



March 19, 2021

RE: Application DP2021-1041, 534 23 AV NW (2400 Block)

The Mount Pleasant Community Association (MPCA) appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on this Development Permit application. Please note that this letter represents the position of both the MPCA Board of Directors and the Planning and Development (P&D) Committee.

In 2019, this site was redesignated (zoned) from R-C2 to M-C2 with the intention for seniors housing (M-C2 is a multi-residential designation in the developed area that is primarily for three to five storey apartment buildings) (the MPCA opposed the rezoning application at that time).

In late December, the landowner approached us with their proposal for this site, which at that time included community continued-recovery housing, with the intent to further engage with us and the community. At that time, the MPCA encouraged the applicant to conduct proactive and comprehensive engagement with the community.

Since being approached by the applicant the following events have occurred:

- Further engagement from the applicant has **not occurred** beyond setting up a website.
- The MPCA P&D Committee has reviewed the Development Permit application.
- The MPCA has received an **overwhelming response** from the community indicating concerns regarding details of the application as well as the lack of engagement (verbatim comments attached). Please note that MPCA has also received some messages of support for Fresh Start as an organization.
- The intended tenant, Fresh Start, has withdrawn from the application process.

Due to the items above, the MPCA is **opposed** to this application and also provides the following more detailed concerns and questions:

- The design of the building should consider the context of neighbouring properties particularly regarding the height of the building. For example, our understanding of the M-C2 district is that it “allows for varied **building height** and **front setback areas** in a manner that reflects the immediate context” under the Land Use Bylaw.
- Discrepancy between plans and what the design team told us – courtyard entrance appears to be on 23rd Ave rather than 5th Street. The team previously indicated this would be off 5th Street and should be confirmed.
- What is the purpose of the phone pedestal situated adjacent to the NW corner of the building? Is this a public pay phone? An emergency help phone?



- There is a 'staging area' for green bins (total of four) situated within the NE corner of the building, adjacent to the north lane. Is there also a staging area proposed for black and blue bins? Or will these be large format bins? If large format, will there be a private waste collection service that accesses where these large format bins are located? They appear to be situated within a sealed area. Have swept paths been confirmed here to ensure a SU-9 (garbage truck) design vehicle can maneuver effectively?
- How will the rear lane (both along the north and east sides of the development) manage stormwater? The grade point elevations suggest that water will flow from west to east along the north lane and from south to north along the east lane. This will create a low point where the two lanes converge, adjacent to the NE corner of the building. Will a catch basin be installed here?
- A shadow/light impact analysis should be completed to understand what sort of implication this height and mass of a building will have on its neighbours. Specifically, the residential units situated immediately to the north and the outdoor play area adjacent to the west side of the daycare facility, immediately east of the building (directly across the lane).
- Designer/developer should confirm requirements of the Land Use Bylaw pertaining to the number of parking stalls. They have flagged the development as being "Area 3" but we believe this location is situated within "Area 2" of the Parking Areas Map which requires 1.0 motor vehicle parking stall for each dwelling unit and 0.15 visitor parking stalls per unit. This would equate to 30 parking stalls, not 27. Visitor stalls would remain as listed at 5. This represents a grand total of 35 required stalls. That said, there may be a mechanism to reduce the number of required parking stalls by 10% seeing that this development is within 150m of 4th Street which is an "existing street where a frequent bus service operates". This would result in a total of 32 stalls required (including visitor stalls) whereas only 17 stalls are being proposed, which directly contravenes the Land Use Bylaw.
- This design is based on the very specific requirements of Fresh Start for post-addictions recovery. There is a risk that this design would not be suitable for a different tenant. It is premature to move forward with this application when a new tenant has not yet been identified.

Our Planning & Development Committee has a method of prioritizing our response to applications circulated for comment. As per this process, this application would count as Priority Level 3 – Neighbourhood, which necessitates that our committee provide comments to the City. Please continue to copy us on any updates for this application.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



Sincerely,

Alison Timmins
Mount Pleasant Community Association Board Director
Planning & Development Committee Chair

ATTACHMENT: Comments from residents received by the MPCA on DP2021-1041 (the 2400 Block post-recovery centre) as of March 18, 2021

Comments are provided as originally received by the MPCA with all personal information removed.

Hi there,

Thank you for bringing this development to our attention. We didn't realize the structure was going to be a recovery centre, and are very concerned about it's proximity to the daycares and schools in that area. We live on [REDACTED] street and [REDACTED] ave and are also very concerned about how this will impact the safety in our neighborhood. It was unclear in your email to community members about what actions we might take on our own to speak up about our concerns. Is it the city, the developer, or one of the other partners involved that would be more likely to hear our concerns? There is an active chat on the Nextdoor app about this development, so it would be good to be able to provide everyone with some information about where to take their concerns.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Alison,

We are a family living on [REDACTED] Ave and [REDACTED] Street NW and have been residents of Mount Pleasant since 2003.

We have seen this area transition to a middle income family friendly neighbourhood in the past almost 20 years.

We are surprised and very concerned at this proposal, putting adults transitioning from substance abuse issues and trying to put their lives back together in the midst of our community, across the street from our community association, park, pool and arena (which we strongly support being redeveloped into a modern athletic and recreation multi-use facility and hub for our community), within a couple blocks of 2 elementary schools, right beside the Montessori school etc. There are so many children in the area and this will undoubtedly expose them and our families to additional risks, when we already face significant crime statistics.

We are not in favour of this project and hope that we and others with concerns will have the opportunity to oppose and that it will not be approved.

We also note the types of multifamily developments that are being approved in Mount Pleasant are in some cases affecting property values negatively.

Thank you

Alison,

We've lived in Mt. Pleasant for +10yrs and would be a block away from this new development.

I don't support this and wonder why our community would. It feels like a sleight of hand by the developer who clearly couldn't secure a deal with a retirement community to sell the units. It feels rushed and in my experience will result in a poorly executed development. My issue is with the fact that this would be a 30 unit rental development and not ownership right in the heart of our community. I understand that with COVID more people are moving away from condos into detached homes therefore making the economics of these developments harder for the developers to justify. However that doesn't mean we need to accommodate their bad investments. I do support the cause of Fresh Start and unfortunately they will get caught up in this. It will become more about the recovery centre than about the fact that a makeshift developer is trying to turn the fastest dollar.

I'm interested in your perspective and the communities take on this as I would have a hard time believing there is a lot of support for this.

Thanks

We live in Mount Pleasant - our niece is here from bc going to university, she has experience with these type of post recovery centres in BC and they are extremely undesirable as they become sources of garbage, needles and crime!
Please do not put this in our neighborhood!

Hi Alison,

Thank you for seeking community input on this project.
Here are some thoughts for the committee's consideration:

1. The standard for the building design should be comparable to the low income building on the south side of 17th Avenue NW between 2nd and 3rd streets.
2. I suggest that a measurable indicator of disturbances should be agreed upon in writing beyond which the use of the building will be changed automatically. As an example, if there are approximately weekly disturbances (how do we define these?) for a two month period the community will request the use of the building be changed. In my neighbourhood we had a troublesome tenant that became a security/safety issue as there were a number of incidents, at one point attracting half a dozen police officers on the premises. If similar situations arise in the development, I suggest the change of use should be automatic upon request by the community without any requirement for negotiation.
3. The community is open to accommodating special developments; however, we should put a limit on these developments. I support the idea of this being the last special development in this stretch of the community. Special projects should be spread around the city. If this development is approved, I suggest that it be approved with an enforceable agreement in writing that it is the last special development in a clearly specified section of the community.

I hope these thoughts provide useful input in the deliberations of the committee.

Best regards

Hello Alison,

Thanks for this opportunity to learn more about the 2400 project. I would like the MPCA to consider (and Fresh Start) how Mount Pleasant CA and residents can welcome the 2400 block residents and ensure that we are as welcoming and supportive to the residents and their loved ones as they continue their journey of recovery. For instance, might we offer access to the community garden or complementary family memberships at the pool for family visits. The more Mount Pleasant creates a positive experience for all, the better off we are as a community.

Thank you,
Resident of 12 years

Hi Alison

Thank you for your email regarding the proposed 2400 Block development.

We are residents of █ Ave NW and live a block away from the proposed development. After reviewing your email and the applicants website, it is unclear to us at what stage the application is in.

The specific questions we have are:

Who is the deciding body on accepting or rejecting this proposal?

Does the MPCA have the power to reject the proposal?

We recently moved here to leave the core and enjoy the quiet nature of our street. We understand the zoning is no longer an option to modify, which is unfortunate as 30 units/80 residents seems excessive. Our main concerns are traffic, safety and crime rates and we look forward to bringing them up at the open house. We just want to ensure there is still a chance to reject this proposal.

Thank you

I have discussed this issue with several residents and business owners of Mount Pleasant, we are writing to the Mount Pleasant Community Association Board of Directors and cc'ing the City of Calgary to gain clarification and full transparency regarding the project located on 23 Avenue NW, between 4th and 5th Street, otherwise known as the 2400 Block project.

From discussions with MPCA Board members, community residents and business owners the following are the understood facts regarding the situation;

- In 2019 the land use for the parcel was amended with the support of the MPCA Board of

Directors with the understanding that the development would be a seniors living facility.

- The board met with the developer and designer who explained the usage would be for seniors living. One of the supporting letters filed with the application in 2019 is a letter from a Mount Pleasant resident supporting the rezoning so her elderly parents could move into the community.

