



A historical community in the heart of Calgary

1136 - 8th Street S.E. Calgary AB T2G 2Z7

August 17, 2008

Grace Lopushinsky & Christine Khandl
Land Use Planning and Policy Division
City of Calgary
P.O. Box 2100, Stn. M.
Calgary, AB. T2P 2M5

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Ms. Lopushinsky and Ms. Khandl;

Re: Draft ARP Amendment Comments from the Ramsay Civic Affairs Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments from the Civic Affairs Committee on the draft ARP Amendment for LOC2007-0080. Thank you also for allowing an extension on the delivery of our comments. The process of gaining consensus in our Committee's deliberations, particularly during the customary summer hiatus, is time-consuming and therefore we appreciate being given the extra time.

Please find attached with this letter, a spreadsheet of our Committee's comments on the language and policy statements of the draft ARP Amendment. You will note that there is some repetition of comment on particular reference points. I felt it was important to allow Committee members' individual comments to stand, as each comment represents a unique perspective with time and effort taken to interpret and understand the language of the subject document.

There are several themes within the list of comments. One of the more important is the community of Ramsay's relationship with the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede as a long-term adjacent neighbour. Historically the community has taken adversarial views on many CES issues perceived to be detrimental to the community's quality of life. Furthermore, we now find ourselves defending the quality of life of future residents that would potentially be adjacent to the CES. We support the development of the CES Back of House property adjacent to the proposed Ramsay Exchange redevelopment as it would allow CES operations to relocate off the east riverbank riparian zone. The interface of the two sites raises concerns about future livability on the Exchange site and some of our requests for wording changes stem from this perspective.

Another theme of equal importance is our position that the August 2007 Stantec Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) study is a flawed document that contains little if any, community context. Since its release, we have been asking politely for a review of the TIA, to no avail. We therefore cannot support any policy that derives from TIA recommendations. Nor can we support any extrapolation of the quantity of occupants the Exchange site might support until we are satisfied that a revised traffic study will reference our community's ARP and traffic calming initiative. We ask that the scope of data collection and analysis encompass the entire community road network, including perimeter roads and development plans including the new District 1 Police HQ and Manchester Yards, not to mention the CES expansion plans. We request that approval of land use and subsequent development permits, be contingent on a revised TIA that studies the impact of the

development on the entire Ramsay community and surrounding developments, with projections for vehicular traffic to the end of the proposed buildout in 2020 or thereabouts on this entire road network. The revised TIA should also address the inaccuracies raised by our traffic committee and should consider the possibility of isolating the vehicular network between the development adjacent to the existing neighbour and the denser interior development and parking facilities to deter traffic from short cutting through the community.

A third theme is the threat being felt by adjacent neighbours by shadowing and light pollution from proposed high-rise buildings on the site. While we support the timely redevelopment of an I-2 industrial brownfield site, many of the Committee do not support buildings beyond M-H2 (50m max.) in density and height, reflective of the community context of low-rise, low density residential adjacent to the site. One fear is that sunlight, currently unobstructed to the adjacent neighbours, will be reduced and the potential for environmentally sensible solutions such as solar power and passive heating will be reduced causing a long term economic and social impact. Another fear is that if land uses for high-rise mixed-use is approved, other developers may seek opportunities for similar land use in other community quadrants, thereby changing Ramsay into another Erlton or Mission. If approved, this development proposal by itself will forever change the face and demographic makeup of our community. Opening the doors to the potential for further high density high rise development is not something we wish to contemplate in the near future. Therefore we are arguing for strict controls on building heights in the proposed ARP amendment to mitigate shadowing and overlooking, and to more accurately reflect community context and streetscape.

In summary, our comments on the ARP amendment are reflective of the aforementioned themes and several others within the amendment document that we take issue with. The Civic Affairs Committee supports the inclusion of sustainable multi-income multi-family residential development on the site with reasonable and clearly defined incentives incorporated into the bonusing language. The potential for such residential mixes will help to maintain a healthy, vibrant, diverse and sustainable community. We feel that residential uses should take priority over commercial development as a means of ensuring the sustainability of our historic Ramsay School and stimulating community amenities through critical mass of residential population, rather than making the development a destination with attendant peak hour ingress and egress vehicular traffic, and parking issues within the surrounding community. We support adaptive reuse of the Dominion Bridge outbuildings for uses that will support the existing community and the future inhabitants of the site.

We look forward to an opportunity to discuss our requests for clarification, a new TIA and wording changes to the proposed ARP amendment with your staff.

The Community of Ramsay welcomes development that respects the history and emerging character of the neighbourhood, complies with the Area Redevelopment Plan and bylaws, and will be a benefit to the people who live here.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Benoit". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "M" and a long, sweeping tail.

Michael Benoit
VP External / Chair Civic Affairs
Ramsay Community Association

Attachment: RCA Comments on ARP pp.1-9