

### **Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society letters**

Comments Attached with respect to LOC2018-0205 circulated Dec. 3, 2018

Name: Hugh Magill Date: Dec. 20, 2018

Organization: Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society

I am responding on behalf of the Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society (PSPS), in response to the circulation of the proposed Land Use change from DC to DC/M-H2. This is supplemental to our response on Oct 17, 2018 to the previous circulation and since there has been no substantive changes to the proposed amendments from the prior circulation, we still object to the proposed amendments.

We object to the move of one 50 meter tower from Parcel H to Parcel I and the addition of one 50 meter tower overall to the Medicine Hill Development by allowing a 29 meter increase to the height limitation in a portion of Parcel I. The intended land use should be constrained and accommodated within the existing height limitation for Parcel I or alternatively accommodated within Parcel H which allows 50 meter towers. There is not sufficient and compelling reasons to allow the height increase in Parcel I or that the proposed land use cannot be accommodated within Parcel H if a tower style of development is desired. There were sound and reasonable limitations placed on the number and location of towers permitted within the Medicine Hills ASP when Council approved the ASP and those reasons have not changed. The visual and aesthetic imperatives required for such and iconic natural area on the Calgary entranceway should not be compromised for the sake of the Proponent's economic objectives.

There is an additional requirement in Section A.5.2(1)(k) of the Canada Olympic Park & Adjacent Lands ASP that has not been addressed. This section states:

*Development applications shall meet high levels of environmental leadership and low impact development, including:*

*(i) wildlife connectivity;(ii) methods to reduce wildlife conflicts;(iii) Bird Friendly Urban Design Guidelines;*

*(iv) minimized interface between surface parking and the Paskapoo Slopes Natural Area;*

*and(v) inclusion of a report from a qualified environmental consultant representing that the submission meets these high levels of current environmental standards and practices.*

The City Planner for this area stated that the report from a qualified environmental consultant would not be required until the Development Permit stage. However, this area has clearly been the subject of high levels of Public and Council concerns with regard to the environmental significance and planning requirements. This is underscored by the requirement for a Joint Advisory Committee(JAC) under this ASP including numerous environmental, community and other stakeholder groups. It therefore makes no sense to leave the environmental report to the development permit stage when it should be an important consideration at the Land Use and ASP amendment stage of decision making. The impact of the proximity of the proposed development to a ravine and the shadow effect of two 50 meter towers are potential concerns that could be confirmed or allayed by having this report available before

### **Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society letters**

decisions are made. The fact that neither the Development Permits or the consultant's report are circulated or shared with the JAC, also diminishes the purpose and function of the JAC and deferring the report to a subsequent stage of planning removes that opportunity for review and consultation from the JAC.

We also consider that the proposal does not satisfy the requirements under Section A.5.2(3)(f) which include a requirement that the development design "ensure compatibility with adjacent development;". The proposed towers will be adjacent to three storey townhouses which in this context should not be considered as compatible. While towers in a lower density and height area are not uncommon and considered acceptable in areas where high density is encouraged and required in support of transit hubs or major routes, that is not the situation and not appropriate in the context of the area as laid out in the ASP. There has also been no visual depiction of the design of the townhouse development provided to the JAC or public to show how it relates to the proposed towers. In fact several of the display boards at the two Public Open Houses did not show the townhouse development at all.

In conclusion we request that City Planning, CPC and City Council require the following:

- 1) That the Environmental Consultant's Report be supplied and circulated prior to the recommendation and approval of the proposed amendments.
- 2) Maintain the height restrictions on Block I as currently set out in the ASP
- 3) If the height restrictions are increased in Block I as requested in the application, that the existing overall limitation of 9 prominent building or max. height 50 meter towers in the ASP be maintained with no additional prominent buildings allowed. If the Applicant is allowed two 50 meter towers in Block I, that should require shifting or reallocating two towers from Block H.
- 4) That the Development Permit be required to be circulated to all members of the JAC for review prior to approval.

Regards,  
Hugh Magill  
President,  
Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society

## **Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society letters**

Comments Attached

Name: Hugh Magill Date: Oct. 17, 2018

Organization: Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society

I am responding on behalf of the Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society (PSPS), in response to the circulation of the proposed Land Use change from DC to DC/M-H2.

We object to the move of one 50 meter tower from Parcel H to Parcel I and the addition of one 50 meter tower overall to the Medicine Hill Development by allowing a 29 meter increase to the height limitation in a portion of Parcel I.

The basis for our objection is as follows:

- The Proponent has not provided any rationale or justification to the City or Stakeholders as to the need to increase the number of 50 meter towers approved by City Council in the ASP from 9 towers to 10 towers.
- The Proponent has not provided in the circulation, the visual perspectives of the two proposed towers and the City has not circulated the visuals and conceptual drawings provided by the Proponent in the file. The visual considerations were key requirements and issues of concern to the public and City Council at the time of the ASP Public Hearing and Approval. Height restrictions and limitations on the number of towers were also strictly limited and of concern to City Council and Stakeholder groups including PSPS. The addition of another tower vs utilizing the existing allotment of 9 towers to suit the development opportunities is seen by us to be a continuation of the erosion on the overall vision, style and concept that was sold to Council and the Public by the Proponent at the time of the ASP consideration and approval. There needs to be some hard lines and limitations maintained on these key aspects of development for Medicine Hills in order to ensure that bar that was established by City Council for the development, is in fact achieved.
- We also believe that the provision of senior's housing in this area would be better accommodated and more appropriately structured within the existing height limits in Parcel I. There is no justification on the basis of the intended use or function that would require a higher/taller structure for senior's housing.

Although the File Manager has indicated that we could attend at City Hall to view the visuals and conceptual drawings in the file, we do not feel that this is a warranted or appropriate requirement given the importance of the visual perspectives and an undue obstacle presented in the engagement process. As Stakeholder members of the Joint Advisory Committee established by City Council for this area, we believe that this information will be required from the proponent at the requisite JAC meeting for this proposal and therefore, should be provided to us on request at the time of circulation since the deadline for responses on the circulation preceded the JAC meeting.

**Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society letters**

Thank you for considering our concerns and we look forward to further involvement on this application as it continues to be reviewed and through the JAC process.

Please also provide us with a copy of the DTR on this application when it is available.

Regards,  
Hugh Magill  
President,  
Paskapoo Slopes Preservation Society