- We are aware after the land use was amended the designer was contacted by a private investor wanting to invest in the project only to be told that the project would not in fact be a senior living facility.

- In December 2020 after approximately 18 months of no contact the developer, designer and Fresh Start met with the MPCA

Board of Directors and or Development Committee, they presented the change from a seniors living facility to a home for people (mainly men) in recovery (a term taken from the designer's website www.2400block.ca FAQ's page).

- Plans were presented and the proposed Development Permit reviewed.

- At least two subsequent meetings followed between the MPCA Board of Directors and or the Development Committee and the developer, designer and Fresh Start.

- It is understood that only two or three members of the MPCA Board/Committee attended these very important subsequent meetings on behalf of the entire community.

- The Designer states on the www.2400block.ca website that "Before filing the Development Permit, we met with the Mount Pleasant Community Association Development Committee to introduce the project, our development team, and to solicit some preliminary feedback, and will continue to do so as we progress."

- On or thereabouts Thursday, February 18, 2021, the Development Permit (DP2021-1041) was submitted to the City of

Calgary, the file manager is Dino Kasparis ((403) 268.5311 dino.kasparis@calgary.ca). In a phone call last week to the City of

Calgary planning department general information line, the current Development Permit application does not mention anything

about Fresh Start, recovery home or staffing, it is purely an application for low-income housing.

- In conversations with the Daycare located directly adjacent to the proposed site and other concerned residents and

businesses little if any of how this will impact the Mount Pleasant Community has been taken into consideration before the

Development Permit application was submitted.

We are looking for the Mount Pleasant Community Board of Directors to answer the following questions to clarify facts so we may assess our next steps;

1. When the land use was amended in 2019 no Development Permit was submitted with the application, why did the MPCA

Board of Directors support the land-use amendment without ensuring a Development Permit was filed with the land use amendment?

2. Can the MPCA Board please provide the letter which was submitted to the City of Calgary regarding the Land use amendment

in 2019 (referenced by the Planning and Development Report to Calgary Planning Commission

dated September 5, 2019)?

3. Immediately following the December of 2020 meeting by the MPCA Board of Directors with the developer, builder and Fresh

Start which drastically changed the proposed use of the site, why were the residents of the Mount Pleasant community not immediately notified?

4. What explanation have the designer and developer given for changing from a seniors living facility to a home for people in recovery?

5. Why did only two or three individuals of the MPCA Board of Directors and or Development Committee meet with the developer, builder and Fresh Start for subsequent meetings following the December 2020 meeting?

6. Where can the meeting minutes of the December meeting and subsequent meetings with the developer, builder, Fresh Start and the MPCA Board of Directors and or Development Committee be found?

7. How did the board adequately convey the concerns of the entire community of Mount Pleasant to the City of Calgary, the developer, designer and Fresh Start post the December 2020 meeting without ever having notified the community of the change of use, without canvassing the community for its opinion?

8. Has the MPCA Board of Directors asked the City of Calgary to review how the land use amendment was originally granted and if so done under different parameters than originally presented in 2019 to the MPCA Board of Directors and community asked for a full stop and inquiry into the land-use amendment? Has the MPCA Board of Directors advised the City of Calgary of the drastic use change proposed from a seniors facility to a home of recovery and brought forward the many identified discrepancies?

9. Requests of the developer to provide the drawings have not been granted, stating that would lead to them becoming public, the MPCA Board of Directors and or Development Committee have seen these plans, when will the MPCA Board of Directors release the Development Permit and plans to the residents?

10. The Designers website states "Fresh Start has an outreach team that visits the continued-recovery housing sites daily." would these people not be deemed staff, is this not in contravention of the Development Permit?

11. A post from MPCA president Jessica Karpal on the Mount Pleasant Calgary Neighbours Facebook page dated February 28 in part reads "I believe with a good relationship with fresh start and a "good neighborhood agreement", this would be a great location for this facility". Is this the position the entire MPCA Board of Directors has taken or will be taking?

12. With this drastic change of use from a seniors facility to a recovery home only having been brought forward in December of 2020 have the true impact on the community and the future residents of the building properly been evaluated?

a. Are there any city, provincial or federal guidelines on where a home for people in recovery may be located?

b. Is it ok for such a home to be located next to a pub with VLTs, overlooking the outdoor play

space of a long-standing

Daycare across from a hockey rink, outdoor pool, playground, community hall on an otherwise low traffic community

street a half block from an elementary and junior high school?

c. Does this location give the potential future residents the tools they need to be successful, is there access to adequate

transit, where will the residents park if there is only limited parking available, where will the Fresh Start team or

guests of the resident's park?

d. Does the location offer enough positive amenities for the residents to achieve the autonomy the designer's website

outlines, are there enough jobs or schools within reasonable proximity to meet their needs?

e. How do the residents of Mount Pleasant feel about the change from senior living to a home for recovery, how do the

residents feel about being told one use only for it to be a completely different use?

f. How do the residents feel knowing that the goal of the home is to have people move on and achieve autonomy

leading to new people coming in and out of the community regularly?

g. Were other low-income housing projects in the community approved like the project on the corner of 20th Ave and 6th

Street NW because this project was supposed to be senior living, can the community support multiple low-income

housing projects and should they be so close in proximity?

h. There is a possibility having a home such as this in the community will negatively affect real estate values, are the

residents of Mount Pleasant in favour once everything regarding this project is fully disclosed?

The programs run by Fresh Start are essential and necessary however it is clear that the land-use amendment was flawed and

subsequent proposed usage for a recovery home have not met the requirement for "community consultation". It appears little research

has been done on how this will affect the community, its current residents and business owners.

A more suitable location should be

found when considering both the community and the future residents of the Fresh Start recovery home.

We are requesting the MPCA Board of Directors return answers to the above-posed questions and clarifications/corrections to any of

the understood facts above before 900am on Thursday, March 4th, 2021.

A written response may be sent to 2400blockmpc@gmail.com

Hello,

I recently learned that the new development proposed for the 2400 Block of 5th Street NW in Mount Pleasant is planned to be an **addiction recovery center**. I have concerns about the location of this development being 1) within 3 blocks of my home, 2) the kind of clientele that it would bring into the area, 3) the proximity to several schools and playgrounds, pubs, a community pool, daycares, next door to a pre-school, etc.

This kind of development has the potential to lead to **increased crime and safety issues** within the community, which would have an impact on our quality of life, personal safety, as well as property values.

When the signs for this development originally went up, I did not note any reference to it being an addiction recovery center. I am not aware that there has been adequate community consultation regarding this development, and only learned of it through neighbors. I took a walk by and saw the sign which refers to Fresh Start Recovery Center on only one of the signs posted, and that information is with an added sticker so it appears that it wasn't originally part of the sign.

Could you please advise as to what kind of outreach or consultation there has been with regard to this development (provide methods, dates, times, etc.)? It is my understanding that it was previously billed as a senior's residence, which would be a misleading bait-and-switch. I am **highly opposed** to this development in our community!
Sincerely

Hi

I'm concerned about the 2400 Block project.

There are schools (St. Joseph's, Montessori) around the corner, a before and after school program in the Community Centre, and the public pool. I just don't think the location is justified and a good fit for the surrounding community.

I just don't think it makes sense to have such a facility in the heart of our community and where our kids walk by every day to and from their schools.

My husband and I are 100% AGAINST the addiction recovery development in Mount Pleasant. There is a school one block away on 24 ave and 5 st.

There is a Montesory preschool on the same block

There is a park and a community centre with before and after school care across the street.

THIS IS NOT SAFE FOR OUR CHILDREN.

There is so much crime in our neighbourhood already.

People break into cars and houses and garages daily and steal in broad daylight.

Access to downtown is TOO EASY and this is not conducive to an Addiction recovery centre.

THIS IS NOT OK.

WE CAN'T EVEN LET OUR KIDS PLAY IN THE YARD BECAUSE OF THE CRIME AND NOW YOU ARE PROPOSING THIS ADDICTION RECOVERY CENTRE...

YOU NEVER ASKED YOUR NEIGHBOURS> NOW WE ARE SAYING NO.

Our population has increased dramatically with the building of town houses on every block corner.

WE ARE 100% against the ADDICTION RECOVERY DEVELOPMENT.

Hi Alison,

I read through the letter and reviewed the website and at this point I was wondering if there was any way still to block the building of this project in the location proposed. There are a couple of schools right around that area so I'm confused as to why it would be appropriate to put a recovery center there.

Is the recovery centre for drugs or is it for other conditions? I think many of the residents around

that area would be concerned about safety particularly for kids.

I was wondering what else we can do as a community to prevent the building of this project or has that already been approved?

Dear All,

As residents of Mt. Pleasant, we are deeply concerned about the proximity of this development to our community center, playground, and preschool (Montessori). While we commend person's with addictions attending rehab, the person's seeking drug rehab not uncommonly will relapse even while in recovery and the people selling drugs know this. I fear the increase of this type of person's in our community, so close to the place where our children will be playing. Person's who use drugs have also a higher likelihood of using tobacco and this will likely be done in the community center park which is directly across the street from the recovery house. This again is not ideal in a park full of children, where after school care often takes place. As parents with children who attend the preschool just down the block, we are opposed to this development and u hope you take steps to stop this.

