

## Palaschuk, Jordan

---

**From:** donotreply@calgary.ca  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 15, 2019 10:14 AM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Cc:** Krasovsky, Vladislav; Simpson, Kiley C.; Chaudhary, Armaghan; Posse Support  
**Subject:** 2040 32 AV SW – LOC2018-0232 – Comment from Development Map

Application: LOC2018-0232

Submitted by: Matthew Hamel

### Contact Information

Address: 3304 20 St SW

Phone: 4039666604

Email: matthew.hamel@gmail.com

### Feedback:

Currently there is no on street parking on my block nor on 20 st outside of my home. A group of row houses a block further north has 4 single car garages most of which are not used for vehicles. This proposed amendment will result in loss of trees, shading, as well as an increase in traffic. Further the current house likely has asbestos.

## Palaschuk, Jordan

---

**From:** J S  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 15, 2019 4:02 PM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Subject:** [EXT] May 27, 2019 Hearing, Item 6: Policy & Land Use Amendment in South Calgary at 2040 - 32 Avenue SW, LOC2018-0232

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Council,

My name is Jessie Shire and I live across the avenue. I would like to voice my concerns over the following item:

Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment in South Calgary (Ward 8) at 2040 – 32 Avenue SW, LOC2018-0232, CPC2019-0431 Bylaws 38P2019 and 108D2019

I notice that there is an increasing trend to creep up the height of buildings in the Marda Loop area on an ad-hoc basis above the ARP. (The community association has brought forth this concern numerous times as well.) This is done before a Development Plan (DP) is in place so that the neighbours/community cannot dispute a change in designation as they don't really know what is going to be constructed. And then when a DP is proposed, the land use has already been changed, so the community cannot dispute the DP based on ARP or land use. Seems like a bit of a loophole developers have found to circumvent local feedback. This specific proposal seems to fall in this category.

As well, there is a push to increase density from duplexes to 4-plexes. This application also proposes this. My concern is that this style of building removes green space and creates a Baltimore projects style of home that is tall and just has a bunch of porches very near the sidewalk. I am not exaggerating by much as you can see by the below picture of said 'Baltimore Projects'. Having looked extensively at the renderings of these 4-plexes, they look really nice on paper, but in actuality they are a cannibalizing of the neighborhood. They do this by eating up the beautiful greenspaces and artful landscaping that Marda loop has and replace that space with building and bare minimum easements. Aesthetically, Marda loop is very nice to walk through and enjoy the beautiful yards and landscaping of the single and duplex homes. In 4-plexes, only minimal space and thought is given to the outdoor aesthetic. Maybe a buzzword like 'community garden' will be thrown out and a cheap planter constructed at most. As more of these 4-plex, project style homes are put up, the neighborhood will feel more claustrophobic walking through, which is the opposite of the city's Mainstreets program goals. This specific proposal falls into this aforementioned cannibalization.

One final thing is that this application also proposes that parking not be necessary. Or rather that the parking amount be circumvented. As one can see from the application photo on page 3 of 8, street parking in the immediate vicinity can be sometimes tight. The addition of a 4-plex will exacerbate this issue.

Thank you for listening to my input and I welcome any feedback or further discussion.

Jessie Shire



320 x 240 - Images may be subject to copyright. Find out more

**Palaschuk, Jordan**

---

**From:** J S  
**Sent:** Friday, May 17, 2019 8:59 AM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Subject:** [EXT] Re: May 27, 2019 Hearing, 6 storey increase and 4 plex approvals

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Added to May 27 Council folder

Council,

My name is Jessie Shire and I live across the avenue. I would like to add an additional comment regarding the change from the entire Marda Loop/Richmond area's 4 story limit to 6 stories. It has been brought to my attention that there was a public ENGAGE process done in November 2018. Almost unanimously, the community said they did not want increased height. It seems insincere on the city's part to ask for feedback and then completely ignore it. Approving these height increases and architecturally impoverished eyesores in the name of density will not create or maintain the jewel of a community that Marda Loop is. In fact, very few areas have the diversity and beauty that this area has. There is a lot of history in this area and to turn it into another auburn Bay type suburb would be a small tragedy. Density can be done properly and respectfully. But all space must not just be used for physical buildings, ie) developer sq ft to sell:

**There must be space allotted for bigger sidewalks** for a better pedestrian sphere.

**There must be MORE space given to greenspaces.** Why does the city not buy/annex some of these empty lots and make new greenspaces such as the empty lot on 21st st sw and 33rd ave. The planning seems to be bent on creating a 6 story wall on 33rd that completely isolates the rest of the community. Some breathing room in the plan would be very nice.

