs the entire length of the Applicant Property's property line with the back alley. Future occupants of the Applicant Property may want the caragana bush removed as it impedes access to this garage. Alternatively, use of such a large garage will place stress on the caragana bush, thereby reducing its effectiveness as a ground stabiliser. In either case, this will increase erosion and place My Property at risk to damage. Therefore, the application for rezoning and the proposed four-unit townhouse complex should be rejected.

Access to the Garage on My Property

Many of the lots in Richmond are 10 feet shorter in length than the norm. Typically, this means garages are smaller than the norm. This, in turn, means access to the entire back alley is necessary to maneuver a midsized car out of such a garage. My Property is such a property.

Currently, the City has three refuse carts: black for garbage, green for compost, and blue for recycling. A four unit townhouse complex means that the complex will have 12 bins. Typically, people leave these bins strewn out in the back alley after pick-up. Historically, I have been able to negotiate with the occupants of the Applicant Property not to place their bins directly behind my garage (and in many cases to not store their bins on the back alley at all), thereby avoiding any access issues to my garage. With 12 bins, instead of three, this amicable arrangement will be difficult to maintain with four different property owners. If the application is approved, bin pick-up for the Applicant Property should be moved onto Richmond Road SW from the back alley.

Inadequate Street Parking

The proposed townhouse complex will have two bedrooms in each unit but only one parking spot for each unit. Moreover, there will be no visitor parking for the entire complex. Thus, street parking will need to accommodate both visitor parking and occupants' second (or more) vehicles.

On Richmond Road SW, there is no parking in front on the Applicant Property as the entire area is zoned as a future bus stop. Across the street from the Applicant Property on Richmond Road SW and further north on Richmond Road SW (adjacent to My Property), there is unlimited parking. However, Richmond Diagnostic Centre staff and patients fully occupy those spots from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm from Monday to Friday, making that parking inaccessible for most of the week. Moreover, there are weekend employee shifts that result in this parking being used during the weekend as well, albeit not to the extent that occurs on weekdays.

22nd Ave SW is zoned for two hour parking from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm commencing on Monday and ending on Friday. On 21st Ave SW, the entire avenue requires residential parking permits.

The Applicant's five unit development at the intersection of 20th Ave SW and Richmond Road SW has placed significant strains on the area's limited street parking as there are two bedrooms (i.e., two possible occupants with a vehicle each) per unit, one parking stall per unit, and no visitor parking.

Consequently, the existing available parking in the general area is inadequate for a multi-unit development on the Applicant Property and will strain the already limited public parking resources. The Applicant has advised me that the City has agreed to shrink the future bus zone to accommodate parking for two vehicles. Having a bus stop immediately adjacent to a high density development with no visitor parking is poor development planning. If the application is approved, the future bus zone should be moved farther south on Richmond Road SW so that the entire front of the Applicant Property can be used for visitor parking.

Elevation

The proposed townhouse complex will be two stories above grade. The Applicant Property is on a hill. Consequently, the ground level of the Applicant Property is parallel to the second floor of the building on My Property. That is, absent any excavation, the second story of the proposed townhouse complex will be significantly higher than any adjacent structure on My Property or any property in its immediate vicinity. If the application is approved, the Applicant should be forced to excavate the Applicant Property so that the entire property is level with the street, thereby making the second level approximately parallel with the second floor on My Property.

Legal Secondary Suite

As it exists now, the Applicant Property is no longer a 1950s bungalow that is wholly incompatible with the City's current inner city development plans, objectives and policies. From 2016 to 2017, the Applicant Property was redeveloped to incorporate a legal secondary suite, thereby increasing its density and incorporating affordable housing into the neighbourhood. Approving the application for rezoning will result in the destruction of this new, affordable housing.

Moreover, to develop the secondary suite, city approval was required. Accordingly, the Applicant Property is currently compatible with the City's higher density development plans, objectives and policies. Therefore, the application should be rejected.

Environmentally Unsustainable Development

As a result of the recent redevelopment of the Applicant Property, the entirety of the basement was rebuilt with new materials. Most of the materials used to renovate the Applicant Property cannot be readily recycled or reused (e.g., drywall). Accordingly, most of this new material will need to be sent to the landfill if the Applicant Property is redeveloped into a multi-unit development. That is, significant building materials will be trashed with little use or wear (i.e., less than one year).