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: 30 Unit Addiction Recovery Housing at 23rd Ave and 5th Street NW (Mount Pleasant Community)

I am writing to you to oppose the proposed development in the community of Mount Pleasant for the Recovery Housing on the corner of 23rd Ave and 5th Street NW.

There are so many things wrong with this proposal, but I would like to start with the process. It has been anything but transparent. For myself, who has been running Montessori Children's House Academy for the past 23 years in the Hill Park Office Building and the residents of the community who are just finding out about it through word of mouth and recently something added in the community news, this is unacceptable.

For a building that will forever change the landscape and dynamics of this community and could bring a potential negative impact. I would have expected more discussion with the long-time business owners and residents who will be impacted. And no, excuses about how COVID-19 impacted this process are not acceptable as well as how the city and other levels of government did not know as it is your responsibility to know what exactly a developer is planning to do.

There is a large population of children in the area, Montessori Children's House Academy which would be located right beside the recovery housing and who has 104 young children enrolled, the Before and After school program that is run out of the Mount Pleasant Community Center,

the Public Outdoor Pool that is always full of children throughout the summer months, the community playground, the Arena that has children coming and going from for hockey and other activities, St. Joseph's Elementary and the Francophone school which would make this development inappropriate for the area. This is not about the business, economy or, denying individuals a place to live and continue their recovery, this is about protecting the children of the community which should be a priority for all levels of government and the Mount Pleasant Association. A "Good Neighbour" agreement is great until it is not and once it is not it puts the community and the children at great risk and that is not something that I or the Montessori Children's House Academy community is prepared or willing to take such a preventable risk for the children who attend the program or any child in the Mount Pleasant Community, it is up to all of us to make sure that children are always protected to the best of our ability and not opposing and stopping this development would be a huge disservice to the children, children that I have dedicated the last 37 years to serving and being a "Good Steward" and "Advocate" for.

Back to the proposal, we all know addiction is a problem in our city, and the devastation that the collapse of oil and COVID has put upon all of us will take years to recover from and which puts pressure on the different levels of government to do something about but not doing your research and not being forthcoming, transparent and putting money before our greatest accomplishments and assets, the children, is unfathomable and something to be quite ashamed of.

The lack of planning and the process of this development is laughable. You allowed a deceitful developer to dupe you or maybe you are choosing to turn a blind eye for the mighty dollar, I guess that your conscious will decide for you which one it is and hopefully will help you to decide to do better for the residents, the business and first and foremost the children of the Mount Pleasant Community.

Right now, it looks like you are planning to just blindly go forward and push through this development by cramming a 30-unit Recovery Housing onto the corner, dwarf everything around it that already exists, increase the traffic to a point that it will create more risk for the children and residents in the area and to bring to the community a potentially negative impact, am I on the right track?

If you are truly trying to work for the residents of Mount Pleasant, and first and foremost the children then you will do your research, make sure that this developer is forthcoming, transparent, and truthful and find that this is not an appropriate area for this development based on facts, on doing better for the children and not making decisions based on money.

Let us demand more of our levels of government, let us find a more appropriate area for this recovery housing so that our children and community are protected, and these individuals can continue with their recovery and hopefully being able to lead healthy, happy, and prosperous lives.

I know none of you would like to have a 4.5 story Recovery Housing right beside your family or your children. Bringing a potential negative impact to your family, to your children, to your community, blocking out the sunlight and changing the landscape and dynamics of your community forever. Funny that you feel it is okay for other families and this community.

As a "Good Steward" and "Advocate" for children I will stand up for them and stand up with the business owners and residents of the community of Mount Pleasant to have this development stopped and relocated to a more appropriate area.

Dear MPCA planning committee,

As new member of Mount Pleasant in the last year, our family **does not support** the 2400 Block Addiction Recovery Project

We have spent our life savings purchase a house in Mt Pleasant to allow our children to live in quiet neighbourhood, compared to the core of Calgary where we lived previously.

The low volume of traffic, safety and low crime rate are the most attractive aspects of living in this community.

The 2400 Block was a complete surprise to us when we saw the signage/website 2 months ago (which at that time made no mention of an addiction recovery centre).

The concerns we have with the development are as follows:

- There had been no community consultation prior to announcement of project. This is unprofessional, offensive to the community members and sets a dangerous precedent.
- The other Calgary Fresh Start locations are not in quiet residential areas (they in industrial or on busier streets), so it is unclear and unknown how this program would integrate in a quiet community like Mt Pleasant and a trial should take place prior to construction to prove that it is safe and effective.

- The height and unit/resident density is too high for a quiet residential neighbourhood and should be reduced in negotiation with MPCA to ensure traffic safety and adequate parking.
- This large increase in resident density will lead to:
 - Traffic volume and safety around playground zone, after school program and St Joseph School
 - Increased parking volume and likely need form parking restrictions/enforcement
 - Increased crime rates in surrounding blocks

In summary, **we are not supportive** of this project. If the developer and Fresh Start had involved the community early on and shown professionalism and transparency, our opinion may have differed.

Please email with any questions, concerns or ways we can advocate against this project.

Sincerely

Hi there,

I would like to know what the community response is to the proposal, (maybe the planar this point) for the recovery Center on the 2400 block. It seems to me that consultation was lacking through the process. I would encourage the community to oppose/impede progress until a fair and thorough review is complete, and is shared with the community. It is disappointing that building after building seems to be approved with seemingly no scrutiny or opposition. This development seems to be straight out of the same playbook as the 16 avenue redevelopment plan over a decade ago now. Any new development should be presented with an open, transparent plan, and followed up with a through an honest consultation process prior to approval. Many communities demand such consultation before anything is approved, and in doing so maintain a degree of control in shaping a community. Please let me know if I can be of any assistance in contributing or shaping a future response to the proposed development, or in discussions about future applications. Thank you

I am glad people are taking expressed opposition to the project and Citizens please take note and voice your opposition to the project to these emails as well:

calgary.mountainview@assembly.ab.ca;

calgary.beddington@assembly.ab.ca; planninghelp@calgary.ca;

planning@mpca.ca; Dino.Kasparis@calgary.ca; mpconcerns@gmail.com

...as Well I want to go on record opposing the development because it attracts the wrong kinds of visitors to our area of the city which is near schools, offices, playschools, swimming pool, community play area and picnic site.

WE DON'T WANT IT HERE PERIOD!

Property values devalue, as no one wants to live near such. There are \$1million homes in the vicinity and they don't want it there either.

A few years after once the developers have made their money, we are left to put up with all the problems associated with what we see over by [our daughter]'s place.

re: The 2400 block development---Paragraph excerpt from the email....Our understanding is that this application is for a “community continued-recovery housing” facility where abstinence and recovery maintenance is a requirement of housing. In addition, this facility is intended to house those who are post-treatment as well as their families.

We don't need problems brought into our community.

Subject: Stop developer planning to build a 30 unit Addiction Recovery location
(Kids safety is endangered)

Message: Mount Pleasant Community Association,

Yesterday afternoon a community member was delivering one page information sheets door to door within the Mount Pleasant Community. She was informing us about a potential 30 unit multi-housing development planned for 5th Street and 23rd Ave. N.W. A while ago, I was informed that this development was going to be a place for seniors housing, but now I have been informed that this will be a place for addiction recovery.

In my opinion this is a not an appropriate location for this purpose for these reasons:

The following five services are all within a one block radius from this location:

- Two elementary schools
- A pre-school
- A Day care
- A Before and after school care program
- Three playgrounds

Right beside this proposed Mount Pleasant 30 Unit Addiction Recovery Development is a pub with VLT's.

The developer has been tactfully dishonest to our community about the purpose of this facility. Myself and others in the Mount Pleasant community were not aware that the developer had changed his purpose from Seniors housing to an addiction recovery development.

I would ask for your insight regarding the security and safety of our children in the Mount Pleasant community. I would also plead that you put a significant barriers to the developers intentions. Dishonesty should never be rewarded.

I am happy to hear that a few members of the Mount Pleasant Community will be meeting at the Mount Pleasant Community Centre out doors on Sunday March 7th at 2:00. If you or a representative could also be there we would appreciate it very much.

Sincerely

Hello Alison,

I am emailing you in regards to concerns about plans for the 2400 block development. I understand that such housing facilities are important to individuals who are recovering from addiction. However, we are strongly opposed to the location of this project. Particularly given that it is directly across from Mount Pleasant Community Centre that houses a before and after school program for elementary school children (Pleasant Heights) and is also very close to St. Joseph's Elementary and Junior High School.

I would appreciate if these concerns could be included within feedback from Mount Pleasant Community Association without the specifics of my identifying information being included. We are Mount Pleasant home owners and parents of a young elementary school child who attends St. Joseph's School and Pleasant Heights after school program.

Thank-you very much

To whom it may concern at Mount Pleasant Planning and Development,

I am writing in concern of a notice I received that a 30 unit Fresh Start recovery center is to be built 1/2 a block from my house.

We have 2 young children and live very close to this location.

The fact this has been approved to be built so close to an elementary school, montessori preschool, community center with after school care, numerous playgrounds, an outdoor pool and a bar (with VLTs) is quite a shock.

The parking concerns, increased traffic and increased density with a 30 unit development in that location is concerning. There are already parking concerns in that area with school drop off/ pick up and sports at the arena. There is also a lot of pedestrian traffic (often children) with the school/preschool and community center.

