Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I object to the application for the following reasons;

1. The potential seven storey building (2 floors of commercial and 5 floor of residential) out of scale for the neighbourhood and not a reasonable zoning given the lack of access for parking and commercial access on 27th Avenue.
2. A rezoning application of this scale must not be submitted separately from the development permit. They should be applied for at the same time to ensure that a re-zoning is for a specific development.
3. The scale of the proposed development associated with this re-zoning is completely out of line with adjacent land use and recently approved development across the street from the proposed development.
4. The Applicant's Proposal will overwhelm existing traffic/road infrastructure on 27th Avenue.
5. The Applicant's Proposal will reduce traffic safety at the intersection of Edmonton Trail and 27th Avenue NE.
6. The Applicant's Proposal will negatively impact existing small businesses on Edmonton Trail in the vicinity of the Proposed Development by adding more commercial/retail development to an already under-utilized commercial/retail infrastructure.
7. The Applicant's Proposal has not addressed safety and privacy concerns of adjacent landowners due to sight lines from the proposed Development to adjacent landowners property.
8. The Applicant's Proposal has not addressed the cumulative effects of road infrastructure use from the approved 3 storey residential development under construction across the street from the proposed development.
9. The Applicant's Proposal is inconsistent with plans presented at an open house at the Winston Heights Community Centre earlier this year. The development proposed at that time was a 6 storey development. The building height is now stated at approximately 7-8 storeys. This re-enforces the need for a re-zoning application and development permit to be submitted as one complete and comprehensive application package to avoid miscommunication of key elements of the proposed development.
Thank you for considering my objection and the reasons for it. Do not hesitate to contact me at 403-816-9312 if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Darryl Burns
427 – 27 Avenue NE
Cell: 403-816-9312
Please see below.

From: Kelly Thom [mailto:kellythom72@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2019 7:59 PM
To: Silot, Joseph A.; Furness, Jordan A.; City Clerk
Cc: CAWard7 - Dale Calkins
Subject: [EXT] Concerns Regarding Application LOC2018-0172, CPC 2018-1301

It has come to my attention that my concerns submitted online in August 2018 were not passed on to those reviewing the above noted application. As such, I am have resubmitted my concerns online and in this email in time to be reviewed prior to the January 14, 2019 hearing.

I live on the same Avenue as the proposed Application LOC2018-0172 and vehemently oppose this redesignation for the following reasons:

1. There has already been and continues to be considerable development on this Avenue consisting of multiple attached dwellings (side by sides) and infills. This has resulted in a higher density population, higher volume of traffic and parking issues. The development of an MU-2h27 designated property will only compound these issues.

2. To make matters worse, there is an M-C1 designated property currently being developed directly across the street from this particular application in question and another one scheduled to be built two blocks away on the same Avenue (NW corner of 27 Avenue & 6th Street NE). As well, it should be noted that the Winston Heights Mountview Community Hall and a playground are located on the same Avenue in question. All of these developments, together with the existing neighbourhood facilities located on the same Avenue will again compound the aforementioned issues.

3. And lastly, to be honest, I am concerned with the kind of people a mixed residential and commercial use development will attract. If you look around at the mixed use developments already in our neighbourhood, the buildings are not maintained and the establishments in the commercial space are less than desirable (ie. bong shops, pawn shops, massage parlours, etc.). We have had 2 houses on this Avenue recently shut down and condemned due to drug and other criminal activity. After witnessing various criminal activities and working with the Calgary Police and Safe Communities and Neighbourhoods ("SCAN") to get these criminals out of the community and the houses shut down, allowing a combination of high density and commercial is concerning to say the least.
Again, I oppose Application LOC2018-0172 and I hope my concerns and the concerns of other community members are taken into account.

Kelly Thom  
617-27 Avenue NE  
Email: kellythom72@gmail.com  
Phone: 403-404-0905

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 27, 2018, at 12:18 PM, Silot, Joseph A. <Joseph.Silot@calgary.ca> wrote:

Good day,

I hope you are well. I wanted to thank you for your comments and let you know that we are finishing our initial review of the proposal. I have also shared your concerns with the applicant and hopefully we can ensure collaborative and transparent communication moving forward. As you may know, the land use redesignation does not include the specific details of a proposal, but the land use aspects only providing the framework for the intensity of the site. In any case, a development of this scope would go through a thorough review as a discretionary development permit if the land use is approved. I understand that many community members may have been away over the summer or could not attend the planning meeting discussing this item. I urged the applicant to look into attending another meeting once additional building details are developed. As the project moves forward with the review, I advise that you keep track of the application and attend the public hearing/council date: https://developmentmap.calgary.ca/#property/LOC2018-0172

Sincerely,

Joseph Silot, BA, LEED Green Assoc  
Planner 2, North Team  
Community Planning  
The City of Calgary | Mail code: #8076  
T 4032682355 | F 4032683636 | joseph.silot@calgary.ca  
5th Floor, Municipal Building, 800 Macleod Tr. S.E.  
P.O. Box 2100, Station M, Calgary, AB Canada T2P 2M5
Palaschuk, Jordan

From: Muir, Althea K. on behalf of City Clerk
Sent: Friday, January 04, 2019 11:48 AM
To: Public Submissions
Subject: FW: [EXT] Edmonton Trail and 27th Ave-Land Use Application LOC2018-0172, CPC 2018-1301

Please see below.

