



25 Avenue Multi-Residential Development

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

August 2017

Project overview

If approved, this proposed development would replace the four existing low-density residential buildings with one seven storey, 44 unit multi-residential building. To accommodate this, the applicant is seeking to change the land use for the site to allow for a seven storey building with a maximum height of 24 metres. Currently, the land use for the site allows for a six storey building with a maximum height of 15 metres. To allow for this change in height, the developer will be required to make a bonus density contribution to the community. Examples of bonus density contributions include creation of public park space in the community, having a publicly accessible green space on the site of a proposed development, or including affordable housing units as part of a proposed development.

The proposed development covers the following addresses along 25 Ave. S.W.:

- 306 25 Ave. S.W.
- 308 25 Ave. S.W.
- 310 25 Ave. S.W.
- 312 25 Ave. S.W.

Engagement overview

Public engagement for the 25 Avenue Multi-residential Development included the following activities:

- **Public Open House:** held June 28, 2017, at the Cliff Bungalow-Mission Community Association.
- **Engage Portal Page:** open for feedback from June 28 to July 12, 2017.

What we asked

The City hosted a public open house for this application on Wednesday, June 28, 2017, at the Cliff Bungalow-Mission Community Association. The purpose of this session was to provide members of the public with an opportunity to learn more about the application, have questions answered by City staff, and obtain their feedback regarding the application.

In addition to providing information regarding the application, The City provided stakeholders with the following opportunities for input:

- **Community Amenity Prioritization:** We provided stakeholders with 5 different possible types of community amenities for bonus density provisions considered as part of this project. These included community amenity space, publicly accessible private open space (maintained by the applicant/developer, not The City), affordable housing, sustainable or “green” building features, and other. Stakeholders were provided with three dots and asked to place these next to their top three community amenity types.



25 Avenue Multi-Residential Development

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

August 2017

- **Community Amenity Ideas:** Stakeholders were asked to write their ideas for community amenities on post-it notes and stick them to a comment board.
- **Other Comments:** Stakeholders were asked to write what they like about the application and what they would like improved on post-it notes and stick them to a comment board.

What we heard

Both in person and online, stakeholders were largely not in favour of the application. Stakeholders were especially opposed to the application not aligning with the Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP), and were concerned that approving the application would create a precedent allowing future applications to exceed the height restrictions and other guidelines set out in the ARP. Stakeholders felt this would negatively impact the character of the community both in the short and long term.

Other key concerns included traffic and parking issues along 25 Avenue S.W., traffic issues in the alleyway behind the application, safety concerns regarding increased traffic, too much density for the area, the loss of neighbourhood trees and impacts to the streetscape due to setback relaxations.

For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.

For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

Next steps

The feedback collected at the public open house and Engage Portal page will be used in The City's review of the application. In the late summer of 2017, the City file manager will respond to the application with a review of the application that will incorporate feedback from our engagement activities. The application will go to the Calgary Planning Commission in the fall of 2017, and to a public hearing of Council in the winter of 2017.

Visit engage.calgary.ca/25AveSW to sign up for updates to this application, including dates for Calgary Planning Commission and the public hearing of Council.

Summary of Input

Community Amenity Prioritization

Type of Community Amenity	Open House	Engage Portal	TOTAL
Other ideas	7	20	27
Affordable housing	20	3	23
Community amenity space	16	5	21
Sustainable or “green” building features	14	1	15
Publicly accessible private open space (maintained by the applicant/developer, not The City)	4	1	5

Open House and Online Engagement – Key Themes

The following table provides a summary of the key themes we heard during the public open house and through the Engage Portal site. Please see the [Verbatim Comments](#) for further details.

Theme	Detailed Description
No change to ARP	Stakeholders were opposed to the application not aligning with the ARP, and were concerned that approving the application would create a precedent allowing future applications to exceed the height restrictions and other guidelines set out in the ARP.
Density	Stakeholders were concerned by the proposed density of the application, and indicated that Cliff Bungalow-Mission already has a higher density than most other neighbourhoods in Calgary.
Height	Stakeholders were not in favour of the proposed height of the application, and were concerned with potential shadow impacts and loss of privacy in adjacent properties.
Traffic	Stakeholders were concerned by the potential increase in traffic along 25 Avenue S.W. as well as in the alleyway behind the proposed site. Stakeholders indicated that traffic was already an issue in the alleyway, especially with the loading area behind the Shoppers Drug Mart, and that increased alley traffic could present a safety issue for drivers and pedestrians.
Parking	Stakeholders indicated parking was already an issue in the area, especially along 25 Avenue S.W., and felt that this application would make finding street parking more difficult.
Flood Resilience	Some stakeholders indicated that the application would provide better flood resiliency than single-family homes.