I am also learning that this was first proposed to be a seniors facility and then switched last minute to be an addiction recovery facility. It does not seem like there has been any community consultation on this project.

I am in support of these programs and I know there are many people in need who benefit from them. But this is clearly not the right location.

Dear Sir/Madam:

It has recently been brought to my attention that there is a recovery house being established on 23rd Avenue Northwest.

I know the people that use a facility like this require proper care and consideration. Allowing an establishment like this to exist next to a daycare outdoor pool community area Community hockey rink needs to be revisited. Furthermore there are multiple elementary schools in the near vicinity. A professional office nearby also FULL of preschool kids in a Montessori program.

I believe this project will not be in the overall interest of the society and will have a negative impact on this otherwise peaceful and vibrant environment.

A concerned area resident AND business owner

It has recently been brought to my attention that there is a recovery house being established on 23rd Avenue Northwest.

I know the people that use a facility like this require proper care and consideration. Allowing an establishment like this to exist next to a daycare outdoor pool community area Community hockey rink needs to be revisited. Furthermore there are multiple elementary schools in the near vicinity. A professional office nearby also FULL of preschool kids in a Montessori program.

I would also like to know from you how to escalate this concern or if I need to show up in person at a hearing.

Concerned area resident AND business owner with SMALL CHILDREN 6 AND 9 YRS OLD

re: The 2400 block development---Paragraph excerpt from the email....Our understanding is that this application is for a “community continued-recovery housing” facility where abstinence and recovery maintenance is a requirement of housing. In addition, this facility is intended to house those who are post-treatment as well as their families.

██████ wondered if there is a petition circulating that she could sign to keep the facility out of the community, she would sign it?

She says “ Put it in Nenshi’s backyard”.

I think many of her concerns I share.

We don’t need problems brought into our community.

The reason for this note is, do you know of anyone working on
A Zoom call for the community to have input?

Yours sincerely

Hello Allison,

While I appreciate this message, I find it alarming that it took 2 months for the MPCA to communicate this significant change in development to the community members.

What ever happened to the senior living complex?!

I was looking on our community website and would like to know when the MPCA will invite the residents to come together to discuss this issue which will have significant impact on our community. Yet I didn't see any notice of upcoming meeting, nor a link to collect feedback. Meanwhile, this development is continuing to move forward in their process.

You indicate that the MPCA neither supports nor opposes this development; isn't it time you collected the thoughts of residents so you could start to represent what the majority of residents want? I find it alarming to read a quote from our MPCA president on the Facebook page; she clearly is very supportive of such a development. I live within half a block so I will most certainly take a financial hit when we downsize our home (let's face it, while proximity to schools, parks, amenities are high on people's wish list, proximity to facilities such as there are NOT). I know I would NOT have bought our current home if that facility had already been in place. Even if some are happy living next door to a facility like that, they are the minority (less potential buyers = lower price).

For the record, I am supportive of allocating resources towards rehabilitation and re-integration. However, I really don't think it should come at a personal (financial) loss to those that are located in close proximity. There are many locations that could be less impactful than this one.

I look forward to hearing back from you. Thank you

Hi There,

I'm writing to voice my concern about a proposed development in my area, file # DP2021-1041.

A significant number of residents in Mount Pleasant have serious questions and concerns about this for the following reasons:

- Parking considerations are not being taken into account for local residents without driveways or parking spaces near their homes off the street. The developer has not planned for enough parking spaces to accommodate the capacity of the proposed development
- Safety concerns around the drastic increase in traffic for an area with an elementary school, day care, and community centre have not been addressed
- There has been a serious lack of community consultation and misleading communication about the intended use for this property despite claiming community support and approval on their website 2400block.ca

For the reasons listed above I am opposed to this proposal moving ahead. I would also like to reiterate the serious questions and concerns that remain unanswered in the attached letter.

Thank you
Resident of Mount Pleasant

Attention please,

As residents of Mt. Pleasant living close to this proposed 5 story, 30 unit, addiction recovery facility, my husband and I object to the underhanded methods used by the developer to sneak 'The Fresh Start Recovery Centre' into the Mt. Pleasant Community Centre without an open, honest discussion with the community. There has been NO impact study done! Furthermore, this developer misrepresented this building project for government funding and profit, schemed for dishonest zoning approval masked as "intended senior's residence".

Mt. Pleasant is an eclectic community with an emphasis on young families, schools, daycares centers, playgrounds, park areas where children play, skate,

swim, soccer fields, music and art schools, bike ride. My husband and I question if this "location" on 5 Street & 23 Ave NW, directly across the street from Mt. Pleasant Community Centre and the large active family playground/park, is the appropriate location for an addition recovery residence? We say NO it is not!

There may be a need for The Fresh Start Recovery Centre in Calgary but this developer has not shown mindfulness or consideration of neighbours or community by sneaking this development into this location. Surely there are more discrete areas better suited for a development such as this for our city. The exposure of residents recovering from addiction will be openly visible to the community, as if living in a fish bowl! In discussion with others in our community, there is growing outrage that this dishonest developer has undercover, tried to silence our democratic voice in this process. The opinion of Mt. Pleasant Community has a right to be heard in this matter: STOP THE DISHONESTY NOW. STOP THIS DEVELOPMENT NOW.

Message: I consider 30 units very high density for this community.
Parking for staff and visitors will cause congestion for the community center, play group, and hockey rink.
The School is also in close proximity.
Not appropriate for this community.

Hi,

I'm writing in regards to the proposed development permit for the 2400Block. I have several concerns with this development foremost is preserving the safety of my children and others in the community. I don't feel that a 30 unit addiction recovery unit is an appropriate development beside the Mount Pleasant Community centre.

The community centre is a hub for the kids in the area, it has a swimming pool, hockey arena, daycare, playground, etc. Both my kids frequently go there and have been registered at the after school care program that currently operates out of the community association. I feel this type of development brings additional risk to a highly vulnerable population, our children. The risk is inherent with this type of development.

5th street is also the "safe" route (aka. not on busy 4th street) for our kids to get to St. Joseph School, the Mount Pleasant Arts Centre and the local skating rink.

Our experience with 'recovery' developments in the community has been mixed. In the past my kids have been pulled off the playgrounds at King George school when there have been altercations that required a police presence at local group homes beside the school. A school has the ability to make that call and bring the kids inside, how can that be managed at the community centre and all its facilities?

We live close to a mental health group home and haven't any issue requiring police intervention but the comings and goings (staff, visitors, etc.) are frequent and add to an existing parking problem being inner city. This is a duplex and we notice the parking issue, I can't imagine what will happen with a 30 unit complex.

I support addiction recovery development, I do not support this development due to its proximity to the community facilities. I also believe that a development of this size needs to account for the parking influx it will bring.

I would appreciate your consideration and would like for this development permit to be declined.

Cheers

Message: Hello

Although I appreciate and support this center and it's work I we were not consulted on it. Schools, Parking, Pre schools and height of this project are al of concern to us.

There may be a better more cost effective less community impact location for this. Please have a community consultation event prior to proceeding.

Message: There is a lot of misinformation being spread about this project on the NextDoor site. I understand why people are concerned but hope that MPCA bases its decision on whether to support or oppose the development application (and whether to appeal if the application is approved) based on facts, not fear. It would be helpful if an FAQ page were added here to correct some of the misinformation on NextDoor (e.g., there is an appeal process if the permit is approved, there are more than 7 parking spaces, this is a long term post-recovery residential building, not a recovery building with residents changing every 12-14 weeks, etc., etc., etc.).

Hi MPCA - Wanted to provide my feedback on the 2400 block project. A 5 story, 30 unit building doesn't seem to fit contextually in our community in that location (ie not on 16 or 20 Ave). I am neutral on the use at this point and need to learn more about Fresh Start but I don't believe there has been enough community engagement to

date. I learned about the project as I was driving by at the end of Feb and saw the sign on the property.

I am committed to learning more about the project but would like to voice my opposition at this point since I have heard the meeting with the community is taking place after the comments are due for the development permit.

Subject: 2400 Block opposition to the development

Message: I oppose the development of 2400Block in Mt. Pleasant. It does not fit. A large contingent to residents gathered March 7 at 2pm to voice opposition to the development.

Hi Dino,

Hoping this email finds you well, although I suspect this may not be your only email on this file today... Hopefully I am not piling on.

Today I learned for the first time the details of a proposed 5 story building to be located on the 2400 Block in Mount Pleasant, down the street from where I live and across the street from our favourite local park (okay - second favourite, Confed is our first!).

I'm not sure if I am late to the party on this development but am shocked at the size and scope of this in the midst of a residential community. I don't feel like I have much of a voice on this (there has been almost no community engagement and I'm someone who reads my community newsletter monthly!) but I am hoping to add my concern to your records, and ultimately my strong opposition.

I am not an urban planner nor do I understand the zoning requirements for the lot in question, but standing on the sidewalk with my 3 kids this afternoon I know that something there, 5 stories high, is completely out of character for the neighbourhood.

I don't have a view on the intended use of the property at this point as I am educating myself on that aspect of this issue.

Appreciate your consideration. Are there other opportunities or methods to provide feedback? Apparently the proponent is holding a meeting on the 18th, after the comment period on the DP (how convenient)...

Many thanks

Re: 2400 Block

[REDACTED]

The only reason I mention the above is I've had many dealings with developers during this time I tried to keep City Planning honest but our only problems then were illegal 4 plexes.

