

Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Peter Choate <pwchoate@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 7:49 PM
To: Public Submissions; Woolley, Evan V.; Office of the Mayor; Peter Choate
Subject: [EXT] Re: Land Use Re-designation – Sunalta – Bylaw 119D2019
Attachments: Land Use .docx

Attached please find our submission on this issue

--

Peter W. Choate,
Clinical Social Worker
Associate Professor, Social Work
Department of Child Studies and Social Work
Mount Royal University

I would like to acknowledge that Mount Royal University is on the traditional lands of the Niitsitapi, Blackfoot Confederacy and the peoples of Treaty 7, which include the Siksika, the Piikani, the Kainai, the Tsuut'ina and the Stoney Nakoda First Nations. In addition, the City of Calgary is homeland to Metis Nation Region 3.

Peter Choate and Associates Ltd.
1524-16 Ave SW
Calgary T3C 1C9
May 20 2019

Attention: Laura M. Kennedy, City Clerk – PublicSubmissions@calgary.ca

Re: Land Use Re-designation – Sunalta – Bylaw 119D2019

We are writing in response to your letter regarding the above. We object to the redesignation for a variety of reasons, outlined below. Thus, our support would require significant changes to the proposal.

1. **Change of neighbourhood** - The proposal would suggest that the land use would lead to a significant change in the nature of the neighbourhood. The developer has put forward the notion of an approximately 28 story building. This far exceeds anything currently in the neighbourhood or even nearby. A building greater than 20 stories is such a change as to permanently alter the nature of the neighbourhood. It is vital to note that, unlike a proposal on 10th Ave and 14th Street, this portion of Sunalta is residential.
2. **Densification** – We are acutely aware that the City of Calgary seeks to increase residential density, particularly in the inner-city areas. That goal is laudable. However, it should not be achieved with the direct loss of neighbourhood for those already living in the area. Currently we understand the maximum is 7 stories. There is no rationale given the neighbourhood to go beyond that – to do otherwise places priority on developer profit and not on neighbourhood quality of life. Arlington puts money in their pockets at our

expense. Is there really a justification for that and the loss of our sunshine, our quality of life?

3. **Traffic** – We have attended both public meetings on this project. Our concerns were acknowledged and dismissed, particularly at the second meeting. When we raised concerns about traffic volumes, a representative of the City Traffic told us that we will need to “accept the changes or move.” Such an attitude is offensive and suggests our concerns are of no value.
 - a. 16th Ave. is not capable of sustained growth. Volumes are already at maximum during many parts of the day.
 - b. The intersection of 16th Ave and 14th Street SW is incapable of further volumes. Throughout the day, that intersection fails to clear. There are often cars stuck in the intersection. Traffic with present volumes is very often backed up on 14th street, particularly southbound traffic, for 4-6 blocks.
 - c. The intersection of 15th St SW and 16th Ave SW, which is a restricted access intersection is beyond a failing point. Because of traffic volumes, multiple times per hour, traffic will disobey traffic signs in order to get around the 16th Ave SW delays eastbound as well as northbound volumes on 14th St SW.
 - d. The proposed traffic light at 17th Ave SW and 15th Street SW will not improve the traffic flow. This was acknowledged by the City Traffic representative at the second community meeting.
 - e. The Sunalta neighbourhood and the adjacent Scarboro neighbourhood have narrowed access due to traffic calming measures. Access is already problematic and will become increasingly so with this densification proposal.

- f. The developer states that occupants of the proposed structures will mainly use public transit. This is an unsupportable statement. They offered no research to support when asked. In our own direct observations with buildings near us, the vehicle traffic related to the buildings is significant.
 - g. Parking – the developer has failed to provide a viable traffic entry and egress plan much less a viable parking plan. They indicate that access must be on 16th Ave SW. This is not feasible given the limits of the street. Even if 50% of the occupants take transit, which is optimistic at best, the volume increase is still very significant. We estimate that is 400 cars per day added volume which the current traffic options cannot support.
 - h. Access to our homes – This also will be further restricted due to elevated traffic flows. Already, we have difficulty accessing our home during busy times. Our laneway has become an alternate route to get into and through Sunalta. We experience high traffic volumes for a laneway that will be further exacerbated by this proposal as drivers seek alternatives.
4. **Sunlight** – We have carefully considered the sunlight studies put forward by the developer. They do not conform to our own lived experience when considered on an annualized basis. The height of the proposed structure robs us of natural sunlight.
 5. **Community Space** – The developer states that they will offer community space to benefit Sunalta as a “trade off” for increased densification. Their proposal offers no guarantees of this, nor are they capable of such given economic, space, ownership and capacity of community groups. Thus, their offer is specious at best.

We are pessimistic that the City of Calgary cares for the needs of the single own homers, particularly in Sunalta. We believe there are communities that get more deference than Sunalta yet are we less deserving?

Yours sincerely

Electronically signed

Peter and April Choate

cc: Councillor E. Wooley – evan.wooley@calgary.ca
Mayor Naheed Nenshi – naheed.nenshi@calgary.ca