From: weekshome@shaw.ca [mailto:weekshome@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2019 6:49 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: CAWard7 - Dale Calkins
Subject: [EXT] Edmonton Trail and 27th Ave-Land Use Application LOC2018-0172, CPC 2018-1301

Mayor Naheed Nenshi and Members of City Council,

My family and I own and reside at 447 27th Avenue NE and I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed application for a mixed use building on the south east corner of 27th Avenue and Edmonton Trail. My concerns are as follows:

- 27th Avenue NE has changed over the years and the street is now mostly made up of infill homes, meaning that there is very little parking in front of the homes. There is already a parking issue on our block as commuters use the street as free parking and then catch the bus on Edmonton Trail to commute to their jobs. A development such at this, with the number of residents and the traffic associated with the proposed businesses is going to require a significant amount of parking. There does not appear any significant parking area associated with this development. Where will these individuals park? We have already had instances where parkers partially block driveways causing difficulty for homeowners to exit their garages. We have no back lanes on 27th Avenue, so a front exit is our only option. I can only see this worsening with this development. I suspect parkers will utilize the community centre parking lot, impacting those parkers who would have legitimate reasons to park in that lot.

- 27th Avenue is one of the first streets where you can legally turn left when heading south in rush hour, meaning that we have quite heavy traffic at that time of day. Despite the playground zone and the traffic calming measures, 27th Avenue NE continues to be a speed zone. Drivers seem to use the speed bumps as “launching pads” and the concrete blocks at the edges of the roadway are nothing but a hazard since they cannot be seen by drivers under the snow in winter and have been impacted by vehicles many times. Families and small children frequent the playground at the community centre and I believe it is only a matter of time before someone is injured by a speeding driver. The increased traffic created by this development will make this situation significantly worse. If parkers illegally use the community center parking lot there will be a real danger to the small children who cross to access the playground.

- A building of this height is incongruous with the rest of the development in the area. Residents on the higher floors will have a clear view into every house and backyard on the street and the height of the building will shade many yards along the block. This is a quite residential street and this type of building would seem to be more suited to a busier area. I am not opposed to higher-density, multi-use housing but something similar to the three-story building on the north east side of the intersection would seem to be more fitting for this area.

I am hopeful that City Council will hear the concerns of the residents who will be negatively impacted by this development and will not approve this application. Failing that, please consider measures such as blocking off 27th Avenue at Edmonton Trail (turning the street into a cul-de-sac) or permit parking, which of course will then need to be enforced by the City.
Sincerely,

Frances Weeks
2019.01.06

Mayor and Members of City Council
City Clerks #8007, The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100 Station M
Calgary AB T2P@2M5
cityclerk@calgary.ca


Dear Mayor and Members of City Council:

The Planning Department and CPC recommended approval of the applications, but their analysis fails to take into account a number of site specific and community constraints and ignores several Council policies. The amendments should not be supported in the current form.

The Planning Department report states that, “The proposal meets the objective of applicable policies as discussed in the Strategic Alignment of this report.” There is only one policy used to support the application, the Municipal development Plan (MDP) and specifically, Section 3.4 Main Streets.

However, reviewing Section b. of the Main Streets Land Use policies, the MDP is clear that the highest densities and tallest buildings should be at nodal locations not a uniform high and density along the length of a Main Street. It further says that the nodes should be determined “through a local area planning process.” Further between nodes “lower scales of commercial, residential and mix-use development are appropriate.” There has been no local planning process, and there are pre-existing nodes at 23rd and 24th Avenues NE, 20th Avenue NE, and 16th Avenue already designated neighborhood commercial. These sites are consistently under developed according to their approved designations. They are perfect candidates for a mixed use designation with highest densities and tallest buildings. 27th Avenue is not node and it is no justification for it to be treated as one. This is a location where lower scale multi-family residential between nodes is completely appropriate.
Considering Section h. in the Main Street Land Use policies, the policy is explicit that building scale between Main Street and adjacent areas has to be sensitive to scale, form and character of the surrounding building and uses.

A critical factor, completely missing from the Planning report is the reality that there are 6 of lane less blocks in Winston Heights/Mountview (WHMV) flanking Edmonton Trail. This constraint means all site access can only be from the residential avenues. This was an issue identified in the 2006 development of the WHMV ARP. It led to the redesignation to a modest multi-family designation M-C1 for those lots that abut Edmonton Trail. Given the lane less nature of these blocks the M-C1 with maximum height of 14m provide a more sensitive interface with the lower density RC-2, maximum 10m height, which makes up the single detached or semi-detached sites to the east.