Questionable Promotion:

To start, the two signs posted are vague. 30 Unit multi housing development. It should say 30 Unit Addiction Recovery Development. The name of the complex is not accurate "2400 Block" it is located on 23 Avenue. When a developer gives only a few clues as to their integrity this alerts you to lots of deception later.

Overall Concerns Are:

1. The complex is not needed and does not enhance our community
2. Parking in our district will be impacted. 30 parking stalls plus visitors parking required.
3. There is a before and after school care program at the Community hall across the street, the children from St. Joseph School will walk by this complex before and after school everyday.
4. It is hard to understand in our present market, there must be many existing buildings that could be used instead of new construction an expensive way to do things.
5. There has been no community consultation and it is definitely needed.
6. The re-zoning process has some flaws for sure. We did not see any postings or community consultation.
7. I have this theory years ago planning departments were put in place to protect communities from unscrupulous developers now, sadly, it appears that planners, having little contact, with residents, we seem to have an additional obstacle to overcome on questionable projects.

Message: My only concern is buildings that exceed 3 stories are not suitable for inner city residential areas for the following reasons:

1. They will limit sunlight. This impacts residents ability to grow plants/gardens. In addition, it already takes sometime for snow to melt due to the density of buildings

making roads/alleys difficult to drive on in the winter - tall buildings will make this worse.

2. Buildings greater than 3 stories will take away from the quaint atmosphere of the inner city. These higher buildings should be restricted to 16 Ave, suburbs with less density, or developments specifically catering to high rise buildings.

Hi there,

I've recently become aware that some of our neighbours are very opposed to the new recovery Center. How can I show my support for this project? I know there will be a lot of nasty emails from some residents and potentially a petition but I want it to be known that many residents are in support of this project.

Thanks

Hello,

Just following up on the 2400 block development in a short email. We do not support this addiction recovery center to be built at that location. We understand the need for these facilities but see that location as extremely unfit for that facility. Strongly opposed to the facility at that location.

Message: Hi,

I'm totally supportive of this development knowing the benefits of having structures in place to support recovery. I'm certain the neighbor agreement will be in place and followed.

Message: Hi there,

I am quite concerned about this project as a continued-recovery house. I am in the neighborhood. My kids and their friends go to McDonald's, 711 and playground, etc. by themselves all the time. I am worried about this project will be an issue for us to do so in the future.

Personally I am happy to see a regular condo building for seniors, who used to live in this community and would like to downsized their house to condo, or young couples with kids, who would like to be close to school, park and playground.

Sincerely

Message: I fully support this project! As someone who has had friends use recovery programs, they provide an important service to the city, and I would be happy to welcome this project in the neighborhood. I am located on █ Avenue, between █ and █ street, very close to the proposed project. I am also a fan of adding more density and diversity to the neighborhood.

Message: While I support the recovery addicts, I do believe the road to recovery can be very challenging. Mount pleasant is a very family orientated community. This location in particular is the heart beat of the community. I do not think that this is the appropriate location for a recovery Center for addicts. In fact, I think it increases the level of risk for the children in the community. Having grown up with a recovering alcoholic, I know that relapse is very likely. I think a better choice would be away from the Center of the community where children come to play and perhaps a community where there are fewer children. If we want to keep people living in the inner city, we need to be very mindful of how the areas are developed and ensure they maintain a 'community like' feel.

Message: Regarding the 2400 block post recovery for addicts and their families. KI would like to know how adding this to our neighbour hood will affect housing prices being 1 block, 2 blocks, and 5 blocks away from the location. Research shows that having centres like this decreases the value of your home. How will our taxes be affected? Will they be impacted according to the new salable value of our home?

What happens to the 44% of addicts who falter while in this program? How many chances will they be given? What time line will be in place for the removal of them (and likely their families) from the apartment? If their families are allowed to stay, will addicts not try to keep in contact with them? Will having a home with this structure not encourage those suffering failure to come back? If this happens, we will have an increase of addicts within a block of 3 schools ranging from pre k to high school, a community park, an outdoor pool, an arena, and a before/after school program. Will my family and those of my neighbours not be negatively impacted by the 44% failure rate? Where will those 44% go? How will they feed their habit?

As much as I believe they need help, I don't think this is the right place for them. Answers to my questions would be greatly appreciated. Either to show me that this is not the correct location for this home or to convince me that it will be ok. Personally I've been affected 3 different times in the past 7 years with addicts. None of the situations turned out well. The most recent one had drug deals going

on outside my house in front of my kids. My experiences have not been positive to say the least.

Again, answers with supporting evidence would be appreciated from the city and the Fresh Start.

Thank you

Awesome! Our household has heard about this and will be proud to be neighbours. We've owned a house here for ten years and look forward to our 1 & 4 year olds growing up in this fantastic and increasingly diverse community.

Message: I am disappointed in the minimal and misleading community engagement that has taken place about this project.

This would change the whole landscape of our community both in the height of the proposed building, and its purpose. We have experienced a lot of crime locally from the youth group home that we already have in our neighborhood. I fear this property would increase it much more.

The facility that Fresh Start built in Greenview was in a more industrial part of the community. The mount pleasant proposal is right in the heart of our community, next to our recreational facility and community hall, as well as surrounded by homes. It will drive our property value down, and potentially create an unsafe environment for our families, friends and neighbours.

Why do they need to build new when there are so many empty options all over the city. Why not repurpose one of those buildings?

I am strongly opposed to this project going ahead in our community.

Good evening,

We are writing to share our feedback on the proposed new development on 23 avenue NW "2400 block" and hope you can pass our feedback along to the City of Calgary.

While we wholeheartedly support the idea of the project and the families that need it, we do not support the exact location due to the large number of primary schools and community amenities in the immediate area.

The community centre, the schools and all of the parks in the immediate area contribute to a safe and thriving environment for the families and individuals that live here and the proposed development has the potential to put young children at risk.

We strongly support the initiative, but do not support the exact location and urge you to consider relocation.

Thank you.

Development Permit Application DP2021-1041

This is a request that The City of Calgary, Planning and Development, deny the application for the Development Permit Application DP2021-1041 (534 - 23 Avenue NW, Calgary, AB) (the "Development Permit") based on the following

1. The Development Permit application was not advertised on location by The City of Calgary nor have the applicants (Bhomac, Baboushkin Design Group [REDACTED] (the "Applicants") engaged with the residents and local businesses, resulting in failure to notify residents and concerned citizens in the manner as prescribed under the Development Permit process.
2. The Applicant's proposal for parking for the 5-storey Multi-Residential Development (one building) is 17 stalls for a building of 30 units, housing up to 80 residents, as well as any required staff parking. This parking proposal falls far short of the requirements as set out in Part 6, Division 1 section 558(1) for multi-residential buildings. This lack of parking will overflow onto neighbouring streets and will negatively impact the surrounding residents and businesses.
3. The height of the proposed Multi-Residential Development is 5-storeys which is which is far greater in height than other buildings in the community. In fact, the Multi-Residential Development is 3-storeys higher than adjacent residences and 2-storeys higher than nearby businesses. The size of the building is out of scale and is a distinct departure from the character of the community and will decrease the community feel.
4. The 5-storey Multi-Residential Development will: (i) increase traffic, noise and cause significant shading on adjacent properties; (ii) decrease privacy; (iii) change the neighbourhood demographics; and (iv) cause property depreciation.
5. Despite significant opposition from the community of Mount Pleasant, the rezoning of the development site from R-2 to MC-2 was approved by The City.

We the community do not support the permit . We need your help

March 10, 2021

Mount Pleasant Residents Community are speaking -- in opposition to the 2400Block development

Questions:

1. **Will our leaders listen?** (I am talking about Community Leaders as well as Political Leaders).
2. **Do the Mount Pleasant resident's and business views matter?**
3. **Should we (residents, neighbors, & homeowners) have input into the decisions made for our Community? Should it matter?**
4. **Do the residents of Mount Pleasant have a say?**

Quite possibly never has such an **enormous residential personal volunteer mobilization (of residents, socially distancing) taken place within the residents of Mount Pleasant, Calgary.**

In a short 2 days, as of 4a.m. March 10, there are 595 names whom have signed onto the petition, and now additionally there are more names being added daily with the ground canvassers whom have volunteered & have been asked by the community, therefore have proceeded to door to door raising awareness plus petition name gathering.

May I enter this? – many residents expressed their views and thanked us profoundly for helping our community keep out what is not wanted by the residents.

We have been asked personally (along with a large assemble of other residents in Mount Pleasant) by the residents of Mount Pleasant, to go door to door with the petition, and March 9 was our first day out. What did we find? A gigantic majority (we will know the final numbers shortly) are **emphatically opposed**.

Personally, **NONE of our neighbors close by** are in favour of the development for our community. We did encounter a small few (in our assigned area of foot patrol) that would not sign the petition, but far far down in the minority.

In the area we have been asked to canvas, One lady said “I have folks that work for the program, so can I think this over?”. My reply was “for sure think it over, do not sign unless you are sure it is opposition”. When we went to her neighbor’s door, she came out of her door and said “Wait a minute, I think the program has merit, **BUT NOT HERE BESIDE OUR SCHOOLS, POOLS, & PLAYGROUNDS**. Let me sign that right now please, it should not be placed there”, willingly asked to sign the petition.

