From: sheahanac@gmail.com
To: Public Submissions

 Subject:
 March 18, <web submission> LOC2018-0260

 Date:
 Monday, March 04, 2019 12:09:05 PM

March 4, 2019

Application: LOC2018-0260

Submitted by: Adam S

Contact Information

Address: 131 38 Ave SW

Phone:

Email: sheahanac@gmail.com

Feedback:

I support the proposed redesignation. The proposed R-CG district accommodates modest intensification in a contextually sensitive manner as desired in the Parkhill/Stanley Park ARP and MDP. The subject site/community is well served by transit (bus and LRT) and is close to greenspaces and commercial services (Macleod Tr, 4 St).

Trevor Phenix
3831 Parkhill ST SW
Calgary, AB T2S 2Z5
(403) 863-0356
trevor.phenix@arasresources.com
March 11, 2019

Members of City Council

C/O Office of the city Clerk
The city of Calgary
700 Macleod Trail SE,
P.O. Box 3200, Postal Station "M"
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

RE: ITEM 1: LOC2018-0260 /CPC2019-0063 PARKHILL LAND USE AMENDMENT

Dear Members of City Council:

I am a long-time homeowner and resident of the Parkhill community, having put my own blood, sweat and tears into our property to turn it into the home it is today. I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed land use amendment and the site suitability of the location in question, 3833 Parkhill Street SW.

First and foremost, I do believe in the merits of development which promotes densification within inner city residential areas such as Parkhill. However, I have strong opposition to the re-zoning of sites that due to the complexities of the site, are not suitable for the type of development that could be allowed within the zone bylaw. In this case, it appears that this site, and the households surrounding it are not suitable for the type of development possible with a zone change to RC-G.

My main opposition is as a result of the number of obstacles that both alone and in conjunction with one another have a negative impact on the merits of a zone change to RC-G;

- Topographic complexities
- Existing city infrastructure limitations and obstacles
- Impact on neighboring households

This particular area within Parkhill lies on a parcel of land with a significant front to back AND side to side slope which causes major building and development concerns. The rear ally behind the site in question (3833 Parkhill) and all neighboring properties is only periodically accessible throughout

Members of City Council March 11, 2019 Page 2

the winter (due to seasonal influences on slopes), and due to a severe ridge along the adjacent rear lane way further reduces accessibility to and from this site. When access is possible, generally only a small vehicle can utilize any rear pad or garage. The front street is more often than not congested due to the narrow lots and narrow street, meaning that homeowners that need to park on the street are often unable to do so in front of their properties.



South

Members of City Council March 11, 2019 Page 3



The type of development that is possible (through discretionary application) with an amendment to RC-G, would have a significant impact on neighboring properties. This is exaggerated due to the sloping nature of the site in question, and as a result of it being between two single family dwellings (as opposed to it being a corner lot).



Due to the narrow sites in this area, a change in zoning would significantly impact neighboring properties. Currently, shadowing is already a concern, but furthermore it would be fair to expect

Public Submissions CPC2019-0063 Letter #2

Members of City Council March 11, 2019 Page 4

that an increase in parcel coverage from the current approval would irreversibly impact the enjoyment of neighboring properties outdoor space. Multi family dwellings added to these sites significantly reduce any privacy available for neighbors in both the front AND rear of existing neighboring properties, and exaggerate the shadowing impacts that already exist.

As previously mentioned, I am strongly opposing this amendment to the zone designation as a result of the number of obstacles that exist on the particular site (and neighboring properties) in question.

Sincerely,

Trevor Phenix

(403) 863-0356



South











From: Sima Veiner
To: Public Submissions

Subject: [EXT] Redesignation of land at 3833 Parkhill Street SW

Date: Monday, March 11, 2019 11:55:30 AM

To whom it may concern:

I live at 3834 1 Street SW, and I am very concerned about the proposed change for the above noted address.

This lot is too small for the 3 units proposed (duplex plus secondary). The street is already overpopulated. There is no parking and far too much traffic for a residential neighbourhood. This street is narrow and tight for the existing traffic burden. Adding three "homes" where there was only one just exacerbates the issues. Then reducing requirements of 2 stalls per unit to one compounds the problem even further.

The rear alley whereby the proposal notes parking access is a train wreck. It is a steep hill and mostly unpaved. Many vehicles cannot make it up the alley in winter and I have seen City of Calgary vehicles slide down the alley in fact on one occasion the garbage truck slid down and right through a neighbours garage. Further traffic down an already unsafe alley is far from opportune to say the very least. Calling 311 for help, as suggested in the report response, is not a solution and in fact does not even address the problem. Then adding up to 9 waste carts in a very tight area where there are only 2 again just adds to the problem.

I am also against changing the height restrictions from 10 to 11 meters. Existing homes in this area are being dwarfed by new homes that do not comply to the existing rules. In fact, many homes recently built or currently under construction completely disregard this rule, and ask for forgiveness later (3835 1 ST SW). Where we used to enjoy a sunny street scape and yard we are now shadowed by towering homes.

I am very disappointed in the City's response to the concerns raised by neighbors and association. The rational for the change in zoning appears to be for personal gain only and without any regard for existing residents or community. The fact that the applicant makes reference to tax benefit to the City should be completely irrelevant. I have sent previous letters, but feel my concerns were not well heard. To reiterate, the only one who would benefit from this proposed change is the applicant, and the neighbors and the rest of the community would suffer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sima Veiner 3834 1 ST SW Calgary, AB T2S 1R3