Verbatim Comments

Public Open House

Community Amenity Ideas

- Density ✓ Diversity ✓ Community Development ✓
- The ARP should be followed much more closely!!!
- Heritage incentives should have been top item listed as community amenity - based on first CA survey, it was the most important amenity.
- Leave arp as is. There is no need to add more density to a family friendly community.
- Changing the arp will open a future can of worms for this community to keep fighting
- hieght proposed would result in significant loss of light to surrounding buildings. Not justified!
- The buliding will put more shade on a busy lane - slippery in winter - an unnecessary danger.
- Look around - density has multiplied - adding on esextra 9m will only give the message developers do not need to abide by restrictions/law
- Parking - Alredy too many buildings - no place for service vehicles. This development does not provide sufficient for itself
- Changing the ARP opens this to further similar applications - parking already an issue. Height is restricted for a reason.
- Not in accord with area redevelopment plan. Turned down several times before. PARKING - too little for the building already no place to park.
- This building will attract people who want to walk & bike. Support it!
- The questions on the online survey seem, to me, to be biased and pro-development
- The ARP was created by many community members working to benefit the whole community. The building will benefity only the developer. I find that distressing.
- Follow ARP scrupulously Yes
- Impact on existing neighbors: 1) Higher density 2) No parking 3) TOO HIGH 5 stories!!
- My family have enjoyed this district since my mother taught at the cottage school on 5th street in the 1920's. It is a special community which this building will not enhance out of character DON'T APPROVE IT
- No more traffic on 25th Plse!
- Height @ 7 stories is in line with the seniors housing
- Exiting underground parking to STREET ALREADY an issue! No more traffic plse
- Why has the community not been listened to yet? 3x?
- I disapprove of the notion of density bonusing in principle, and am loathe, therefore to name anything to sweeten a bitter pill.
- Parking ent/exit too close to 2nd - ally currently congested + not designed to with stand 50+ cars in/out
- Traffic and parking

- I oppose any increase in height on that street [personally identifying information removed]
- Public/street parking is already limited. Especially if I have guests. I don't qualify for a guest parking pass.
- We have been through this many times. Parking - not sufficient.
- Parking on 25th not enough for current residents
- Parking issues already!
- Idea #1: follow the rules. Idea #2: listen to the community Idea #3: think long term
- I would like to see a mechanism to ensure that a proportion of the units in this development area affordable.
- Can't we work for tings to BETTER our historical community rather than fighting for the status quo? This does not IMPROVE the community
- This tall building does not fit our street scape. It is for one man's benefit - not for the community.
- One of the posters mentions the Main Street public engagement activities and how one of the outcomes of that survey was "promote and retain character" of neighbouroods." If that is true, this development is a BAD idea.
- I enjoy working inmy plot in the community garden. I don't want a huge building with residents nearby watching me.
- Impositions on community, negative impact on neighbours and precedent [?] should outweigh personal gains of developer.
- More density = more accessibility like this project
- Can 25th ave handle additional car traffic?
- Why spend time & \$ on an ARP if they are just going to ignore/ammend
- No more traffic on 25 & surrounding area's.
- Follow the law of ARP
- Better "shadow" display during 31 Dec - 31 Mar, 31 June - 31 Sept please!
- Developer know rules when bought property - Follow ARP
- Respect the trees! Respect the ARP! We wnt to walk on sunshine, not shadows!
- Shadowing is a concerne Shadowing should be done in winter months. We need the sun.

Other Comments

- Max. height should be 6 storeys
- This development goes against our ARP - as a community we have stood against this development before and will continue to do so, no matter how many times it is rehashed and brought back to life. We do not want this development to go ahead.
- Handle density realistically. Appropriate!!! parking requirements for developments
- This development will bring in similar or higher buildings. Which will be a very bad precedent. My vote is reject it.
- "Scollen House
- lot empty fo 2 yrs. Development of this size not needed. Scollen house + new = traffic + lack of parking etc."