It’s enough for me to know that the residents of Mount Pleasant overwhelmingly **DO NOT WANT** the 2400Block Development.

CLEARLY THE RESIDENTS OF MOUNT PLEASANT ARE SPEAKING!

Yours truly

Message: Hello, I wanted to pass on feedback that my family and I are supportive of the planned Fresh Start recovery center as it helps provide a much needed service in the

community and in Calgary. We are located in the [REDACTED] block of [REDACTED] Ave so not directly affected by the project but we would also support it if it were our immediate neighbors. I hope the community ends up supporting the development as aiding people on their journey to recovery is a worthy cause. With the MPCA working with Fresh Start on the GNA, we're confident the center would be successful in the community. If there is a mailing list I'd like to receive updates on the process and attend community engagement meetings to express support for the center.

Thank you

Message: Hi there! I had someone knock on my door tonight with a petition against this development to which I declined but realized I should have spoken up as to why. I took to the Mount Pleasant Neighbours Facebook page and have gotten a huge positive response to my thoughts. I was asked by one lady to share it with you here. I have copied and pasted below for your convenience. Thanks for your consideration. A large amount of neighbours are in support of this development and that needs to be known.

Sincerely

Hi neighbours! I have come out of my social media hiatus to say a few things to the guy who knocked on my door asking me to sign a petition against the recovery housing going in on 23rd Ave (as well as the other people opposing this development). Have you guys actually looked into the FreshStart program? It's a great program to help people suffering from addiction. It's not just homeless people who are suffering with addiction. It's working members of society, it's parents with families, it's people with loved ones who want nothing more than recovery and treatment for the trauma they've endured. And yes, it's rooted in trauma folks. There is so much stigma and ignorance that perpetuates fear of the unknown. Treatment is only partially covered by AHS and on average these programs cost the individual over \$3000 out of pocket for treatment, for a total of over \$6000 for a 12 week program. Unfortunately recovery is a rich man's solution. It's not right. FreshStart is a program that helps with longterm recovery and treats this mental health issue. And yes, it's also a mental health issue, not just poor life choices. These are people who are PAYING to get better. It's not a halfway house. I realized after I declined to sign the petition that I should have taken the opportunity to say why I declined and I kicked myself as I watched the guy go house to house. Let me ask you guys...if you found out your partner, brother, sister, uncle etc was suffering in silence with addiction would you not want them to seek help? Addiction is ALREADY in this neighbourhood, I can promise you that but how nice would it be to offer support instead of judgement? I suggest kindly to get educated on the program and recovery process before strongly opposing it because you don't want it in your neighbourhood. As I say, it's already here. I know this as I have friends struggling currently, especially after the year we have had. Mental health needs to be spoken about and understood

not swept under the rug for some other neighbourhood to deal with. Try moving from a place of empathy and compassion not stigma and judgement. Just try it! See what happens!

Hi,

I am writing to voice my disapproval in the 2400block project taking place on 5 St & 23 Ave NW.

When I first heard about this 5 story development it was supposed to be a seniors housing. Now I find out through my neighbors that its intended use is going to be a Fresh Start addictions recovery development, directly beside a new bar?

I do not support allowing a 5 story building in this neighborhood and especially one intended to house recovering alcoholics placed next door to a new bar, a playground and a school in my neighborhood.

Thank you.

Hello,

I hope to speak with you more in this regarding the Fresh Start in Mount Pleasant .

I own my home in Highland Park and my parents own there home in Mount Pleasant and own the office in the community .

1st of all; When police are called to a break in enter , theft , prowler caught on camera on private property , drug addict in garbage room passed out on Fentanyl with a knife, seniors car hood was spray painted , the next door apartment building was spray painted , next door house was caught fire by arson , my vehicle twice had a car break in and 2 others I know of personally , attempting to steel a chariot stroller which resulting in burning of the lock and side panel while trying to steel it , lighting a green lee bin on fire trying to open it and steal the contents in our garage , drug addicts hiding out in the garage with there pants half down , drug dealers living questionable garages that aren't intended for habitation I will say again ; Police do NOT disclose if the person gets caught or where they came from .

These are only a few instances I know of ; imagine the rest of the folks living here .

This has only happened since they built Fresh Start ! (aside from the fire that was arson next door in 2009) . 2009 had a half way style house next door and someone caught it on fire . It burnt to the ground .

I have owned my home here since 2010. I am fully aware of the amazing facility Fresh Start is however it needs to be built in areas that suit it .

Perhaps near hospitals ; Couciling services , police stations etc .

No one can accuse Fresh Start Residence of these items however it brings the wrong folks into the community of Mount Pleasant .

I am a Foster mom for two years now and support rehab completely ; in the proper form ; in the proper setting .

These are my experiences .

Kind regards

To whom it may concern

We are opposed to this development permit based on the following and request that amendments be made accordingly.

The push to get this development started was much too fast and did not adequately canvass affected residents.

Parking and traffic will be a major issue on 23rd Avenue and 5th Street. There are already over 100 vehicles per hour on 23rd Avenue at non peak hours. (I've counted a number of times, pre covid) this number increases dramatically at drop off and pick up times for the Montessori daycare. This daycare routinely walks the children to the park five or six times per day in groups of a dozen or more. St Joseph's School also has groups of elementary aged children walking on 5th Street to the park on a daily basis. Increasing traffic in the area without significant changes will be a disaster waiting to happen.

The design of the parking garages requires drivers to back out into the lane where the children are being marshalled for their walk to the park. The lane off 5th Street is much safer for parking but woefully inadequate as far as spaces go. If underground parking cannot be considered, residents of this building must be restricted from owning vehicles.

Further to traffic, 23rd Avenue should be changed to a one way westbound from the entrance to the MacDonald's parking lot. For the safety of pedestrians and the children, the playground zone should start at MacDonald's as well. Parking on the south side of 23rd Avenue should be 24 hour resident only for those existing houses.

There is currently no crosswalk on 5th Street at 23rd Avenue to safely get pedestrians to the park, ice rink, playground and swimming pool, this should be rectified regardless of the development.

The design of the building itself appears dark and foreboding based on the rendition shown on the billboard on site. It needs to be lighter, brighter and with more colours and greenery on the south and west faces. Murals might be considered.

Lastly a "Good Neighbour" agreement is a must and has to involve residents within a couple of blocks as well as the Mount Pleasant Community Association to address concerns regarding use of this facility. This has to be in place before moving forward with this development.

March 11, 2021

Attention: Dino Kasparis

Re: File # 2021-1041 (permit application for 2400 Block)

I **strongly oppose** the 2400 block project based on the following:

No Community Engagement

The land was rezoned to M-C2 in 2018/2019 using seniors' facility as rationale. There had been ZERO community consultation to announce the project is going to be a Community Continued Recovery Center. The applicant has a "COMING SOON!" sign which misled many residents to believe that all approvals were complete. They secretly put on the Fresh Start sticker on February 26, 2021. I live adjacent to the development site; my neighbors and I did not receive any communication about this development, and we were not able to find anyone in the area who received information (not even a simple flyer). The information was not on the Mount Pleasant Community website either until March 2, 2021. This is very unprofessional and a dishonest process. The limited information does not allow the community to take an informed position.

Lack of Notification

I did not receive the New Development Permit Application letter (Attached) for comments dated on February 24, 2021. It indicated that there were no available documents for download on the City of Calgary website as of March 11, 2021. The development permit was uploaded to the MPCA website on March 6 and I realized that the comments are due by noon on March 16, 2021. The information session won't happen until two days after close of comment. This does not give us enough time and information to comment and points to an extremely flawed process.

According to one of the City of Calgary documents, “Once the development permit has been submitted, a sign (notice posting) will be posted on the development site with information on how to provide feedback as a member of the community.” The site does not have this information as of March 11, 2021. The development permit was submitted on February 19, 2021. The developer and Fresh Start did not make an effort to inform our community.

Lack of Consideration for the Surrounding Area

I have concerns about the building itself as the height is not consistent within the neighborhood context. It is too large for the site and is a poor fit with any consideration given to adjacent properties. There are no 5-story buildings in Mount Pleasant except on 16th Ave which is a major road. According to the previous document I received from the City of Calgary PL1263 (R2017-09), “the maximum height is 16m, which is lowered to 11m, when adjacent to M-CG or a low-density residential district.” The plan is 16m and the row house currently is M-CG. The row houses have a planned solar project which along with a planned daycare play area will be severely shaded by this 50-foot building. It is unacceptable and unreasonable that these important impacts are ignored.

Parking

When I compare the Affordable housing that the city is developing on 2020 6 Street NW with the 2400 Block project, the affordable housing on the 20th Ave has 16 units and with 16 resident stalls and 3 visitor stalls. It is located on a busier area and is another data point that indicates 30 units and 50 feet tall is too large on 5th street 23rd Avenue as it is not a main road. If the Affordable housing on the 20th Ave is offering 1.0 vehicle parking stall per dwelling unit for residents, the 2400 block should do the same since they are both affordable housing. Also, loading stalls are required for multi-residential building has more than 20 dwelling units.

What I am Demanding

Using the Affordable housing project as a minimum standard. I would like to see proper engagement like what City of Calgary <https://engage.calgary.ca/mountpleasant> has done for the affordable housing project on the 20th Ave. This project had three engagement sessions before the construction start. Parking report, Shadow study, impact to the adjacent residents, business and infrastructure should have been done before the developer applied for the development permit. This project should be immediately stopped and resized based on appropriate studies (shading, community impact, traffic pre-pandemic, business impact, etc.) and community engagement.