**There also must be consideration given for vertical space** and how it affects the atmosphere of the area. Allowing a 6 story plex next to a 2.5 story duplex isn't the best option. There is a reason that 4 stories is the max.

Council, please allow the Marda Loop area to grow more organically within the bounds of a 4 story limit and also do not allow any more 4 plexes on crowded lots. A few are quirky, but having more takes away, rather than adds to the greater Marda community.

thanks,

Jessie Shire

**Palaschuk, Jordan**

---

**From:** AGATA NOWAK <abnowak@shaw.ca>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 19, 2019 8:15 PM  
**To:** Public Submissions  
**Subject:** [EXT] Public Hearing May 27 LOC2018-0232  
**Attachments:** Objection to Land Use Amendment LOC2018-0232 May27.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

Attached please find our letter in objection to the Land Use Amendment from R-C2 to R-CG in our neighbourhood for the Public Hearing on May 27, 2019.

We would also like to express our objection to the new MU-2 zoning of 33/34 Ave SW. City Council's Application to rezone 33/34 Ave. S.W. is biased towards Developers. City Council has not taken into consideration the November 2018 "What We Heard Report on Zoning" which clearly shows that the community is against rezoning including the new MU-2 zoning.

Sincerely,  
Boguslaw and Agata Nowak.

Boguslaw and Agata Nowak  
2034/2036 32 AVE SW  
Calgary, AB, T2T 1W6  
Ph. (403) 714-4789  
abnowak@shaw.ca

May 19, 2019

VIA E-MAIL

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

**RE: LAND USE AMENDMENT FROM R-C2 TO R-CG  
SOUTH CALGARY (WARD 8)  
2040 32 AV SW  
LOC2018-0232**

Dear Members of Council:

We are the owners of the property located at 2034/2036 32 Avenue SW. Our property is adjacent to the proposed four-unit townhouse, with shared use of the back lane and access to the garages. With this letter we would like to join the voices of our neighbors and members of our community and express our 100% objection to the proposed land use change from R-C2 to R-CG.

We are directly affected by this proposed amendment and as such, we feel that our voices should be given appropriate weight in this process. We will have to live with the consequences of this and not the City officials who will make this decision, who never visited the site, nor the developer whose sole concern is to make the profit.

The approval process is fundamentally flawed. We only had 12-day notice to express our opposition, which gave us not enough time to conduct proper consultation with our neighbors or organize a petition. I cannot be expected to accept this proposed building envelope not having the opportunity to examine more finalized plans as we have no idea what to expect.

We are being asked to accept something on principal and being told that we will have the opportunity to oppose to specific building elements later, while we feel that later it will be too late, and the fourplex will be a done deal, no matter how many letters we write. Our main concern is with the size and number of units, as we are fundamentally opposed to having a fourplex built next door.

Our decision to build our residence in this area was based on the fact that this was R-C2 designated area, all the houses in the immediate proximity were either single or duplex properties, within the mature, family-friendly community. Also, we wanted our home to support our lifestyle and current needs, but most of all, we wanted to invest our hard-earned money (and our future retirement income) in an area that would hold, and potentially increase, the value of our investment. We strongly believe that the proposed fourplex will decrease the value of our home and other properties in the area.

From the preliminary site plans, it is evident that the builder intends to build a similar structure as the one directly to the north (2039 31 Avenue SW), which gives us a good indication as to the perimeter, mass and height, amount of shading it creates, and complete loss of privacy in our backyard.