An example of this challenge of no lanes and no transition can be seen on the site to the north now under construction with the M-C1 designation. The existing adjoining single family dwelling now has 4 stories, 9 front doors and 18 windows arranged along its west flank. The subject application is requesting an additional 10 meters in height to 24m and 6 stories with likely many more doors and windows.

The subject application is also requesting a mix-use designation, MU-2h24 which requires commercial on the ground and 1st floors. Mix-use is a main component of the Main Street program implementation however mix-use comes with complication of different parking, access and waste disposal requirements at different times of the day. In other Main Street locations, such as further south from the subject site or west on Centre Street these increased, and sometime conflicting requirements can be met from flankage or lane access. Here again access must rely a single point on a residential avenue. Further, 3.4.2 Urban Main Streets Land Use policies indicates

“c. ...Individual Urban Main Street densities and appropriate job and population distributions will be established through a Local Area Plan or within an Implementation Guidebook.”

This has not yet happened, in the Main Streets Implementation Plan update that Council dealt with in April last year, this section of Edmonton Trail was part of the 20 sections recommended for near term action (2018-2020). However, some of this policy work has been subsumed in the North Hill Communities Local Growth Planning, currently underway with some 32 representative from 9 different north hill communities. This application should not set the bar for redevelopment in advance of the local policy work that’s underway.

Public engagement or the lack of it is another concern. It has been limited to the immediate neighbors, convened by the applicant, poorly advertised. The applicant’s submission says, “The neighbors were satisfied with the solutions presented to mitigate their concerns.” This not the
case. As the planning report indicates 10 letters of concerns, many by neighbors who heard about the meeting later, were sent to the planner. The letters were not shared with CPC and concerns summarized in one sentence. The “solutions” offered on response presumably refers to a parking technology that is suspect. More importantly there is no way to ensure that it will part of the development application or final construction. Even if it was included, it also does not answer the questions of constraints, transition, scale and location.

This application represents a major land use precedent not only for the 6 blocks in WHMV but for an equal number of blocks on the west side of Edmonton Trail in the community of Tuxedo. Therefore, this should be part a broader community planning discussion on how to implement Main Streets in this area not a one off approval.

Conclusion

The justification for the land use application is weak and in order to mitigate against the more serious issues of scale, intensity and the constrained site, a more respectful solution would be:

1. The maximum height should set at 14m. This will allow a chance for a sensitive transition to the remainder of the adjoining low density on the avenue.
2. The designation should be MU-1h14. This is a mixed use designation with a major difference that the commercial is optional and confine to the ground level. It is a scale that better fits this section of Edmonton Trail.
3. A development permit be applied for at the MU-1h14 designation with adequate public and community engagement and reviewed for parking, access, transition to adjoining properties and other matters that the approving authority thinks appropriate and approved prior to second and third reading of the redesignation and ARP Bylaws.

Neither myself, nor my wife, as registered title owners of 408 – 26th AVE NE, have been contacted by the developer. Only a ‘Notice of Public Hearing on Planning Matters’, date stamped 2018.12.27 has been received. The information contained is dated, therefore misleading for Winston Heights/Mountview Community members and residents.

Respectfully,

A & G Colabella
January 6, 2019

Mayor and Members of City Council
City Clerks #8007,
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100 Station M
Calgary AB T2P@2M5
cityclerk@calgary.ca

RE: CPC2018-1301, LOC2018-0172 at 407 27 Ave. NE and the proposed amendment to the Winston Heights/Mountview ARP scheduled for the Public Hearing of City Council January 14, 2019

Dear Mayor and Members of City Council:

With regard to the above-referenced matter, this letter is a formal objection by all the undersigned residents in the community. To our surprise, there has been little-to-no public engagement between the Winston Heights residents, and confusion as to how the Winston Heights/Mountview Development and Planning committees’ could endorse the subdivision to the City of Calgary without proper consultation with the residents. There are most definitely a large number of residents in the community that are opposed to this development. Residents of Winston Heights have concerns on a number of issues that have not been addressed by the Developer or the City of Calgary to date through any meaningful consultation. This development will definitely change the dynamics of the community.
The Planning Department and CPC recommended approval of the applications has failed to take into account a number of site specific and community constraints and ignores several Council policies. The amendments cannot be supported in the current form. Some of the outstanding issues are as follows:

The Planning Department report states that, “The proposal meets the objective of applicable policies as discussed in the Strategic Alignment of this report.” There is only one policy used to support the application, the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and specifically Section 3.4 Main Streets.

However reviewing Section b. of the Main Streets Land Use policies, the MDP is clear that the highest densities and tallest buildings should be at nodal locations not at uniform high and density along the length of a Main Street. It further says that the nodes should be determined “through a local area planning process.” Further between nodes “lower scales of commercial, residential and mix-use development are appropriate.” There has been no local planning process, and there are pre-existing nodes at 23rd and 24th Avenues NE, 20th Avenue NE, and 16th Avenue already designated neighborhood commercial. These sites are consistently under developed according to their approved designations. They are perfect candidates for a mixed use designation with highest densities and tallest buildings. 27th Avenue is not node and it is no justification for it to be treated as one. This is a location where lower scale multi-family residential between nodes is completely appropriate.