One of the City's objective for higher densification is to create environmentally sustainable development. However, by approving the rezoning of the Applicant Property, the City will be green lighting the exact opposite. Therefore, the application should be rejected.

School

The proposed four unit complex has a “condo-like” floor plan. In short, unlike the secondary unit scheme currently in place or an attached or infill dwelling complex, the units will be ill-suited for families with children.

Richmond School is the designated public school for the area in which the Applicant Property is located. Currently, Richmond School is well below enrolment capacity. It has been placed on “closure watch lists” in the past. The proposed re-zoning and development will further deteriorate the possible enrolment population of the local schools by eliminating housing suitable for families and replacing it with housing ill-suited for families.

In addition, a condo-like development (as opposed to the existing legal secondary suite configuration) would decrease the diversity of the neighbourhood by making the area less appealing for various sizes of families. For example, it is highly doubtful that my former neighbours, a six member family from South Asia, would find such a development suitable for its needs. Focusing on such development opportunities would create inner-city neighbourhoods with large diversity gaps of age, sex, ethnicity and religion, which is not desirable. Moreover, the City will be seen as not supporting such diversity in all of our communities.

Therefore, on both accounts, the application for rezoning and the proposed four-unit townhouse complex should be rejected.

Restrictive Covenant that Runs with the Land

The Applicant Property is subject to a restrictive covenant which is registered with number 9685GC on its Land Title Certificate. Pursuant to this restricted covenant, only one single or two family dwelling house may be erected on the Applicant Property. The rezoning and proposed four unit townhouse complex is fully incompatible with this restricted covenant.

The restricted covenant is an interest in land that is binding on all owners of the affected lands. Moreover, any such owner may enforce the restrictive covenant. That is, by itself, the City does not have the legal authority to waive or rescind the restrictive covenant. It is my understanding that existing property owners intend to enforce this restrictive covenant. The City has the ability to stop this unnecessary litigation by rejecting both applications.

The existing secondary suite can accommodate all of the City’s inner-city development objectives, including higher density, without violating the restricted covenant. Moreover, the restricted covenant is not placed on all property located in the Richmond area, so a proposed townhouse complex should target those properties, not properties subject to that covenant. Indeed, there are several such projects already being developed in our neighbourhood. Consequently, the application should be rejected.

Office of the City Clerk
The City of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station M
Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5

Proposed BYLAW 270D2018

To redesignate the land located at 2212 Richmond Road SW (Plan 8997GC, Block 10, Lot 10) from Residential – Contextual One / Two Dwelling (R-C2) District to Multi-Residential – Contextual Grade-Oriented (M-CGd81) District.

General Objection and Request for Changes

I, Samantha N F Chin, am a joint owner of 2137 - 21 Ave SW (“**My Property**”). My mailing address is 2137 – 21 Ave SW, Calgary, Alberta, T2T 0P1, and my e-mail address is samantha.nf.chin@gmail.com. My Property is adjacent to 2212 Richmond Road SW (“**Applicant Property**”). Although Sarina Developments’ (“**Applicant**”) has made significant effort to address my concerns, I still oppose the Applicant’s proposal to: (i) rezone the Applicant Property from R-C2 to M-CGd81, and (ii) build a four unit townhouse complex with a large detached garage. I ask that the City of Calgary (“**City**”) reject both applications for the following reasons. In the alternative, I ask the City to adopt the suggested changes that are detailed below.

Increased Risk of Flooding

The intersection of Richmond Road SW and 21st Ave SW is at the bottom of three hills. One to the south on Richmond Road SW, one from the east on 21st Ave, and one from the west from 21st Ave. Accordingly, whenever there is a thunderstorm, extreme flooding occurs as water enters the intersection from three different directions. The gutter is overwhelmed at the intersection of Richmond Road SW and 21st Ave SW. Water goes over the sidewalk and, typically, reaches 3 to 6 feet onto the lawn of My Property. Moreover, significant debris is left behind after each storm. This flooding occurs six to twelve times each year.

