

**File Number - DP2020-4776**

**Planning Representative – Kjelti Kellough, on behalf of the Community Association and Development Committee**

**Community Association – Stanley Park/ Parkhill**

**September 22, 2020**

***I commit to the Planning System core values: innovation, collaboration, transparency, accountability, trust and responsibility.***

---

**Comments:**

The Parkhill Stanley Park Community Association (the “Community”) strongly opposes Enclave Ventures (the “Applicant”) application (the “Application”) for:

- (a) Spot amendment to the Parkhill Stanley Park Area Redevelopment Plan (“ARP”);
- (b) Rezoning from R-C2 to M-C1; and
- (c) Development Permit Approval

with respect to a proposed multi-unit residential development (the “Development”) at 4120- 1A Street SW (the “Property”).

The Community embraces its unique role as a mixed-density neighbourhood, with easy access to major roadways, transit, recreation areas near the Elbow River and downtown. The Community understands the direction of the current City of Calgary administration to increase density in these unique areas and has generally been very supportive of mixed-density development in the Community. That said, increasing density can not be done in an *ad hoc* or spot manner. It must be done with intention and with the impact to the entire Community in mind. The Application fails to do so and must fail in its current form.

**1. Neither the rezoning or the Development comply with the ARP and a spot amendment of the ARP is not appropriate.**

The ARP was initially approved in 1994 and was created in coordination with the City and the Community, with an understanding that Parkhill Stanley Park, through thoughtful development, could play a critical role as an inner city community, close to public transit by appropriately balancing single family dwellings amongst low and mid density multi-family dwellings. An ARP is a foundational and statutory document that provides generations of guidance on the development of a community. Certainly, circumstances do change, and the Parkhill Stanley Park ARP has been amended on several occasions (notably most recently in 2017) to reflect same, however it permits homeowners and developers alike to have comfort in the community and its future.

While Parkhill Stanley Park appears on the surface to be an eclectic community, which may suit the proposed rezoning, upon careful consideration of the ARP it is clear that the eclectic look and feel is purposeful and founded in strong urban planning principles. One-off applications, such as the Applicant’s, without consideration as to how the redesignation fits in to the ARP erode the foundation of the Community.

Further, the Applicant's position that the Application need not be considered under the low-density test of the ARP because it is an application for increased density results in a non-sensical application of the ARP. As currently zoned, the Property is low-density. In order to consider a high-density designation, the Applicant must do so in consideration with the ARP. Simply declaring that the Development meets the high-density test is not an argument in support of higher density.

Spot amendments, by their very nature, are counter-intuitive to an ARP. The purpose of an ARP is to provide a consistent approach to development. The Applicant has failed to articulate why a spot amendment would be appropriate in this circumstance and how it does not create precedent for erosion of the ARP. Simply stating that to be the case, does not make it true. It is the Community's position that the Applicant's failure to address these concerns is fatal to their application.

**2. The Applicant has failed to provide any rationale for rezoning the Property from R-C2 to M-C1 aside from pure self-interest.**

The objectives of the ARP are to "enhance and ensure the continued stability and character of this low-density family-oriented community" and "to encourage new development... which respect the scale and character of the existing community". The Applicant has been unable to provide any reason as to why the ARP should be modified to reflect a spot redesignation of the Property other than the owner behind the Application already owns the Property. There has been no consideration of the objectives of the ARP or the Community impact by the Applicant. The Application is driven out of pure self-interest.

The owner of the Property was fully aware of the zoning of the Property when it was purchased years ago and there are current lots for sale in the Community that are properly zoned for the proposed Development.

The Application is purely motivated by self-interest and the Applicant has failed to identify any planning rationale for the rezoning or the Development.

**3. The Proposed Development does not respect Community context.**

The ARP was developed through careful consideration of how to best balance a variety of lot densities within one fairly small community. This is not a case of 'Not in My Backyard'. We have welcomed many projects in recent years that have (or are slated to have) removed existing single-family homes and replaced them with multi-family dwellings, including but not limited to:

- (a) multi-unit complex on 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Parkhill Street SW;
- (b) multiple multi-unit dwellings that are accessed from 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW;
- (c) multi-unit low rise buildings on Mission Road SW and a companion property to be built on the corner of Parkhill Street and Mission Road; and
- (d) multi-unit dwellings on the corner of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Parkhill Street SW.

In addition, there are several mid-level apartment buildings found on the streets closer to the C-Train station, allowing for increased density near public transit. These projects have all respected the ARP and allowed increased density in an appropriate way. Managing multiple densities in a community cannot be done on an *ad hoc* and spot basis. It must be done with planning and intention.

Further, as clearly shown when referring to the overhead view of the proposed Development in context with the remainder of the homes on that block of 1A Street SW, the Development fails to consider the rear contextual rhythm of the entire north south block and is far too dense for the lot. Solely as a result of the increased density, the building is far more aggressive than other adjacent developments and takes up significantly more of the Property than neighbouring buildings, resulting in far less green space in the rear of the Property and shadows on adjacent properties.

#### **4. The Proposed Development will have an adverse impact on traffic and parking in the Community.**

The access from 1A Street to 42 Avenue SW permits entrance-only into the Community. There is no exit from 1A Street at that intersection. Given the proximity to Stanley Park and as one of a small number of access points to the Community (with no corresponding exit), it is already a very congested intersection with poor traffic circulation.

The rear lane is equally congested as it connects a very steep rear lane (the back lane of 40 Avenue SW) to a congested area with multiple multi-family dwellings. The access to this very small, highly densified area is limited. As well, the rear street parking is extremely limited. There is only street parking on the very short 41 Avenue SW and it is generally filled under the current situation.

The massive increase in density added to a block that currently suffers from lack of access and lack of parking will not be mitigated by the Applicant's plans for parking. It is unreasonable to expect the surplus vehicles generated by these housing units to find parking on the street.

The roads were established when the Community was originally built and are designed to support a neighbourhood of single-family residences. The current roads and access have already been stressed by the additional development and will not support the dramatic increase in density that will occur with the addition of this Development, impacting current and future residents. The Development severely impacts the objective set out in the ARP to "provide for a safe and efficient circulation system for pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles".

#### **Conclusion**

The Calgary Planning Commission and City Counsel, by their own language set out on the City of Calgary website, are required to take in to account the relevant plans and policies, context, the rationale of the proposal and sound planning principles when reviewing the Application. The Application meets none of these criteria and the Application must fail.