Considering Section h. in the Main Street Land Use policies, the policy is explicit that building scale between Main Street and adjacent areas has to ‘be sensitive to scale, form and character of the surrounding building and uses.

A critical factor, completely missing from the planning report is the reality that there are 6 blocks without back lanes in Winston Heights/Mountview (WHMV) flanking Edmonton Trail. This constraint means all site access can only be from the residential avenues. This was an issue identified in the 2006 development of the
WHMV ARP. It lead to the re-designation to a modest multifamily designation M-C1 for those lots that abut Edmonton Trail. Given the laneless nature of these blocks the M-C1 with maximum height of 14m provide a more sensitive interface with the lower density RC-2, maximum 10m height, which makes up the single detached or semi-detached sites to the east.

An example of this challenge of no lanes and no transition can be seen on the site to the north now under construction with the M-C1 designation. The existing adjoining single family dwelling now has 4 stories, 9 front doors and 18 windows arranged along its west flank. The subject application is requesting an additional 10 metres in height to 24m and 6 stories with likely many more doors and windows.

The subject application is also requesting a mix-use designation, MU-2h24 which requires commercial on the ground and 1st floors. Mix-use is a main component of the Main Street program implementation however mix-use comes with complication of different parking, access and waste disposal requirements at different times of the day. In other Main Street locations, such as further south from the subject site or west on Centre Street these increased and sometime conflicting requirements can be met from flankage or lane access. Here again access must rely a single point on a residential avenue. Further, 3.4.2 Urban Main Streets Land Use policies indicates

“c....Individual Urban Main Street densities and appropriate job and population distributions will be established through a Local Area Plan or within an Implementation Guidebook.”

This has not yet happened, in the Main Streets Implementation Plan update that Council dealt with in April last year, this section of Edmonton Trail was part of the 20 sections recommended for near term action (2018-2020). However some this policy work has been subsumed in the North Hill Communities Local Growth Planning, currently underway with some 32 representative from 9 different North
Hill communities. This application should not set the bar for redevelopment in advance of the local policy work that’s underway.

Public engagement and the lack there of is another concern for residents. It has been limited to the immediate neighbors to the East of the development, neighbors to the immediate South of the development were not even contacted. A meeting was convened by the applicant, and very poorly advertised. The applicant’s submission says, “The neighbors were satisfied with the solutions presented to mitigate their concerns.” This is not the case. As the planning report indicates 10 letters of concerns, many by neighbors who heard about the meeting later, were sent to the planner. The letters were not shared with CPC and concerns summarized in one sentence. The “solutions” offered on response presumably refers to a parking technology that is suspect. More importantly there is no way to ensure that it will part of the development application or final construction. Even if it was included it also does not answer the questions of constraints, transition, scale and location.

This application represents a major land use precedent not only for the 6 blocks in WHMV but for an equal number blocks on the west side of Edmonton Trail in the community of Tuxedo. Therefore this should be part a broader community planning discussion on how to implement Main Streets in this area not a one off approval.

Conclusion

The justification for the land use application is weak and in order to mitigate against the more serious issues of scale, intensity and the constrained site, a more respectful solution would be:

1. The maximum height should set at 14m. This will allow a chance for a sensitive transition to the remainder of the adjoining low density on the avenue.

2. The designation should be MU-1h14. This is a mixed use designation with a major difference that the commercial is optional and confine to the ground level. It is a scale that better fits this section of Edmonton Trail.
3. A development permit be applied for at the MU-1h14 designation with adequate public and community engagement and reviewed for parking, access, transition to adjoining properties and other matters that the approving authority thinks appropriate and approved prior to second and third reading of the re-designation and ARP Bylaws.

Respectfully

C. Giorgi

R. Volpi

and the undersigned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>418 16 Avenue, Suite 2 &amp; basement, 8616 Executive Mall (Aberdeen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 AVE NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 AVE Development Occupation Sign-up Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2605 SE 47th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5322 S 27th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5316 NE 40th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515 NW 37th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5314 NE 42nd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5316 NE 42nd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2605 SE 47th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5322 S 27th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5316 NE 40th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515 NW 37th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5314 NE 42nd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5316 NE 42nd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2605 SE 47th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5322 S 27th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5316 NE 40th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515 NW 37th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5314 NE 42nd Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5316 NE 42nd Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Ave Development Objection Sign-up Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Ave Development Opposition Sign-Up Sheet