Even though we were not able to see the more detailed plans, judging by the copy of the plan supplied, builder proposes massive flat wall with large cantilevers extending throughout the entire length of the building facing my property. In addition, contrary to the assumption that the intent is to increase height to 11metres, the preliminary plans specify maximum building height of 14 meters. We feel that there is no reason for extending the height when it is easy to design attractive and functional buildings within the 10 meters height (my property is a good example).

Current R-C2 rule requires 45% max for building envelope lot coverage. It is not possible to build a fourplex on this lot without covering 60%, so the property will have to cover most of the lot. This will result in not only blocking the sunlight from both front and back, but also a total loss of privacy in my back yard.

We won't be able to use our deck during the summer without feeling like being constantly on display or being observed, not to mention being in constant shade. During a visit to my property by the city planner, I voiced my concerns regarding privacy. While she agreed that our privacy will be non-existent, she suggested that it is possible to use obscure windows. Not a solution since if those are bedroom windows, they will have to be openable, which negates the privacy for me.

The property will probably have balconies on third floor which will add to loss of privacy. Also, having four units backing towards our property means increasing fourfold the likelihood of having our privacy invaded (as compared to having one neighbor if this was just a single house or a duplex). Another issue with sharing our wall with four units across a very narrow space, and possibly having four air-conditioning units running in the summer will result in a noise level that will result in a nightmare of many sleepless nights.

At this point, I feel doubly deceived by the City. When I decided to purchase and re-develop the old property in this neighborhood with R-C2 land use designation, I felt reassured that eventually someone will also revitalize the property next door following the area standards. I was not informed that the City is planning to change density in the area. Knowing that, I would have re-assessed my plans.

In addition, when I was developing my property plans, I was required by the City development to upgrade and invest in outside materials, door cladding, and stone “to keep the upscale feel of the community and increase value”. Now by considering this land use change, the City is promoting downscaling, opening doors for additional secondary suites and rentals that will change the neighborhood’s family-friendly character.

We feel that this land use re-designation process is mainly about money and profits despite of being presented as benefiting the community and creating affordable housing. By purchasing this property for close to a \$1M, the developer must have felt very confident not only that his application will be accepted, but also that he will make good profit when the properties will sell for \$650,000 - \$750,000 each. The City will also benefit by approximately additional \$1M of taxable property on an annual basis (difference between property tax of a duplex vs fourplex).

The claim of trying to create affordable housing is very ironic given the fact that these units will possibly sell for \$750,000, which makes them not very affordable to the citizens who are in need of affordable housing: low and middle-income families, Indigenous, recent immigrants, seniors, persons with disabilities, lone parent families, singles and youth, according to the City of Calgary website (<http://www.calgary.ca/CS/OLSH/Documents/Affordable-housing/Affordable-Housing-Needs-Assessment.pdf>).

There are already areas nearby (or in other neighborhoods throughout the city) that are zoned for the multi-unit housing, with much better transportation and amenities access, so there is no compelling reason for such re-zoning in this area. Even though the applicant claims to create more affordable housing units, while in fact he is inflating the market by paying premium price for the land anticipating high profits, which compels other sellers to increase their selling price, it will make it less affordable for other people to buy old properties and revitalize the community.

We are also very concerned with the limited street parking for the residents and their visitors, which is further aggravated by the high volume of customers and patrons of the businesses along the 33 Avenue. In addition, the on-going commercial construction in the area contributes to the traffic and lack of parking. Adding four units (with potentially eight additional vehicles) will make the parking situation even more challenging. Rezoning will allow the possibility for secondary suites which will create even more parking issues.

In conclusion, we would like to respectfully urge the Council to deny this request for a change to the zoning of 2040 32 Avenue SW.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Boguslaw (Bob) and Agata Nowak

Following are a few pictures of our back yard to illustrate our points regarding loss of privacy and shading.



View of our back yard facing the proposed fourplex development.



Amount of shading we are experiencing on a relatively sunny day. Imagine what will happen having 11 meters high wall blocking the sun all afternoon and evening all year.





Instead looking at these trees, we will be looking at a wall with windows. Or even worse, someone will be looking at us ...