Rezoning the Applicant Property to allow for higher density development (i.e., 4 townhouses and detached garage) may exasperate this flooding. This site is one-half block away from the overwhelmed gutter/intersection and is along side the main flood path. A four unit town house complex with a large garage will reduce the amount of ground available to absorb and hold rainfall. Although the Applicant has walked me through the City mandated water drainage containment systems for the proposed development, I remain concerned that the proposed development may result in severe flooding of My Property. Mechanical systems like the proposed water containment system eventually fail, and the typical property owner is not mechanically inclined or maintenance conscientious. At some point this system will fail, and My Property will be severely damaged. The same cannot be said of the absorption capability of the Applicant property’s existing lawn. Therefore, both applications should be rejected.

Increased Erosion

The back alley between 21st Ave SW and 22nd Ave SW is at a very steep angle. The bottom of this hill is on Richmond Road SW (adjacent to the Applicant Property and My Property) while the top of the steep

hill is on 20th Street SW. Every time it rains, this back alley becomes a river and erodes the material comprising the top layer of the back alley. This material is typically deposited on Richmond Road SW.

To minimize erosion at the base of the hill (and thereby prevent debris and water from being channeled into the backyard of My Property, which is at a significantly lower elevation than the back alley), the City planted caragana bushes on the north side of the back alley adjacent to the property line with My Property (but not on My Property). The caragana bush's root system provides stability to the soil. Without this root system in place, more of the back alley would erode away, likely leading to rain and debris being diverted into the backyard of My Property.

The proposed development has a four car garage that runs the entire length of the Applicant Property's property line with the back alley. Future occupants of the Applicant Property may want the caragana bush removed as it impedes access to this garage. Alternatively, use of such a large garage will place stress on the caragana bush, thereby reducing its effectiveness as a ground stabiliser. In either case, this will increase erosion and place My Property at risk to damage. Therefore, the application for rezoning and the proposed four-unit townhouse complex should be rejected.

Access to the Garage on My Property

Many of the lots in Richmond are 10 feet shorter in length than the norm. Typically, this means garages are smaller than the norm. This, in turn, means access to the entire back alley is necessary to maneuver a midsized car out of such a garage. My Property is such a property.

Currently, the City has three refuse carts: black for garbage, green for compost, and blue for recycling. A four unit townhouse complex means that the complex will have 12 bins. Typically, people leave these bins strewn out in the back alley after pick-up. Historically, I have been able to negotiate with the occupants of the Applicant Property not to place their bins directly behind my garage (and in many cases to not store their bins on the back alley at all), thereby avoiding any access issues to my garage. With 12 bins, instead of three, this amicable arrangement will be difficult to maintain with four different property owners. If the application is approved, bin pick-up for the Applicant Property should be moved onto Richmond Road SW from the back alley.

Inadequate Street Parking

The proposed townhouse complex will have two bedrooms in each unit but only one parking spot for each unit. Moreover, there will be no visitor parking for the entire complex. Thus, street parking will need to accommodate both visitor parking and occupants' second (or more) vehicles.

On Richmond Road SW, there is no parking in front on the Applicant Property as the entire area is zoned as a future bus stop. Across the street from the Applicant Property on Richmond Road SW and further north on Richmond Road SW (adjacent to My Property), there is unlimited parking. However, Richmond Diagnostic Centre staff and patients fully occupy those spots from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm from Monday to Friday, making that parking inaccessible for most of the week. Moreover, there are weekend employee shifts that result in this parking being used during the weekend as well, albeit not to the extent that occurs on weekdays.

22nd Ave SW is zoned for two hour parking from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm commencing on Monday and ending on Friday. On 21st Ave SW, the entire avenue requires residential parking permits.

The Applicant's five unit development at the intersection of 20th Ave SW and Richmond Road SW has placed significant strains on the area's limited street parking as there are two bedrooms (i.e., two possible occupants with a vehicle each) per unit, one parking stall per unit, and no visitor parking.

Consequently, the existing available parking in the general area is inadequate for a multi-unit development on the Applicant Property and will strain the already limited public parking resources. The Applicant has advised me that the City has agreed to shrink the future bus zone to accommodate parking for two vehicles. Having a bus stop immediately adjacent to a high density development with no visitor parking is poor development planning. If the application is approved, the future bus zone should be moved farther south on Richmond Road SW so that the entire front of the Applicant Property can be used for visitor parking.

Elevation

The proposed townhouse complex will be two stories above grade. The Applicant Property is on a hill. Consequently, the ground level of the Applicant Property is parallel to the second floor of the building on My Property. That is, absent any excavation, the second story of the proposed townhouse complex will be significantly higher than any adjacent structure on My Property or any property in its immediate vicinity. If the application is approved, the Applicant should be forced to excavate the Applicant Property so that the entire property is level with the street, thereby making the second level approximately parallel with the second floor on My Property.

