

Jonathan Klein
302-1059 5th Ave NW
Calgary Alberta T2N 4S8

March 31, 2019

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

Emailed to: PublicSubmissions@calgary.ca

RE: LOC2018-0215 | 810 9A Street NW | Application for Land Use Amendment from Multi-Residential Contextual Grade Oriented (M-CGd72) to Direct Control/Multi-Residential – Contextual Medium Profile (DC/M-C2)

Dear Councillors,

Regarding the subject application I have the following comments for your consideration.

- 1) I am opposed to this application because it will involve the destruction of a beautiful old house:



This house adds a touch of beauty to the community that is enjoyed not only by residents of Sunnyside but also by thousands of commuters passing by on the C-train every day.

- 2) If this application is approved, then I would suggest that any funds to be contributed to the Hillhurst/Sunnyside Community Amenity Fund in exchange for a density increase, be instead contributed to the "Bow to Bluff Urban Design Framework", as mentioned in the Hillhurst Sunnyside Community Association Letter (Attachment 3 of the Calgary Planning Commission Report).

Since this house is located within the boundary of the "Bow to Bluff Urban Design Framework", which apparently lacks funding, it would seem appropriate to me that any contributed funds be spent on this project, rather than elsewhere in Hillhurst/Sunnyside.

- 3) I have a few comments related to the design of the new buildings.
 - a) From the applicant's submission it appears that in one building they intend to have three "senior oriented" units at ground level, and above these three "student oriented" units. This doesn't seem right - I envision an elderly granny stuffing cotton in her ears in a desperate attempt to get some sleep while a SAIT student parties all night in the unit above her.

If the applicant is serious about having students and seniors living one above the other, I would suggest that the upper units should have floor construction that provides a high degree of sound insulation so that elderly residents in the lower units are not disturbed by noise from above. For example solid concrete slab floors generally provide better sound insulation than wood joist floors.

- b) Also related to sound insulation, the C-Train creates a fair bit of noise which may be an annoyance to residents of the new buildings. So, I suggest that the exterior walls and windows should also be designed for a high degree of sound insulation.
 - c) Security is also a concern in the neighbourhood being that the C-Train station is so close. It appears that the applicant is proposing all units to have exterior entrance doors, which are a security concern, and an enclosed courtyard, which could provide cover for a thief trying to break in. So, I suggest that extra security features be incorporated into the design of the buildings.

I make these comments because, for one, thoughtless design by developers in order to save a few bucks irritates me to no end, and also because a building of low quality construction affects the entire community even if only a little bit.

If council has the authority to impose design requirements on new developments I would like to suggest that my comments be reviewed by a City department with expertise in building construction, which could then recommend specific requirements to be incorporated into the design of the buildings.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Klein

From: [Jones, Steve P. \(LUPP\)](#)
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] Land Use Amendment LOC 2018 0215
Date: Monday, April 01, 2019 12:53:53 PM

Hi...this was just sent to me today. I'm not sure if they have met the deadline or not.

Regards,

Steve

Steve Jones, M.Pl., MCIP, RPP

Senior Planner | Community Planning | North Team

The City of Calgary | Mail Code: # 8076

T 403.268.2523 | **F** 403.268.3636

P.O. Box 2100, Stn M, Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

From: David McLean [mailto:dmackmclean@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 12:03 PM

To: Jones, Steve P. (LUPP) <Steve.Jones2@calgary.ca>

Subject: [EXT] Land Use Amendment LOC 2018 0215

Hi Steve,

Please provide these comments to the city clerk for the public hearing.

RE.

Land Use Amendment: LOC2018-0215

Location: 810 9A St. NW

We are the family who lives at 814 9A St. NW: David, Sophia and our two year old daughter, Matilda. We oppose the proposed land use change.

Current zoning allows for a smaller multi-family unit that makes sense for the property size and capacity of the neighbourhood. We can all agree that density in the inner-city is positive; however, when that growth is unsustainable, it will create problems in the community. We feel the current zoning is adequate, allows for sustainable growth and, therefore, oppose this land use amendment for the following reasons:

Reduction of future density potential

810 9a st NW, the lot with the land use proposal and our lot 814 9a st NW are locked between two larger condos. Developing one of the lots reduces future development and density potential. We have made several overtures to the developer; and are open to moving and developing our lot. For capacity or financial reasons the developer is unable/unwilling to accept any options. Developing only of these lots reduces future density opportunities. Why only development one lot with 8 units when you could develop both and build exponentially more units. This isn't a good deal for future density nor is it positive from a land use perspective.