CPC2018-1301, LOC2018-0172 at 407 27 Ave NE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Tully</td>
<td>42126 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kendon.tully@em.com">kendon.tully@em.com</a></td>
<td>Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Lizick</td>
<td>413-26 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alizick@em.com">alizick@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Schaum</td>
<td>449 27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:danielsenn@shaw.ca">danielsenn@shaw.ca</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy Neisen</td>
<td>4417 27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:treverw@em.com">treverw@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Reaney</td>
<td>443 37 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:treverw@em.com">treverw@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Wipfings</td>
<td>4427 27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjwipfings@em.com">kjwipfings@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Wirth</td>
<td>4433 27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christie@em.com">christie@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Baras</td>
<td>423-27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dsw273@em.com">dsw273@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry-Malik</td>
<td>429 27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmalik@em.com">jmalik@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Malikan</td>
<td>433 27 Ave NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmalik@em.com">jmalik@em.com</a></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Ave Development

Sign-Up Sheet

06-Jan-19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rex Volpi</td>
<td>79 Reno Rd, NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rexvolpi@gmail.com">rexvolpi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Scott</td>
<td>417 26th Ave NE</td>
<td>cs <a href="mailto:Scott@cs.com">Scott@cs.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Ave Development Objection Sign-Up Sheet
January 7, 2019

Mayor Nenshi and Members of City of Calgary City Council

City Clerks Office #8007, The City of Calgary

PO Box 2100 Station M

Calgary, Alberta

T2P 2M5


Dear Mayor Nenshi and Members of City of Calgary City Council,

We are writing to express our complete displeasure and objection to the proposed rezoning of the parcel of land as referenced above.

As residents of the City of Calgary since 1958 and residents of Winston Heights since October 1966 we have enjoyed living in this great community with our neighbors since that time. Many of the current residents that are my neighbors have also been here since 1966 when our homes were newly built. We all take great pride of ownership in our homes, gardens, and yards year round.

In the past I have been involved in the creation of the ARP for Winston Heights / Mountview (2006).

Many compromises during the creation of the new ARP were made in 2006 to increase the density of the overall community. At that time, the creation of an MC-1 zoning along the east side of Edmonton Trail was reluctantly agreed to that the new zoning would satisfy the needs of increasing densification in the City of Calgary. No creation of higher density was discussed and approved on the west side of...
Edmonton Trail in the community of Tuxedo. We found that to be unfair at the time and still continue to believe so.

**We did not approve a commercial node for 27 Avenue and Edmonton Trail.** The nature of the community is such that there is no laneways for many of the avenues starting on 25 Avenue and progressing North to J.P.Vanier School. Because of this access to new developments and parking issues on avenues would become a significant issue since all the homes on the avenues mentioned have front driveways and garages thereby severely limiting the amount of on-street parking.

Speaking with regards to the maximum building height was already determined to be substantial and significant reduction in privacy was going to occur. Also given the heights of the MC-1 zoning already in place significant reduction in afternoon and evening sunshine in our backyards will occur.

Now getting on to the issues that we also believe are significant in this application was the complete and total lack of engagement on the part of the developer, and the Winston Heights / Mountview Community Association Community Development and Planning Committee on this up zoning of this parcel to us. We received notification from the City of Calgary on the last week of December 2018 that this was indeed going to Council for approval. No communication of any kind was received by us in regards to this prior from them.

I understand letters and communications by other members of our community (Mr. David Watson and Ms. Betty Watson) have other issues which I agree with and support and I understand they have been submitted to your office.

My neighbors to the south of me (Mr. Christian Giorgi and Mr. Reno Volpi) have compiled a list of names of residents and signatures also opposed to this proposed rezoning. I understand they will be submitted to your office. This is just a small sample of names that were collection in one afternoon. Given the amount of opposition we find it incredulous that the Winston Heights / Mountview Planning and Development Committee does indeed believe this is an acceptable rezoning.

**What are the unforeseen issues and unintended consequences?** Why not take a look out 10 to 20 years our or more and visualize the community? For example what will the increased traffic on Edmonton Trail be like after the LRT is construction north of 16 Ave since there will be only a single lane going each way instead of two as there are at present?

In reviewing the documents from the Calgary Planning Commission and I quote “Although no public meetings were held by the applicant or Administration, the applicant consulted with the community association and community members directly.” Neither I nor, Maria Di Stefano did receive any communication from either the Applicant or the Community Association.

Previously this parcel of land was approved for a multi family residential project. That alone was of substantial size and was greeting with opposition from the adjacent neighbors. **Why is it that we endeavor to create an ARP and then ignore it?**
The Planning Department and the CPC recommended approval of the applications but their analysis fails to take into account a number of site specific and community constraints and ignores several Council policies. The amendments should not be supported in the current form.

The Planning Department report states that “The proposal meets the objective of applicable policies as discussed in the Strategic Alignment of this report.” There is only one policy used to support this application, the Municipal Development Plan and specifically Section 3.4 Main Streets. In reference to Section B. of the Main Streets Land Use policies, the MDP is clear that the highest densities and tallest buildings should be at nodal locations not at uniform height and density along the length along the length of a Main Street. It further says that the nodes should be determined “through a local area planning process”

Please do not support and approve the rezoning of this parcel of land and respect the members of the community that live here and work hard to keep our community healthy and vibrant!