- Building no necessary. Look at the lot that is Scollen House. Improper traffic assessment. Did not include Shoppers Drug Mart loading dock. Too tall of a structure that causes too much shade. Traffic nightmare if 2 projects go at once.
- Developers should read the Mission ARP and bylaw before buying land!
- The development is not "sensitive to the context of the community" It will help to destroy the context.
- Building is far too large + will completely dwarf neighbouring structures! - will disrupt streetscape
- Inconsistent w/ area land use. And street scape. North of 25 ave is not high density
- Developments should not eliminate access to sunshine. Larger developments should vary total height or split building into two parts (like Ezra on Riley Park)
- No way to increased height which disrespects all neighbours
- This area has the 2nd highest density in Calgary. We don't want building that don't meet the ARP
- Mission ARP is outdated - 2006 approval - and does not take more recent flood disasters into account.
- Development on 25th & 26th aves should take flooding into consideration. It may be better to have more highrises and less houses.
- Traffic assessment: -stopped right before shoppers, didn't include. Misses big issue. Trucks. Loading dock specifically.
- There is already a precedent for numerous highrises on 25th ave SW. The ARP is committed to high density.
- Possibly look at more height in Mission, less in Cliff Bungalow.
- Building height is too high.
- All buildings around development are low rise except on 23rd. Consider impact
- Scollen House. Worried that this application will create precedent for higher guildings in ARP & North
- Traffic: construction traffic in alley --> can't get out of building.
- 7 stories transitions well from 16 stories
- A busy alley will get a lot worse.
- I do not support this application. It is spot land use redesignation. We support the Mission ARP height limit of 15m.
- Ther is already one approved condo that is not built on the block. Is this another?
- The height is the killer factor. Would impact already limited natural lighting to W + E facing 2417 2 St SW
- Do not allow a building with higher density, traffic is bad now, will be worse/impossible
- Property has 20 + trees, plan has how many trees will remain? Neighborhood impacted.
- All sunlight for 6 units is eliminated with extra height
- Do not allow a building to impair street scape by ignoring set back allowance
- If allowed other developers will have the ability to ignore set guidelines
- More density 44 units = more parking issues. YES!!
- I do not believe that developer greenspace will be maintained. Generally they get smaller/rougher

- The precedent set by a byelaw change would influence decisions around countless other houses in the area that may be converted to apt. buildings
- Please require ALL developers to follow the ARP in ALL cases
- Buildings should comply with the current height restriction. Efforts should be made to retain trees and reduce street parking as well as maintain or enhance sidewalk space. YES
- Streetscape will be very impacted by style of building no setback
- An overly tall building with no setback changes the pedestrian experience on 25th ave.
- This development sets a terrible precedent for other developers to use in their applications
- This would be a dreadful precedent which will seriously impact [?] feel of community
- 25th ave is not a collector traffic on 25th is busy with needed parking
- Please conduct a traffic/parking study to assess impact in alley + road + parking
- Do not allow a building 60% higher than allowed
- It is a reasonable expectation of current owners that future development will follow all applicable rules
- Nice looking building for some other community with a land use that will allow it.
- If it's between a 5 storey or a 7 storey building, are the concerns about parking going to make a huge difference for 2 extra floors?
- Development is inconsistent with surrounding land use and density. Should NOT be approved.
- The character of our neighbourhood is damaged by each building that ignores the ARP
- Amount of shadow that will be cast by the new structure is unacceptable!
- I'm seriously concerned about the precedent that will be set by this development and the City favouring ad-hoc decision-making.
- Residents have a right to expect a stable planning regime - decisions like this go against this principle.
- Private citizens have to work in CA to renovate - must be consistent.
- We like a pedestrian oriented community 25th is busy now - we don't want any more traffic. Community parking is also a problem.
- Community amenities as listed do NOT benefit community heritage is not even present.
- Such flagrant disregard for existing regulations sets a terrible precedent in the neighbourhood.
- Beautiful building strong addition to Mission
- Beltline is for density preserve a local village atmosphere here
- This neighbourhood is more than doing its part in densifying Calgary. Projects like this set an unwelcome precedent for more higgelty-piggelty planning that ignores solid ARP.
- Stick to ARP!!
- "The approved density for this community is already too high
- Highest residential density in City"
- Great idea! Totally fits within the community context! Put density where people want to live!
- ↑ density will create traffic that 25 Ave cannot accommodate, and lead to potential safety issues.
- City doesn't follow it anyway???