Parking:

The 8 unit development seeks approval to only have two parking spots in lieu of eight minus the 10% reduction for the development's proximity to the LRT. 9A Street is currently heavily congested from the development of the one hundred and ten unit Ven condo. Guests visiting the Ven condo spill over creating heavy congestion on our street. We are frequently unable to park in front of our own house because of this traffic. Calgary is ultimately a commuter city. Residents and guests of the large Ven condo, despite their underground parking facility, have overflowed onto 9A Street creating ongoing parking problems. The street has zero capacity to park additional vehicles.

Ven condos previously argued that the proximity to the train and that their smaller units would attract students who would simply walk. In actuality, and even with underground parking on site, we have witnessed incredible parking problems on our street. Allowing for eight units and potentially over twenty people and cars in this proposed development is unworkable without parking on-site.

Front and Rear setbacks would be awkward and unsafe along 9a st:

The contextual front setback is far too close to the sidewalk and doesn't match the current street layout. All of the multi-family dwellings on the street as well as the houses share the same set-back from the sidewalk. The proximity of the proposal building is significantly closer to the property line. This would create a disjointed and incongruent street layout. Moreover, the setback would further block sunlight and our view of the neighbourhood. There is a tight sense of community along the single family homes on 9A St. NW. The children from the houses, while supervised, play together along the street. The new setback would block our line of sight between the houses creating a safety concern for our children walking between the houses. The setback is so close to the property line that we worry that our toddler would not be able to see oncoming traffic.

Further, there are zero buildings facing the park behind 9A St. NW. Allowing a development to build a unit that faces the park would feel incongruent and not match the street.

Setback Relaxations:

Placing eight units on a single family lot feels excessive and arguing the need for setbacks to achieve those development goals will create additional problems. If the setbacks are allowed, the project will be challenged to fit construction equipment on their property, create shadowing issues and impact our privacy and risk flooding our property. Setbacks exist because of a strong planning rationale. Ignoring setbacks to simply build more will create problems and challenge the project.

Drainage and Landscaping:

Hardscaping nearly the entirety of the property will create serious drainage issues. We live in a century home and we are unable to install perimeter weeping tile due to risk of damage to our foundation. Enabling an entirely hardscaped development next door would create serious water runoff issues that would flood our basement. The apartment next door accidentally had a leaking gutter last winter adjacent to our building. The water flooded a room in our basement. An entirely hardscaped lot is a flooding risk to neighbouring homes.

Shadowing:

The current house on the lot already casts a shadow over our property creating issues with

ice damming. Allowing for an even larger building will exacerbate this problem and we will be burdened with mitigation cost.

The development would be situated south of our property. The setback relaxations alongside the oversized development would heavily shade our property including our front and backyard. This would drastically reduce our quality of life and would create further issues with snow buildup around our property. Snow buildup alongside our century foundation increases flooding risk in our basement.

Privacy:

We would lose all sense of privacy in our back and front yard. We would have a condo building with raised windows with an unobstructed view of our child playing in our back and front yard. In addition, the current building plans include a courtyard between the two proposed buildings. This courtyard would align with our backyard. With a potential of twenty or more residents using this common space, we feel we would lose our privacy and deal with noise issues. Moreover, the developer seeks relaxation on setbacks and privacy screens further exacerbating this problem.

Density:

Current zoning is appropriate and permits a smaller multi-family development which is more suited to this site and community. The proposed land use change would create excessive density and create problems such as those listed above. A smaller multi-family unit makes more sense and is logical for the community. We feel a land use amendment is unnecessary as the current zoning is appropriate for the community.

For these reasons we oppose the proposed land use amendment.

David McLean, Sophia Aristou and Matilda McLean.

From: [Jones, Steve P. \(LUPP\)](#)
To: [Public Submissions](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] Comment on the Proposed Land Use Change for LOC2018-0215
Date: Monday, April 01, 2019 1:11:27 PM

I received this for an item on April 8 public hearing.

Regards,

Steve

Steve Jones, M.Pl., MCIP, RPP

Senior Planner | Community Planning | North Team

The City of Calgary | Mail Code: # 8076

T 403.268.2523 | **F** 403.268.3636

P.O. Box 2100, Stn M, Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

From: Carole Wagner [mailto:carole.beatty@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2019 9:50 PM

To: Jones, Steve P. (LUPP) <Steve.Jones2@calgary.ca>

Subject: [EXT] Comment on the Proposed Land Use Change for LOC2018-0215

Mr. Jones,

We are writing to provide a comment on the proposed land use change for Project LOC2018-0215 (810 9A St NW). The notice also asks that we reference Bylaw 83D2019.

Our comment is simply that a 4-5 story building is not appropriate for a single lot. We take no issue with a duplex or fourplex, but a 5 story apartment building is much too large for the land on which it is proposed to be built. We would accordingly ask that the land use be limited to a 2 or 3 story building. This would also be more consistent with the other buildings on the street.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carole and Tom Wagner--

Carole Beatty

T | +1 403 3897451