Legal Secondary Suite

As it exists now, the Applicant Property is no longer a 1950s bungalow that is wholly incompatible with the City's current inner city development plans, objectives and policies. From 2016 to 2017, the Applicant Property was redeveloped to incorporate a legal secondary suite, thereby increasing its density and incorporating affordable housing into the neighbourhood. Approving the application for rezoning will result in the destruction of this new, affordable housing.

Moreover, to develop the secondary suite, city approval was required. Accordingly, the Applicant Property is currently compatible with the City's higher density development plans, objectives and policies. Therefore, the application should be rejected.

Environmentally Unsustainable Development

As a result of the recent redevelopment of the Applicant Property, the entirety of the basement was rebuilt with new materials. Most of the materials used to renovate the Applicant Property cannot be readily recycled or reused (e.g., drywall). Accordingly, most of this new material will need to be sent to the landfill if the Applicant Property is redeveloped into a multi-unit development. That is, significant building materials will be trashed with little use or wear (i.e., less than one year).

One of the City's objective for higher densification is to create environmentally sustainable development. However, by approving the rezoning of the Applicant Property, the City will be green lighting the exact opposite. Therefore, the application should be rejected.

School

The proposed four unit complex has a “condo-like” floor plan. In short, unlike the secondary unit scheme currently in place or an attached or infill dwelling complex, the units will be ill-suited for families with children.

Richmond School is the designated public school for the area in which the Applicant Property is located. Currently, Richmond School is well below enrolment capacity. It has been placed on “closure watch lists” in the past. The proposed re-zoning and development will further deteriorate the possible enrolment population of the local schools by eliminating housing suitable for families and replacing it with housing ill-suited for families.

In addition, a condo-like development (as opposed to the existing legal secondary suite configuration) would decrease the diversity of the neighbourhood by making the area less appealing for various sizes of families. For example, it is highly doubtful that my former neighbours, a six member family from South Asia, would find such a development suitable for its needs. Focusing on such development opportunities would create inner-city neighbourhoods with large diversity gaps of age, sex, ethnicity and religion, which is not desirable. Moreover, the City will be seen as not supporting such diversity in all of our communities.

Therefore, on both accounts, the application for rezoning and the proposed four-unit townhouse complex should be rejected.

Restrictive Covenant that Runs with the Land

The Applicant Property is subject to a restrictive covenant which is registered with number 9685GC on its Land Title Certificate. Pursuant to this restricted covenant, only one single or two family dwelling house may be erected on the Applicant Property. The rezoning and proposed four unit townhouse complex is fully incompatible with this restricted covenant.

The restricted covenant is an interest in land that is binding on all owners of the affected lands. Moreover, any such owner may enforce the restrictive covenant. That is, by itself, the City does not have the legal authority to waive or rescind the restrictive covenant. It is my understanding that existing property owners intend to enforce this restrictive covenant. The City has the ability to stop this unnecessary litigation by rejecting both applications.

The existing secondary suite can accommodate all of the City’s inner-city development objectives, including higher density, without violating the restricted covenant. Moreover, the restricted covenant is not placed on all property located in the Richmond area, so a proposed townhouse complex should target those properties, not properties subject to that covenant. Indeed, there are several such projects already being developed in our neighbourhood. Consequently, the application should be rejected.

Sarina Developments Ltd.
208, 3515 17 Ave SW
Calgary AB T3E 0B7
T: 403-249-8003
info@sarinahomes.ca

05 November 2018

Re: LOC2018-0150 - What We Heard Report
To: City Clerk

Please find Sarina Homes' responses to the concerns we have heard from stakeholders to our proposed development.

Key Engagement notes:

- Engagement session held Monday 17th September at RKHCA, with 7 neighbours in attendance and the RKHCA Development Committee Chair
- Subsequent conversations with neighbours re concerns raised

Key concerns and Sarina responses:

- **Parking**
 - The DTR comments note a future bus zone is located directly in front of the property on Richmond Road SW, and there is currently no parking allowed. Neighbours expressed concerns of increased burden on existing parking capacity from the proposed development.
 - Sarina has obtained verbal approval to immediately remove the no parking signs from the City. Sarina will strive to obtain written agreement of such and lead the request for the parking to be permitted.
 - Sarina has negotiated the design dimensions of the future bus zone with the City to allow for sufficient space for 2 parked cars on Richmond Road to the North of a future bus zone to remain.
- **Waste & Recycling**
 - The RKHCA Development Committee Chair requested the garage depths be extended 3' to 23' depth as has been seen at other developments, to fully ensure waste containers can be positioned inside the garages and not in the laneway.
 - Sarina has revised plans to accommodate this request.

- **Water containment**
 - The neighbours located at 2137 21 Ave SW (immediately North of the site) detailed the current status of water pooling on the property during heavy rain, and expressed concern that our proposed development would worsen this condition.
 - Sarina met with the neighbours to walk them through the Water containment practices designed by a Civil Engineer for the development, with no runoff draining on to adjacent lots and all on site stormwater to be contained on site, relieving their concerns and demonstrating the impact to their property would be lessened by our proposed development.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Max Parish', enclosed within a circular scribble.

Max Parish
Project Manager, Sarina Homes
max.parish@sarinahomes.ca

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Subject: RE: RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

From: Cathy Good [<mailto:cathy@goodinnovations.ca>]
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2018 3:10 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>; Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] FW: RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

Subject: RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

TO: CITY CLERCK @cityclerk@calgary.ca
CC EVAN WOOLEY – evan.woolley@calgary.ca

RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as R2C. I chose to reside here as it supports a safe and family friendly community –

I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSED FURTHER DENSIFICATION OF OUR COMMUNITY.

Further to this, I am disgusted that, in spite of the application of Courtyard 33 being opposed by both the Richmond/Knobhill and Marda Loop Community Associations for several reasons, including that FACT that the request includes substantially higher height and floor area ratio limits than currently allowed by the Marda Loop Redevelopment Plan, (which by the way, was enacted with much community engagement and volunteer time and effort) , the Commissioners, with MINIMAL discussion , passed a motion to forward this application to city council with a recommendation for approval – I also understand that the application is seeking Special Direct Control land use – which essentially disallows appeal from the community residents.

The traffic, the parking, the ridiculous, inefficient, poorly planned flow of Marda Loop has made me NOT shop in this community – where is common sense – and where is the neighborhood advocate and what happened to putting Communities First !

Cathy Good

GoodInnovations
403-244-4998
cathy@goodinnovations.ca

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Subject: RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

From: Darcie Gutowski [<mailto:darciegutowski@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2018 1:25 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>; Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

Dear City Clerk and Evan Woolley,
I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as R2C. I have chosen to reside in this community as it is safe and family friendly. I do not support this proposed further density classification of our community.

--

Thank you,
Darcie Gutowski

2115 21 Ave SW, Calgary, AB T2T 0P1
EMAIL darciegutowski@hotmail.com

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Subject: RE: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

From: Monica L [<mailto:textmonlam@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2018 7:17 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road SW)

I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as "RC2". I chose to reside here as it supports a safe and family friendly community. I do not support this proposed further densification of our community as traffic and density is already an ongoing issue.

Yours Truly,
Monica Lam
2009 Tecumseh Road SW

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Subject: RE: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

From: Lianne Garrett [<mailto:lianne.doerr@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2018 11:15 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

Dear Mr. Wooley and City Clerk,

As a member of the Richmond/Knob Hill community, please be aware that I am strongly supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knob Hill's current Land Use Classification as RC-2. I am **not** supportive of the proposed change in land use classification to allow multi-residential housing in our community.

Sincerely,
Lianne Garrett
(2128 22 Avenue SW)

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Subject: RE: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

From: Natasha Schaufert [<mailto:nschauf21@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2018 9:01 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Woolley, Evan V. <Evan.Woolley@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

To whom this may concern,

I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knobhill's current Land Use Classification as "R2C." I chose to reside here as it supports a safe and family-friendly Community. I do not support this proposed further densification of our Community.