I request the opportunity to speak to Council on this matter and address other issues which are relevant to this application.

Sincerely,

Adriano Di Stefano
2019.01.07

Mayor and Members of City Council
City Clerks #8007, The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100 Station M
Calgary AB T2P@2M5
cityclerk@calgary.ca


Dear Mayor and Members of City Council:

The Planning Department and CPC recommended approval of the applications but their analysis fails to take into account a number of site specific and community constraints and ignores several Council policies. The amendments should not be supported in the current form.

The Planning Department report states that, “The proposal meets the objective of applicable policies as discussed in the Strategic Alignment of this report.” There is only one policy used to support the application, the Municipal development Plan (MDP) and specifically Section 3.4 Main Streets.

However, reviewing Section b. of the Main Streets Land Use policies, the MDP is clear that the highest densities and tallest buildings should be at nodal locations not an uniform high and density along the length of a Main Street. It further says that the nodes should be determined “through a local area planning process.”
Further between nodes “lower scales of commercial, residential and mix-use development are appropriate.” There has been no local planning process, and there are pre-existing nodes at 23rd and 24th Avenues NE, 20th Avenue NE, and 16th Avenue already designated neighborhood commercial. These sites are consistently under developed according to their approved designations. They are perfect candidates for a mixed use designation with highest densities and tallest buildings. 27th Avenue is not node and it is no justification for it to be treated as one. This is a location where lower scale multi-family residential between nodes is completely appropriate.

Considering Section h. in the Main Street Land Use policies, the policy is explicit that building scale between Main Street and adjacent areas has to ‘be sensitive to scale, form and character of the surrounding building and uses.

A critical factor, completely missing from the Planning report is the reality that there are 6 of laneless blocks in Winston Heights/Mountview (WHMV) flanking Edmonton Trail. This constraint means all site access can only be from the residential avenues. This was an issue identified in the 2006 development of the WHMV ARP. It led to the re-designation to a modest multifamily designation M-C1 for those lots that abut Edmonton Trail. Given the laneless nature of these blocks the M-C1 with maximum height of 14m provide a more sensitive interface with the lower density RC-2, maximum 10m height, which makes up the single detached or semi-detached sites to the east.

An example of this challenge of no lanes and no transition can be seen on the site to the north now under construction with the M-C1 designation. The existing adjoining single family dwelling now has 4 stories, 9 front doors and 18 windows arranged along its west flank. The subject application is requesting an additional 10 metres in height to 24m and 6 stories with likely many more doors and windows.
The subject application is also requesting a mix-use designation, MU-2h24 which requires commercial on the ground and 1st floors. Mix-use is a main component of the Main Street program implementation however mix-use comes with complication of different parking, access and waste disposal requirements at different times of the day. In other Main Street locations, such as further south from the subject site or west on Centre Street these increased and sometime conflicting requirements can be met from flankage or lane access. Here again access must rely a single point on a residential avenue. Further, 3.4.2 Urban Main Streets Land Use policies indicates

“c. ...Individual Urban Main Street densities and appropriate job and population distributions will be established through a Local Area Plan or within an Implementation Guidebook.”

This has not yet happened, in the Main Streets Implementation Plan update that Council dealt with in April last year, this section of Edmonton Trail was part of the 20 sections recommended for near term action (2018-2020). However some this policy work has been subsumed in the North Hill Communities Local Growth Planning, currently underway with some 32 representative from 9 different north hill communities. This application should not set the bar for redevelopment in advance of the local policy work that’s underway.

Public engagement or the lack of it is another concern. It has been limited to the immediate neighbours, convened by the applicant, poorly advertised. The applicant’s submission says, “The neighbours were satisfied with the solutions presented to mitigate their concerns.” This not the case. As the planning report indicates 10 letters of concerns, many by neighbours who heard about the meeting later, were sent to the planner. The letters were not shared with CPC and concerns summarized in one sentence. The “solutions” offered on response presumably refers to a parking technology that is suspect. More importantly there is no way to ensure that it will part of the development application or final
construction. Even if it was included it also does not answer the questions of constraints, transition, scale and location.

This application represents a major land use precedent not only for the 6 blocks in WHMV but for an equal number blocks on the west side of Edmonton Trail in the community of Tuxedo. Therefore this should be part a broader community planning discussion on how to implement Main Streets in this area not an one off approval.

Conclusion

The justification for the land use application is weak and in order to mitigate against the more serious issues of scale, intensity and the constrained site, a more respectful solution would be:

1. The maximum height should set at 14m. This will allow a chance for a sensitive transition to the remainder of the adjoining low density on the avenue.
2. The designation should be MU-1h14. This is a mixed use designation with a major difference that the commercial is optional and confine to the ground level. It is a scale that better fits this section of Edmonton Trail.
3. A development permit be applied for at the MU-1h14 designation with adequate public and community engagement and reviewed for parking, access, transition to adjoining properties and other matters that the approving authority thinks appropriate and approved prior to second and third reading of the redesignation and ARP Bylaws.