- Building should conform to the 15m buildent strategy in the ARP. Period. The proposal is not a good precedent.
- Why have an ARP if a developer can get it changed? Mission should not become another Beltline!
- Wider sidewalks needed in area
- Improve transit so other neighbourhoods will be density-positive
- Look at Paris - If entire city were 4-stories we could all share the density
- Parking needed, street parking unavailable now!
- How can this proceed without a community. "Revitalization" fund - unwanted & unneeded
- Stick to ARP (15m) Address back alley congestion
- Why would any Calgary community negotiate their ARP's with the City when the
- "The District" on 18 Ave. SW. should be the last building in Mission to obtain a "street oriented sideyard" of just 1m. - cuts out all light and privacy for neighbours.
- "What do you like about..." is NOT a question, it's a double-bind :-(
- City must be consistent. Taylor house took down 3 houses for 1 Why does Mission have to accommodate more?
- We already exceed density in most other neighbourhoods.
- Will they really stick to 7 stories? (past developments have exceeded.)
- Setbacks, window and balcony placement should respect neighbours.
- Why have an ARP if it can be broken? Bad can of worms to open!
- Bigger is NOT better... hasn't been on 2 earlier attempts, still isn't
- This would be lost with taller buildings.
- Stick to A.R.P.
- I'm in favor, but am concerned about parking availability
- This application same as previous one turned down by Planning Dept. and Planning Comm. Nothing has changed! NO!
- This development is inconsistent I neighbourhood. LISTEN TO ARP!!
- The north side of 25 av is mainly <15m and this helps walkability & keeps an urban village feel.
- Maintain history
- Mission ARP is new (2007) It has expressed how the community will grow after a 7 year process. It proposes density in a human scale community
- Happy with more apt. style buildings to provide easier access for young people in a great neighbourhood!
- Does this proposal conform w/ existing ARP?????
- Increased density proposed by project will hugely impact existing access issues. Traffic impact study is inaccurate. Safety is a concern.
- Why wants to live in a dense, concrete, treeless community?
- Need variety -heights - density
- Fill out the existing densification zones before creating new ones. Listen to the community!

- STRONGLY opposed to this development that violates the character & regulations of the neighbourhood - regulations that exist to preserve the moderate density & quality of life in the neighbourhood
- This project is not needed (see Scollen lot) and is an unjustified step out/deviation from ADP + DC.
- I worry about traffic safety in that alley.
- The building dwarfs the buildings on both sides. Yep...
- What is the point of a policy if you can circumvent it by paying money

Engage Portal

Community Amenity Ideas

- I believe developers should NOT be given any way to circumvent zoning limitations. Would it be OK for me to speed through the developer's neighborhood if I donated books to its library? Rules are in place to serve a purpose, and once a single developer gets to squeeze by, there is precedent for the next to do the same.
- We do not want density bonusing in our neighborhood. Period.
- The Mission-Cliff Bungalow district is a desirable area and prides itself in maintaining a diverse demographic. However, single family homes in this neighbourhood are unaffordable for many Calgary families. Affordable spaces for families within the new development would be a significant advantage.
- This 44-unit, 7-storey residential building is not a "community amenity" and cannot be converted into a community amenity. It is a sellout of part of the community's natural environment, architectural environment, and social environment as enshrined in the community ARP, for purposes of private financial gain.
- To deny planning permission for this project which does not meet height requirements for this site.
- Landscaped courtyard space or other publicly available green / park space, similar to what is offered by some downtown office buildings (consider the new parkspace incorporated into Brookfield Place).
- These questions are premature and irrelevant to deciding the application in question:
 - o Community residents are opposed to density bonusing as a planning tool.
 - o A clear majority of residents (82%) believe that spot upzoning should not be allowed and planning decisions should respect our Area Redevelopment Plans (ARPs).
- The application should be denied as submitted and the Developer required to revise the redevelopment to conform to the ARP building height limits. The City also needs to look carefully at other aspects of the proposal, including traffic, parking, and pedestrian issues surrounding the development, including the cumulative effects of including ...
- A community plaza along 4th Street with an adjacent community centre designed to meet the needs and interests of an urban demographic. It might contain, for example, a live music venue, an e-reading room, arts and other activity spaces, some commercial space to help offset operating costs, etc. The plaza/centre indoor/outdoor link is critical.

25 Avenue Multi-Residential Development

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

August 2017

- I'm looking for them to follow the Area development plan as-is, and not for the city to use it as a bargaining tool to milk the developer out of things. Those plans were developed for a reason and I don't want it to be ignored just because the developer hucked enough money into the area.
- I am not at all in favour of this development so I see no need to let the city know what community amenity I would take as a "ransom" for this approval to go through. I am in favour to see increases in density throughout the city as I understand population growth but for one developer to ask for a 1000% increase in density is just plain greedy!!
- A building that is going to last & add to the community, not simply another wood frame apartment building cheaply made that's going to start to wear after a few short years.
- A green space that people in the community could use.
- 25 Ave already has access issues. Roxboro House north parking exit competes with the bus stop outside our exit door, cars turning on 25 from both directions from 4 St. Plus cars exiting from Mission Center across the street. 70 vehicles exit from this side only to have vision blocked by garbage trucks, moving vans and sometimes down to one lane!!!
- Do not develop!
- Reject this project. There is too much traffic in the alley and the Shoppers loading dock was not taken into consideration. Scollen House is supposed to be built on the same block. The proposed building is too tall and robs me of daylight as I live directly behind the proposed development. Parking is scarce. Project doesn't fit in to neighbor hood.
- I like the community just the way it is right now thank you very much....we have everything we need, no bribery required
- The increased height will rob winter sunlight from the south-facing residents of the building to this lot's North. Can this be made up by adding green features? No. Height restrictions are designed to prevent neighborhoods like CB from becoming cold dark canyons between towering structures. This exception is good ONLY for the developer.
- We do not want density bonusing in our neighborhood. Period
- Densification offers a number of ecological benefits. This can be maximized with sustainable/green building features.
- 25th avenue could use some street enhancements with more lighting along the street as it is such a gateway into the neighbourhood - perhaps the developer could assist with these improvements coming over the bridge
- "o If a density bonusing scheme is imposed on our neighbourhood, a clear majority of residents (84%) believe the community should receive a public benefit. o Density bonusing (if implemented) needs to be tailored to our community. o The governance model should place community at the centre of decision making.
- ... Scollen House in the mix. For whatever reason, the community, at the Open House, was not permitted to examine the site plan. There has been an alley use study but, as was pointed out, the study did not account for 4th street commercial users. Is vehicle access articulated to minimize congestion and maximize safety? Can loading, unloading ...

- There are two, possibly three sites, but any one of them would be costly to acquire. Quite a few highrises would need to be built and the City would need to make a contribution in the millions. The present community facility could continue as a family oriented place. As it stands, the community has no real people place or focus.
- Keep the ARP in tact. This document allows for enough density throughout the Mission community and it took lots of time and money to craft. If the city now starts allowing any developer, who has the means, to simply open the document and change as only they see fit you will be opening a can of worms that you will never get the cover back on!!
- This should be affordable and comparable to what is currently available. It would be a shame if the neighbourhood started to become expensive because of new high-rise buildings - this isn't what Mission is about.
- Axe the development.
- Do not develop!
- Leave the space as is. A 7 story building sticks out and does not fit into the neighbourhood feeling. There is very little parking as it is and we can not sustain another condo development.
- I have lived in a city (Houston) in which zoning was "relaxed" to encourage growth. Result: it became a disaster. I've just moved here from Denver, where sensible solar plane rules were relaxed. A sweet small home in my neighborhood is now fully in the shadow of a three story monstrosity to its south. Owners can no longer garden. Heartbreaking.
- We do not want density bonusing in our neighborhood. Period
- Perhaps the developer could take steps to upgrade some of the amenities at the nearby river banks to make this area more accessible for public use / enjoyment.
- "o Approval should only occur where the following conditions have been met: 1) proof that the proposed site can not be economically redeveloped under existing zoning; 2) commitment from The City to provide matching funds or dedicate tax dollars associated with the extra density, to fund projects that will benefit the community; and
- ... and garbage pickup take place with out blocking access to either other residences or commercial buildings? will the two developments include visitor and, specifically, service provider parking to compensate for the increased volumes that will be generated? Will the buildings be uniquely permitted street front loading/no parking zones? ...
- While there is zero possibility of a community plaza centre coming to pass, it would be nice. Apart from that, some wider sidewalks would be appreciated, where possible (and stop taking away those that we have - i.e. Hopewell block) and, as well, some repairs to our public art are clearly needed.
- The building should blend into the surrounding neighbourhood and not be an eye-sore.
- Do not develop!
- Reject this project. One of the people running in Ward 8 is helping the developer put this project through.