Yours truly,

Natasha Schaufert
Owner of 2124 22 ave SW

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: Oosterhuis, Jessica
Subject: RE: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road)

From: Chris Bunce [<mailto:CBunce@bgcengineering.ca>]
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2018 6:14 PM
To: evan.woolley@calgary.ca; City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road)

City Clerk and Evan Woolley

I am supportive of maintaining Richmond/Knob-Hills current Land Use Classification as "R-C2". I choose to live in Richmond/Knob Hill as it supports a healthy, well-balanced, diverse mixture of young, middle-age and older residents in a safe and family friendly community. The RKH community continues to go through ongoing densification as the original single family homes are replaced with duplexes, effectively doubling the population and density of the community. This process is less than 50% complete. It would be inappropriate to increase the rate of densification until the current renewal of housing stock has progressed to near completion. Densification above that of R-C2 will drastically alter the natural maturation of the neighbourhood.

As a result. **I do not support the further densification of the RKH community above that provided by R-C2 zoning.**

Thanks,

Chris Bunce, Ph.D., P.Eng., P.Geoph.
Principal Geotechnical/Geological Engineer
BGC Engineering Inc

2601 – 21 Street SW
Calgary, Alberta
T2T 5A9

Palaschuk, Jordan

To: City Clerk
Subject: RE: [EXT] evanwoolley@calgary.ca; chris@chrisdavislaw.ca,neil@chrisdavislaw.ca

From: G Maida [<mailto:yychomesweethome@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, November 05, 2018 9:28 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>

Subject: [EXT] evanwoolley@calgary.ca; chris@chrisdavislaw.ca,neil@chrisdavislaw.ca

RE: LOC2018-0150

Please see attached my input regarding the about reclassification of 2212 Richmond Road S.W.

Giulia Maida
Owner - 2132 22 Avenue, SW

The City Clerk at cityclerk@calgary.ca.

Re: LOC2018-0150 (2212 Richmond Road S.W.)

I am writing, again, to highlight my objections to changing the Land Use Designation of the property located at 2212 Richmond Road S.W. from R-2C to multi-residential, Contextual Grade-Oriented (M-CGd81). Both this property and mine, as well as many other within this community, have a caveat registered on title as 9685CG. For your ease of reference, I have attached both the title to 2212 Richmond Road and the caveat.

The caveat it clearly outlines a building scheme for this community. The building scheme detailed by that caveat does not allow for densification of any lot beyond two dwellings. The caveat it clearly obligates each lot owner to the observance of the building scheme. Apparently, the applicant, now before you, is requesting a Land Use reclassification that does not respect the caveat, the existence of with caveat would have been noticed upon the most casual review of the title as at the time of purchase.

Based upon conversations that I have had with the City Planner involved in the Application now before you, I am informed that City Council does not respect the obligations set-out in the caveat. I am of the opinion that the building scheme referred to in the caveat is valid and subsisting and should be respected by Council. I, and many other neighbours, have sought advice of counsel regarding next-steps in the event that Council elects not to honor the clear intent of the caveat.

In the event that the position of Council with respect to the caveat, as expressed to me by Planning, is accurate, I also note that the Applicant is asking for a relaxation of visitors parking requirement of the proposed Land Use district. I also do not support such a relaxation. I do not believe, in the short term, that the residents of Calgary are reducing their dependence on motor vehicles, therefore, The City's rules requiring visitor parking must be respected in order to prevent undue pressure on the surrounding roadways and impinging upon the rights of the surrounding neighbours.

Finally, this site does not have the 40% green space allotment required by the proposed Land Use amendment. Once again, I think you need to work to improving this since this community and other have lost many trees with development as well as from various storms over the past few years. Not only does vegetation support effective drainage for the grade of our street, but it supports the ecosystems within our community. The loss of many trees in our community has seen displaced woodpeckers. We have also lost a home for blue jay that once lived on a tree that existed on that specific site.

Once again, I am not supportive of this development and this reclassification to a multi-residential lot. I, and many of my neighbours, chose to live in this community in part due to its single-family nature, which nature is protected by the caveat. The Applicant, too, purchased the lot for which it now seeks a Land Use Reclassification with full knowledge of the caveat and its clear intent. The Applicant clearly seeks to dishonor the intent of the caveat and the simple question now before Council is: what will Council do? Will Council respect uphold the caveat

and the building scheme which has deemed acceptable to many purchasers in the past, including, apparently, the Applicant, or will it not?

Regards,
Giulia Maida
Homeowner – 2132 22nd Avenue, SW

CC: Evan Woolley at (evan.woolley@calgary.ca)
Chris Davis Law