Respectfully

Jason & Denise Abbate
Dec. 31, 2018

The Mayor and Members of City Council:

Re: Policy Amendment and Land Use Amendment in Winston Heights/Mountview (Ward 7) at

407 - 27 Avenue N. E., LOC2018-0172

There are two critical questions, I believe, to be answered regarding your support for either of these amendments. They are straightforward. Why here? Is this an appropriate location for higher density or more intense uses? And secondly; why now? Is there a valid reason or pressing benefit to be gained at this point in time or in the near term future for more of what the applicant intends to provide under these amendments. The answer to both of these questions is no. There is nothing substantial to be achieved, either by the community or the city and exposes both to unnecessary jeopardy through premature or overly ambitious development.

Let’s look at the “why now”. In light of a current policy void for the area, an obvious concern is the lack of comprehensive, detailed and current planning policy. The Main Streets Implementation has yet to deliver the promised analysis required for confident planning decisions at the community level. Bafflingly, Main Streets classifies Edmonton Trail in the category as an Urban Main Street as opposed to the less aggressive and more appropriate Neighbourhood Main Street. More on this point later. It is clear that risk is more imminent when the policy is vague or inconsistent.

Is it worthwhile to proceed regardless of this gamble? Might a situation be averted which credits the requested amendments? Leaving aside that there is an oversupply of both commercial and residential opportunities in the city at present, is the longer term demand for this mixed use development that must be considered? Is there be an urgent necessity for which preparations must be made and sacrifices paid to avoid calamity in the future? The answer is again no. The most compelling argument surely lies in the proximity to the Green Line. However the development of the nearest station is a decade away based on the most recent update. Hardly urgent.

Why here? Is this site, in this location ideal for this type of development? The relevant existing community planning policy specific for this area is the Winston Heights/Mountview Area Redevelopment Plan. It encouraged increased density including commercial uses in appropriate locations along the Edmonton Trail corridor. However, after careful analysis, it wisely identified the unique situation that exists in this community and which is critical in evaluating this specific proposal. There are six contiguous laneless blocks perpendicular to Edmonton Trail. With no alternative, both access and egress to all these sites are reduced to one driveway only which is off of the residential avenues. The far more usual situation, of having at least one back lane and possibly one flanking lane to allow easier on-site circulation and site access, in this situation is not an option. In addition, there is no on-street parking available to help support office or commercial uses anywhere in the area because of front driveways. There is no parking on Edmonton Trail. Primarily in response to these anticipated access and parking limitations, recognizing that both would be exacerbated with commercial use and or greater residential intensity, the ARP recommended no higher land use intensity than multistory residential (M-C1). The conclusion of the ARP is the most prudent option.

Winston Height residents have accepted change and are seeing greater density being achieved. They welcome the opportunity for more services locally and continue to back a vision which is consistent with
the move towards a more compact city form. It is widely recognized to be a laudable goal that should be supported in appropriate locations and where unavoidable negative elements can reasonably be mitigated. Winston Heights and especially 27th Avenue has already seen much redevelopment of residential lots which has substantially increased density. Just one example, directly to the north of the subject site, a multifamily townhouse project now adds to the range of housing forms on offer in our community with 17 units under construction where formerly a mere two homes occupied the land. Not insignificantly, given the previous discussion, it also has but one access and egress point. The driveway for this site and the one for the new development are slightly offset by a few meters and both are situated less than twenty 20 meters from the intersection. This is not an ideal circumstance from a traffic safety point of view and is made even more precarious by the slope of the avenue.

Moving on from the narrow 27 Avenue residential aspect of the intersection to the north-south axis of the broader Edmonton Trail context, one can readily foresee the many inconsistencies that this proposed building would create. Addressing merely one issue; there is no development of equivalent height and scale anywhere along the length of Edmonton Trail north of Meredith Road at the Bow River. As alluded to earlier, it is a built form that occurs on commercial streets most often at major intersections including TODs; not at residential intersections with little to recommend it as a commercial node.

This location is unlikely ever to successfully support such a dense development as there a many other prime opportunities for transit oriented development much closer to the proposed LRT. The subject site is actually outside the pedestrian walking circle. And, Edmonton Trail effectively dead ends under two kilometers further along. There is just one bus route serving this neighbourhood which is something of a backwater geographically speaking. Again, shortcomings imposed by the site itself and the very real inherent limitations of this block (and the multiple contiguous blocks) will inhibit their potential now and in the future.

However, these amendments present a significant threat to one of Calgary’s most defining but all too often under-valued assets. Currently we are justified in boasting of vibrant and attractive inner city communities of which Winston Heights is one. Precipitous and opportunistic development does nothing to add to the community asset base but threatens, not only 27th Avenue but also those blocks adjacent to it. This precarious position can readily be avoided. In this instance the status quo is the most advantageous route forward since it thoughtfully and responsibly embraces the future without sacrificing our community unnecessarily. Please do not support these recommendations to amend the ARP and to re-designate the land use.