Let me know if you require further information.

Thank you

Hello,

I am writing to you all to voice my concerns about a 30 unit development called the "2400 Block" on 5 St and 23 Ave NW.

My husband and I live in Mount Pleasant just a few blocks up the street from the development.

I received a flyer stating that this development is intended for addiction recovery housing. However, the project's website (www.2400block.ca), which is not very transparent by the way, states that the development is intended for affordable housing.

While we support an affordable housing project, we do not support continued recovery housing in our community.

Please feel free to email me additional information or to further discuss our position.

Bests

Myself and over 1000 others signed the following petition opposing application DP2021-1041 found on change.org:

Petition against the Development Permit application at

534 23 Avenue NW (DP2021-1041)

Mount Pleasant started this petition to Dino Kasparis (Planner, City of Calgary)

This petition is to request that The City of Calgary, Planning and Development,

deny the application for the Development Permit Application DP2021-1041 (534 -

23 Avenue NW, Calgary, AB) (the "Development Permit") based on the following objections.

We/I, the undersigned, strongly object to the Development Permit for any one or all of the following reasons:

1. The Development Permit application was not advertised on location by The City of Calgary nor have the applicants (Bhomac, Baboushkin Design Group and Mike MacDonald) (the "Applicants") engaged with the residents and local businesses, resulting in failure to notify residents and concerned citizens in the manner as prescribed under the Development Permit process.
2. The Applicant's proposal for parking for the 5-storey Multi-Residential Development (one building) is 17 stalls for a building of 30 units, housing up to 80 residents, as well as any required staff parking. This parking proposal falls far short of the requirements as set out in Part 6, Division 1 section 558(1) for multi-residential buildings. This lack of parking will overflow onto neighbouring streets and will negatively impact the surrounding residents and businesses.
3. The height of the proposed Multi-Residential Development is 5-storeys which is which is far greater in height than other buildings in the community. In fact, the Multi-Residential Development is 3-storeys higher than adjacent residences and 2-storeys higher than nearby businesses. The size of the building is out of scale and is a distinct departure from the character of the community and will decrease the community feel.
4. The 5-storey Multi-Residential Development will: (i) increase traffic, noise and cause significant shading on adjacent properties; (ii) decrease privacy; (iii) change the neighbourhood demographics; and (iv) cause property depreciation.
5. Despite significant opposition from the community of Mount Pleasant, the rezoning of

the development site from R-2 to MC-2 was approved by The City.

Please note that residents of Mount Pleasant with no affiliation to our community association organized, created a website, crafted a petition, and knocked on roughly half of the doors in the community in a mere 7 days. While absolute numbers were higher, we have a high rate of confidence in approximately 1150 petition signatures. Furthermore, we believe we could have had many more signatures if time and resources had allowed. Needless to say, there is very strong opposition to this project.

Below are my additional concerns, comments, and thoughts that were not addressed or fully captured in the petition wording.

The City of Calgary has been treating residents of established communities unfairly. The existing zoning (R-2 in most of Mount Pleasant) largely needs to be honoured. Specifics around re-development and particularly density matter – both in location and size. Mount Pleasant deserves the same logical master planning that Currie Barracks or Tuscany received. Like housing must be grouped with like housing to avoid surprise, stress, anxiety, and conflict. For example, apartment style condos with apartment style condos, row townhouses with row townhouses, duplexes with duplexes, starter homes with starter homes, and estate homes with estate homes. I understand doing this in an established neighborhood is slower, but it is still the only way to proceed.

The inner city of Calgary has seen quite possibly the highest rate of re-development of any major North American city in recent decades. As a result, our inner city remains liveable, with relatively low crime rates. This has been achieved to date largely by honouring the historical zoning in place, and that's not a coincidence. After letting a bunch of us invest into our homes

in the inner city, it is now too late for you to change the rules. You owe us a stable, and fair framework for re-development. We are a big part of why our neighborhoods are desirable, we are residents who use very little infrastructure, yet pay higher taxes due to the tax assessment system. I lose sleep over unwanted changes to my neighborhood, but people living in suburbia don't. How is that fair? How does this encourage people to stay in the inner-city let alone move here?

Furthermore, our communities have very limited amenities and those we have are old. Things like schools, pools, and arenas were built for the density of the community 50-100 years ago. We need these facilities expanded as our neighborhood is already 50% re-developed, and our population is growing as a result.

Social housing, when required, needs to be dispersed evenly and fairly throughout the City. No one community should have a disproportionate amount. Proposed locations for new social housing should consider the location of existing social housing, and doing so may require more analysis than looking simply at neighborhood boundaries. If a neighborhood has been receptive to this type of housing in the past, this should not be perceived as an opportunity to site even more in the same neighborhood.

Finally, the Guidebook for Great Communities (GGC) and the North Hill Plan (NHP) are terrible for established neighborhoods like mine. I've provided feedback on these and I get dismissed. Both are designed to advance your agenda of density at all cost, anywhere and everywhere.

Your communication (for something specific like DP2021-1041 or the GGC and NHP) is so weak

I have to wonder if it's not intentional. Perhaps if less people know you will soon blanket the entire city with a minimum R-8 zoning, the more likely you are to succeed. Not enough

dialogue has occurred for the GGC and NHP to be approved as is at this time. The changes you are proposing will not affect anyone in a new suburban neighborhood in their lifetime, but given the age of structures in my neighborhood it affects me now.

The Mount Pleasant Community Association (MPCA) spoke on behalf of Mount Pleasant residents to the applicants of this project despite not knowing what we thought. On this project, the MPCA should have held a meeting for residents, started a survey, or taken a vote but they did not. The MPCA had knowledge of this proposed project months before they shared any information with residents. This “too little, too late” approach left residents alarmed, with a lack of information, no confidence in the MPCA, and scrambling to respond within tight comment period deadlines. We expect the MPCA to make us aware of contentious development applications such as this, ask the entire community how we feel, and then side with the majority. Now that the MPCA has been provided quantifiable survey results and numerous letters regarding DP2021-1041, I expect the MPCA to formally shift from neutral to opposed on this project. Only after hearing from your member residents can you speak on our behalf. If the MPCA does not do this, it does a disservice to its members. I hope recent events make it obvious that changes are needed within the MPCA regarding communication, engagement, and personnel. Going forward, better vetting of volunteers in key positions is needed to ensure appropriate qualifications and conflicts of interest are avoided. As a default, the MPCA needs to oppose all projects unless good faith consultation with the community is begun quickly and thoroughly.

The applicants (Bhomac, Baboushkin, [REDACTED]) appear to be some combination of builder, designer, and landowner but they never had an open house to introduce themselves.

The promise of seniors housing to get the MPCA to support (or at least not oppose) your successful land use amendment to M-C2 in 2019 was shady. To then switch to “community continued-recovery housing” later was not cool. Your proposed design simply did not fit with our community. It was unloved because you tried to build the biggest thing ever, in an unsuitable location. Your lack of consultation with the community at large, makes me wonder if you were trying to take advantage of low awareness, and simply run out the clock. You showed us no courtesy or respect, lost any and all trust, and were very unprofessional. I hope you guys exit Mount Pleasant for good, and conduct yourselves differently in the future elsewhere.

Fresh Start, the proposed “community continued-recovery center” facility operator also needs mention. We’ll never know when you started coordinating with Bhomac, Baboushkin, and [REDACTED] so it would be unfair to associate you with a possible deceive, lay low, and run out the clock playbook. However, your organization needs to choose its partners carefully as it will be judged on the company you keep. You also failed miserably on educating, communicating, listening, and so on. Scheduling your first open house for two days after the DP comment period was to close was inexcusable. I can’t fathom how you let that happen given you must always encounter some resistance with your proposals. Control your narrative or someone else will do it for you. Doing so early and openly may not win you everyone’s support but it will tilt the odds in your favour, and is much better than blowing up in your face at the 11 th hour.

Municipal, Provincial, and Federal governments need to be fiscally responsible with taxpayer dollars. Projects like this apply and receive grant funding from various government departments. Land costs vary depending on location, and new construction is very expensive.

As a taxpayer I expect you to stretch our dollars by doing more with less money, or doing more

with the same money. With that in mind, I am puzzled why this project was proposed on expensive land and required new construction. There are cheaper parcels of land elsewhere, or larger parcels for the same price. Likewise, there are many existing buildings for sale that are selling below replacement value. I would think an existing building could be re-purposed cheaper than building a new one. All government departments considering application for grant funding should ensure that only the lowest cost solutions are granted funding. Further to that, a scoring system should be in place so that only the most reputable organizations are trusted with public funds. The goal here is to help people in need, not make developers a bunch of money.

Please be advised that I have serious concerns about the aforesaid Development Permit. Many of us in Mount Pleasant have received word that Fresh Start Recovery is “abandoning” its plan for a Recovery Centre in our neighbourhood, however we are still very concerned about the proposed development. From my own personal perspective (as well as those to whom I have spoken), there are many issues which surround the developer’s plans. These questions extend beyond the tenant(s) who will occupy the building.

1. The height and massing of the building. My understanding is that the proposed plans call for a four - five story building. This would be far higher than any existing structure in Mount Pleasant (and all of its adjoining neighbourhoods).