Other Comments

- Again, please consider the fact that the rules were carefully created with lots of input from experts, and were designed to protect the character of the neighborhood and the residents who live there. Let's face it, the developers do not live in the neighborhood and therefore CANNOT have the best interests of the neighbors in mind. If they did, they would find a way to work within the specs. An exception here will lead only to more, and you will have lost what can never be regained.
- Please do not approve this development. It is against the community's ARP and will erode the character and stability of our community. We, as a community, stood against this development the first time around, we will continue to do so until you hear us.
- I support the idea of a high rise on 25th Avenue. There are already a number of high rise buildings on 25th Avenues. High rise buildings bring more people into the community. Larger buildings within walking distance to the downtown core reduce commuter emissions. Finally, a high rise structure offers more resilience to flood events. The Mission ARP is outdated (approved 2006) and does not account for the damages caused to properties in the 2013 floods.
- Why is this unapproved project framed as a fait accompli, focused on directing respondents to select among meaningless crumbs of consolation? The real issue is whether a project which does not meet ARP requirements should be approved and allowed to set a precedent for relaxations of bylaws in exchange for some "amenities". To this, my input is a resounding "no". Respect the community's ARP, and come up with a development strategy rather than letting developers set the agenda.
- I'm not opposed to the density and feel it could be a good thing for the area, but only if done in quality manner. Mission/Cliff Bungalow is a key neighbourhood for urban living, and a development of this size could easily damage the area's appeal over the long term if done with cheap materials or poor architectural design.
- This application is in direct conflict with the objectives ,policy and intent of the Mission ARP! Mission is already the third most dense community. The Calgary Planning Commission turned down the proposal once . Mission is the only community in the City of Calgary/Main Street program that is exceeding density targets for both employment and residents.. I strongly oppose allowing the developer to exceed the the height restrictions and if passed the City is letting down the residents of Mission!
- This first question presumes that density bonusing is a fair exchange. CBM already has shouldered so much density. We need instead to preserve less dominating street scapes and encourage mixed family dwellings. We have a dwindling resource of single family dwellings. We need to look a creating a better balance of housing in our community by building some lower density units rather than increasing density in this community.
- "3) the community has a clearly identified project for enhancing the neighbourhood that requires funding."
- The communities accept that traffic will increase. However, it is also reasonable expect that they see a mitigation plan with the interaction of the building with the street, the alley, and it's neighbours be designed/articulated accordingly. Pedestrian and construction and post construction issues need to

addressed. Why is density bonusing front and centre and not the pros, cons, and consequences of the development itself? Seems a bit premature unless, of course ...

- Lots. How about some links on the page to sources of detailed information.
- Reduce the maximum height to the currently allowed limit. Those tall monstrosities behind them never should have been approved in the first place. We shouldn't be adding more.
- I'd like if the city were more forthcoming about the builder!
- Zoning should be changed. 25 Ave is a key road down to McLeod and further to Blackfoot, never mind central to Stampede grounds, Hockey arena etc.
- Leave the houses as they are because they bring a unique character to the neighbourhood. A new condo development will introduce more congestion to the area with increased traffic and parking issues. The neighbourhood is currently a nice, peaceful residential area and it's perfect the way it is now. The families and the elderly who live in this neighbourhood love it for its peacefulness. Please don't build a high-rise condo!
- This survey has leading questions!! The ISSUE is not trade-offs but whether the ARP should be violated so blatantly. Although I am in favor of increasing inner city density, Calgary needs some inner city "villages." The Beltline is becoming filled highrises so a near downtown "village" concept needs to be maintained."
- There is nothing positive about the proposed development. There is another development taking place on the same block. It is an empty field right now. When the traffic assessment of the alley was done they omitted the Shoppers Drug Mart loading dock and parking lot. This proposal doesn't want to follow the rules and is too tall and will ruin the aesthetics of Mission. Too many empty condos and completely unnecessary.
- The present ARP allows 6 stories, max 15m or 2.5m/floor. This developer has asked to build a 7 story unit....at 2.5m/floor this should give a finished height of 17.5m. Instead they are also wanting to increase the height allowance to 24m. Sounds like "give an inch, take a mile"- bribery is not worth opening a Pandora's box and change what is so special about our community (houses) and why the present ARP was fought for. There is a glut of vacant condos downtown - the city does not need more.