Yours respectfully,

Betty Watson
Dear Laura M. Kennedy, City Clerk

I would like to take a few minutes of your time to express some concerns about the rezoning of location 407 27 Ave NE (Winston Heights/Mountview bylaw 13D2019)

I am concerned with the new rezoning because of the height allotment. The height of the building will go up and that means more shadows for the residences that are located east of the property as well as the houses west of Edmonton Trail. When I asked at the meeting about the shadows, I was told that it is not a concern because the developer has done his research and it won’t be a problem. The developer was not able to provide information about when (season or time of year) he had done the research for the shadows. There is also a concern with the height on how much people can see into the yards of others and homes of the community.

I am also concerned with the amount of traffic that will come with the rezoning. Commercial and retail buildings bring business (which is good) however it also brings traffic and congestion of people. With the new development across the street and now the proposed new development, I believe that the traffic and congestion on the streets will increase and cause problems. The street corner will increase with pedestrians trying to cross and people turning in and out regularly. This will slow down traffic and eventually maybe needing a cross walk or lights. With a crosswalk 2 blocks north, I doubt they will put in another one so close. From what I have witnessed already, people do not walk the extra blocks to use it and now with the current construction across the street and the future development of this property, increase accidents is in the foreseeable future. With the amount of people going to be using the building (living, businesses, and retail), there will be large amounts of people going into the community to find parking, which most likely will be at the community hall. This will cause problems when the hall is booked for events. There is also a school zone half a block in from Edmonton Trail that already sees people speeding through it because most of them are not local traffic and are not paying attention. This is a concern because of the amount of kids and families who are always using the park and community hall on 27th Ave.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Roberta Robb
Community member
To whom it may concern:

My name is Cristin Tollefson and I would like to share my comments and concerns regarding the Land Use Amendment LOC2018-0172. I live directly next to this lot, my address is 413 27th avenue N.E. My spouse and I purchased this house in June 2017 and we were aware that the lot next to us (the lot in question) was rezoned to accommodate a 3-4 storey residential unit.

When we found out about the proposal to rezone to commercial use we attended the community meeting with the developer to share our concerns regarding parking and building height. I feel his parking solutions are ambitious but unrealistic and when I questioned it, he was not able to provide a 'plan b'. The only alternative offered to combat overloaded street parking is to make the street parking by permit only. This is a big concern for me. As a home owner, I should not have to purchase a parking pass to park on the street, in front of the house that I own. Not to mention, there is a large set of residential units being built across the street which is already going to cause more traffic and street parking. The developer has planned for retail stores, office space and residential units, if the underground parking carousel doesn't work out as planned, street parking is going to increase even more. Also, they would have to use some of the lot to provide parking spaces which leads me to my next concern, the size of the lot and height of the building.

The current zoning allows up to 4 storeys, the proposed rezoning would allow up to 8 storeys. This is a very big difference that will have a huge impact on my property. The sun, shadows and view into and out of my yard will be greatly affected. I have many plants and a garden that rely on the sun and an 8 storey building will negatively affect their growth. Not to mention the direct view into my yard from an 8 storey building. I do understand that it is possible that the building will not be 8 storeys even though the zoning allows it, however, there is no guarantee that the building will not be 8 storeys.

When asked about the height, the developer said the building needs to be higher to accommodate all the units they want to build. But, the lot is not big enough to accommodate parking and the size of building they proposed so they would have no choice but to continue to build up if the parking plan doesn't work.

Rezoning would guarantee more than 4 storeys which is completely unnecessary on a residential street. While I like the concept of bringing more commercial buildings to the area, this lot is not in the best location and it is too small to accommodate what has been proposed. The rezoning of this lot will bring more traffic, increased street parking and congestion to an already busy street. Currently, there are already problems with parking, traffic, congestion and speeding down the street. Adding another large unit with several people will only add to these problems. I would like to see this lot stay as it is currently zoned. This way it is guaranteed to be no more than 4 storeys high and each residential unit has parking.
Lastly, I would like to mention that in the proposal, the developers noted that they had addressed all of my concerns and that I was completely on board with their proposal and this is not the case. I have been in contact with the developer and expressed my concerns and even though he has offered solutions, they are not concrete. He has not offered any alternative plans for parking and congestion. Nor has he really taken my concern over the building height seriously. His response continues to be that the building has to be tall to fit everything in.

Rezoning this lot will provide the developer an option to build an 8 storey commercial building next to my 1 storey residence. This is completely unnecessary for the location and proximity to my house, other houses and the community. Please deny his request and maintain a zoning that limits the height to 4 storeys.

Thanks for your time

Cristin Tollefson
413 27 ave NE
Calgary, Ab
T2E-2A5
403-797-1771
hockeyspice09@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone