



Planning Committee  
917 Centre Avenue NE Calgary AB T2E0C6

brcacalgary.org

11 September 2018

Circulation Control  
Planning, Development & Assessment #8201  
The City of Calgary  
PO Box 2100 Station M  
Calgary AB T2P2M5

**Attn:** CPAG.Circ@calgary.ca  
**cc:** Steve P Jones, File Manager ([steve.jones2@calgary.ca](mailto:steve.jones2@calgary.ca))  
Ali McMillan, BRCA Planning Director ([planning@brcacalgary.org](mailto:planning@brcacalgary.org))

To Whom It May Concern:

**RE: LOC2017-0400 (523 – 8 Street NE)**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment again with respect to the application for a Land Use Amendment affecting land at 523 – 8 Street NE (LOC2017-0400). Our last LOC letter was dated Jan 14, 2018 and this is an updated version of that letter however that initial letter is also important to read to see how things evolved and we are not repeating all the points.

This Land Use Application was discussed at a meeting of our Planning Committee convened 4 January 2018. Notice of that meeting was given to neighbours adjacent to the subject parcel. Despite the relatively short notice that preceded the meeting, approximately 7 neighbours attended, as did many regular Planning Committee members. The applicant was also invited to the meeting, but was not able to attend. Since this the applicant sent us revised drawings by email on August 14, 2018 with a list of building design changes they have made. We sent this out via email to neighbours who had previously expressed concerns and asked them for additional feedback to be sent to the file manager.

The comments below regarding the LOC application reflect some feedback we received via email from neighbours and the few BRCA Planning Committee members who have seen the updated drawing set, and the responses that relate to their opinion of the land use.

The application is seeking a new land use designation for the site of R-CG instead of the existing R-C2. We are still strongly opposed to such redesignation by means of this application for the same reasons stated in our initial letter dated Jan. 14, 2018. However we can also add that four individuals from the BRCA Planning Committee are also on the City's ARP Advisory Committee and have been working on a strategy for R-CG for the community for the new ARP yet to be decided. The City still has not landed on one approach despite showing end of block treatments at a recent open house for the updated ARP. Unable to

provide a rationale for why there, the City has once again gone internal with their discussions on R-CG in the community and we are still left with no overall plan for the district.

Therefore we still feel that allowing this application to change land use at end of block this deep into the "Conservation Zone" with no updated ARP is still destructive of the planning and engagement process. Approval of this rezoning would effectively be pre-ordaining that all end of block treatments are fair game throughout the community. If City Planning is seeking to ignore process and the voice of this community, we respectfully suggest that you blanket the RC-G zoning across all communities, over top of all objections City-wide.

We strongly feel that Bridgeland needs and is in the process of creating a unique solution to R-CG. Not all neighbourhoods in Calgary are the same. They vary in character, block orientation, density needs and opportunities available for density to be added in targeted areas.

- a.) Bridgeland is unique in that it's blocks are oriented North – South instead of East-West. This makes 4 plexes on the south side of blocks complicated in terms of shadow impacts on adjacent yards to the north. Although this proposal is on the north end of a block, if approved it's precedent will encourage others to apply for more end of block treatments on opposite south end of blocks.
- b.) The zoning proposed, in the particular location proposed, continues to be met with significant opposition both by individuals who are members of the BRCA Planning Committee, the BRCA Board, and also the local area residents – comments on reasoning from the first letter still apply to community wide planning approach and concerns for precedent. Allowing this changes the context entirely and will throw the community into chaos without a plan. I.e. next developer comes in requesting a spot zoning across the street based on this one.
- c.) The Mainstreets area where we just added 14 blocks of R-CG -still no rationale from City ARP team about why we need more or where there is justification. We have asked for facts/ demographic etc. which have not been provided to date. Much land we see as more appropriate for this type of housing has been offered up.
- d.) The concern about this application not being tied to plans is still valid. With plans effectively complete, this is an easy way for the applicant to do something completely different than the suggested plans, with no recourse by the community and a zoning fait accompli. It is both dangerous and potentially devastating to the character of the area..

Please refer to all comments about ARP and multi-residential criteria in our letter from JAN 2018 as they still apply.

Sincerely,

BRIDGELAND-RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Per: BRCA Board of Directors  
Planning Committee