Not only would this affect the community’s character, it would have a hugely detrimental effect on the areas immediately surrounding the site. It was a

significant exception (at the time), to agree to three story developments in the neighbourhood. Now developers want to push for five story structures. This noteworthy and excessive height variance would set a dangerous precedent going forward. Three story structures are already too high for this residential area - five stories would be an abomination. One gentleman noted that he will never have sunlight in his backyard again if the project proceeds as proposed.

2. Residential density. The current construction site is within a three block radius of two schools; a daycare facility; a vibrant outdoor pool; a playground; the community centre and a well used ice arena. If, as I understand, the proposal is for 30 units – all of which are capable of housing families, the density is very much a concern. With the inadequate building parking plan, how will the adjoining streets accommodate additional vehicles? Will traffic safety rules be amended as a result? There has been no information provided to us in that regard.

3. Community consultation (or lack thereof). Many residents in Mount Pleasant were taken aback at the lack of information provided to us about the project. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to form an informed opinion. A brief consultation or meeting with our Community Association is not akin to consultation with the community, itself. There are many questions which need to be answered by Bhomac and Baboushkin Design Group. It has been very difficult to obtain any data. This has led to residents attempting to make numerous inquiries with multiple organizations in a very short period of time. If the City intends to approve a multi-dwelling unit of this magnitude, the process must be

open, easy to follow and allow for adequate time for information roll out and effective consultation. Regrettably, I do not believe that this has occurred in this particular instance.

Accordingly, regardless of Fresh Start's involvement or not, concerns still remain about the project, and I would strongly oppose the approval of any development until further consultation has occurred.

Letter of March 12, 2021

Mount Pleasant Resident Community has/& is speaking -- in opposition to the 2400Block development

Sent to:

themayor@calgary.ca; calgary.mountainview@assembly.ab.ca,
calgary.beddington@assembly.ab.ca, planninghelp@calgary.ca,
planning@mpca.ca, dino.Kasparis@calgary.ca,
mpconcerns@gmail.com, Calgary.Klein@assembly.ab.ca,
2400blockmpc@gmail.com, PRESIDENT@mpca.ca,
druh.farrell@calgary.ca, pastpresident@mpca.ca

Are we blind to the fact that we have 3 elementary educational schools within a block, a community pool, and kiddie playground kiddie corner across the street?

Did we buy here (for many, their home is the most expensive asset they own) to have our landscape and community invaded?

This gigantic expression of Community cannot be overlooked:

Clearly the leaders and folks in trusted positions within the Mt. Pleasant Community of residents, **cannot ignore** the **volunteered outpouring of opposition (when the citizens banded together and mobilized 5 days ago March 7 at the outside meeting)** soon presenting various submitted articles presented to planners etc. within the City of Calgary in opposition to 2400Block Development namely: Development Permit DP 2021-1041, Address: 534-23 Avenue NW, Calgary, AB (23 Ave & 5 St. NW Calgary, Alberta)

I as well am overwhelmed at the outpouring of support for our neighbors & friends in the Community of Mount Pleasant, in opposition to the 2400Block Development.

There are well over **1000 (and growing)** names on one petition and another large number of paper petition names the “ground canvassers” are working on .

Like one resident voiced at the March 7 gathering outside – the overflow parking will try to fill the Mount Pleasant Community Hall Parking Lot across the street.

With the huge vacancy of properties in Calgary, there does not need to be another facility built. Use the existing & they could be ready shortly.

“Any dead fish can float with the stream. It takes a live fish to fight against the stream”. Thanku Citizens of Mount Pleasant for

speaking; you have proved personally and collectively, you are the “Alive Fish” for future as well.

Is the safety of our well being at stake.?

Questions residents have voiced (but not limited to these):

1. The residents of Mount Pleasant have spoken.
2. Do the names on the petitions count?
3. Does my view count?
4. Why would you want to rehabilitate someone in an locale where they could most likely never afford to buy a house in that area?
5. Why didn't I buy a house by a hospital?
 - a. If I wanted to live by a hospital I would've bought a house by a hospital.
6. Why is the cancer hospital near to the main hospital?
7. A hospital is necessary. Maybe Fresh Start is too? But they should be located together, nearby one another, not here.
8. I have a concern with transient population. Move ins and move outs continually (Read of resident views in the USA)
9. I did not buy my house beside an Addiction Recovery Centre for specific reasons.
10. The reason we bought here is because of the quietness and because of the saving grace from areas like you are presenting.
11. How do our 1000+residents and neighbors fight for themselves?

12. Who speaks for ones that won't speak for themselves... our local residents those that don't use email or internet (there are many in Mt. Pleasant)?

13. I am speaking for the residents of Mt. Pleasant where we own our home and business.

14. Fads & bandwagons come and go....

15. Fresh Start works on addiction rehabilitation.

16. Why would you want to rehabilitate someone in an locale where they could most likely never afford to buy a house in that area?

Dino,

Please find below our letter of concern for the project located at the corner of 23 Avenue and 5 Street NW. As an affected party, we are writing to you to express our concerns about the project and seek clarification on a number of matters pertaining to the file.

While we understand council previously approved the rezoning for the parcel, this was done without the broad support of the community. During the application the applicant also made explicit that the project was to be a senior residence, a use that garnered some support in the community with the hope this facility would permit some of our aging residents to stay in Mount Pleasant.

While we are also aware that situations change and market conditions fluctuate, the current application makes no mention of seniors housing but until today, was proposing an entirely different use for the project. It is our feeling that city council approved the rezoning based in part on the assertion from the applicant that the building would be for seniors. A derivation from this commitment should necessitate a reevaluation of the approved zoning with the appropriate public engagement necessary.

Further to the point of use and while we understand the applicant has as of today communicated that the project will not be a post addiction treatment centre, there are design elements within the project that clearly are intended to support this use. In the interest of transparency and good neighbors we would ask that any revised submissions be shared with us in order to confirm that those purpose-built treatment design elements have been removed from the design.

Failure on the part of the applicant to make logical and complete design revisions would suggest the intent on the part of the applicant to seek an approval for a Development Permit under the auspicious of multi-family, only to subsequently apply for a change of use permitting an alternate program for the project. We would ask that the approving authority also seek such assurances that the permit is being applied for with clear and transparent intentions and further, we ask the approving authority to provide terms and conditions within any approved application for the site that would require any change of use to the project within a set timeframe to be subject to a full new Development Permit application process.

As a point of clarification, can you please provide confirmation on the process for approval of use related to a post treatment addiction centre. As per the MC-2 zoning, an addiction treatment centre is listed as a discretionary use with conditions as noted in section 139. However, we are unclear on how the approving authority would categorize a post treatment addiction centre, and as such, would appreciate your input on this.

As it pertains to the design as submitted we have the following comments. Please note we have provided the items below in hopes of the application taking further strides to provide the highest quality project for the community.

Courtyard, while facing south, misses an opportunity to face the community park thus providing urban and visual connections between the building and its residents to the park. A building of this scale and density offers a valuable opportunity to provide more 'eyes on the street' that would enhance to safety of the park.

The courtyard itself would appear to be inhospitable. The first courtyard area is restricted in width, depressed from the public realm and behind a full height metal security fence. The fence ensures no connection between the courtyard and community, providing a hostile and standoffish street interface.

The depressed courtyard further reduces its ability to gain sunlight and thus to support soft landscaping. It is again reduced in its function with the addition of window wells along the perimeter and provides significant privacy and oversight concerns by having bedroom windows adjacent to the public space, ensuring a conflicting overlap of private and public spaces.

Inner courtyard, though drawn with pergola and seating areas, is also overseen with a number of unit bedrooms and of a scale and orientation that will provide a cold dark space unlikely to be enjoyed by the building residents.

Given the building proposes a full basement, it would appear that the owner is comfortable with the cost of providing this space. As such, it would also appear a better use of space to relocate the limited parking to the basement, thus reducing the number of vehicle access and egress doors onto the lane from 7 garage doors to 1. This would also seem to provide the opportunity to relocate areas such of the activity room to the main floor in areas previously utilized by garages, thus providing both light and exterior connection to these areas.

The project does appear to provide a variety of units types and scale, however we note that there is nothing identified for accessibility within any of the units. We would ask that the applicant include provision for accessible units, especially given the apparent loss of the seniors housing use.

The project presents an institutional character overall, imposing and cold, standing in stark contrast with the overall street context. Elevations are static and do not provide a variety of materials or windows size and alignment needed to enhance the projects integration with the community. Material choices for the elevations are monolithic and serve to enhance the scale of the project, rather than make efforts to provide material and massing choices to break up the scale of the project. Given this will be the largest building within the entire Mount Pleasant community and it sits adjacent to single family two story houses, breaking up the visual mass of the building is an important contextual aspect.

The project proposes seventeen parking stalls, nearly half required by the MC-2 bylaw. This shortcoming is exacerbated by two handicap stalls that do not appear to meet standards and one stall with stairwell access impeding manoeuvrability. While the project is close to Fourth Street, the public transit service does not appear to meet the service level that would justify the order of magnitude relaxation being proposed and as such significant TDM measures would appear required. As such, we have concerns about the transportation support being proposed for the project's residents.

Given the above comments, at this time we are unable to support the application and look forward to further communication with the affected parties on how these items have been addressed.

Thank you.
