



February 25, 2019

Crescent Heights Community Association  
1101 - 2nd Street NW  
Calgary, Alberta  
T2M 1V7

**Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD)**  
reference item # PUD2020-0164

Re: North Hill Communities – Local Area Plan – Final Proposed Plan

We respectfully include our previous letter stating our concerns with the Local Area Plan (LAP) draft from January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020 to this submission. The majority of our concerns included in the January 30<sup>th</sup> letter have still not been addressed to our satisfaction in the Final Proposed Plan and we will not support the Plan until these items are addressed or responded to in some detailed fashion.

Our first concern listed was with timelines and the unsustainable pressure on our volunteer base to respond to items in such a speedy manner. The first viewing of the final plan was on February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020 to us as members of the Working Group. Our independent review and this corresponding letter to PUD needed to be submitted a mere one week and one day later. This is untenable, particularly as we are also grappling with the revised alignment of the Greenline. More importantly, the general public will have only had the ability to see the Plan from February the 24<sup>th</sup> to the 25<sup>th</sup>, and submit letters to PUD on the 26<sup>th</sup>. We understand that the community and its residents will be able to attend the Public Hearing scheduled for April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020, but even this leaves us little time to get important information out to the community and parallels the Greenline engagement and response times. We strenuously object to the time lines that we have been presented with and feel that this impedes our ability to achieve meaningful feedback and the ability to work together to achieve a desired result.

Due to these same time constraints, we have been unable to do an in depth review of the changes to either the Guidebook or the Local Area Plan. As per our letter of January 30<sup>th</sup> (and further detailed there) we wish to underline the following main areas:

**1. Timelines**

Unattainable and unsupportable by a volunteer organization.

The revised alignment of Greenline and subsequent decisions and impacts that will be coming in the future further influences this Plan and are not adequately addressed and create a number of unknown influences that may impact our communities structure and composition. We believe that until this is better known, this Plan adoption must be delayed.

**2. Local Area Plan Contents**

We have been unable to undergo a thorough review of the changes to the Guidelines as they pertain to Section 2.32. We find it concerning that changes were made to the Guidebook to reflect the Local Area Plan rather than the Local Area Plan adhering to the original direction. These last minute changes to bring both documents into alignment seem hasty and potentially ill considered when communities such as ours do not have adequate time to respond.

We continue to ask for the identification and recognition of individual community characteristics and the inclusion of community specific policies. Target, or existing, populations are not addressed in the Plan whatsoever and we can not comprehend the projected population for our community and how population changes would be handled in triggering plan changes or achieving goals. Furthermore, the potential impact of Greenline on subsequent traffic patterns is not in any way addressed in this Plan. How can such a major infrastructure change not be incorporated into our Local Area Plan?

### **3. Characteristics/Urban Form**

The LAP now contains a section on Heritage areas (Section 2.13) which partly addresses our concerns and desire for a recognition of an alternate urban forms category. This is, in reality, merely an objective, and there is no guarantee that this will become a statutory policy. We further believe that this should be located in the Guidebook, so that all future communities can benefit should it become policy. We continue to have concerns over this aspect of the Plan and the lack of certainty it brings to our community.

### **4. Tree Canopy/Open space**

We have now formally requested firmer and more meaningful policies under these areas twice, and it continues to remain unaddressed in the Final Local Plan.

In our previous feedback we made the following requests:

- Include firm policy wording on the protection of the tree canopy. Introduce enforceable legislation that supports this. Develop meaningful penalties if not followed;
- Detail how to “support and expand” the tree canopy in an ever-denser urban form;
- Introduce meaningful and actionable policy and plans to protect, enhance and expand our open spaces.

We do not see any real commitment in this plan to have our amenities, including parks, open space and tree canopies, maintained, improved, and considered in light of the anticipated increased density.

For the reasons listed above and those in our letter from January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020 (below), the Crescent Heights Community Association does not support the North Hill Communities – Local Area Plan – Final Proposed Plan as submitted. We would like the opportunity to continue to work with the planning group to resolve our issues and find solutions in a reasonable time frame, with considerations for the other planning related issues that our community is currently addressing. It is in the best interests of all involved that this Plan be the best it can be.

We are hopeful that this groundbreaking multi-community plan can be achieved to our mutual satisfaction. We are eager for the plan to be a successful project for future communities to aspire to and hope that Council and the City will consider our concerns.

Sincerely,

By email only

Simonetta Acteson, Director of Parks,

North Hill Communities Working Group, CHCA Representative

On behalf of the Crescent Heights Community Association

cc. Troy Gonzalez, RPP, MCIP, Senior Planner | Community Planning, The City of Calgary

Dale Calkins, Senior Policy & Planning Advisor, Ward 7



January 30, 2019

Crescent Heights Community Association  
1101 - 2nd Street NW  
Calgary, Alberta  
T2M 1V7

Attention: Troy Gonzalez, RPP, MCIP  
Senior Planner | Community Planning  
Planning & Development  
The City of Calgary

Dear Troy,

Re: North Hill Communities – Local Area Plan – Revised Draft

The Crescent Heights Community Association (CHCA) appreciates this opportunity to give the planning group our second round of feedback on the draft North Hill Communities Local Area Plan (the Plan). For the purposes of transparency with the group of communities participating in the Local Area Plan, we will be sharing this response with representatives from the other community associations.

We begin by saying that there are a number of elements in the Plan which we support and feel respect the needs of our community. These include the objectives and goals around Main Streets as well as policies and objectives that identify supporting design improvements, connections and beautification, to mention a few.

We also understand and appreciate that this is a huge undertaking for the City, and that we are the first group of communities to be put through this process. Because we are the test case, we feel it is even more important that the City take the time and care necessary before adopting plans that have not been fully tested on how they will be used by both the City and the communities they serve.

We continue to have concerns with the content, or in some cases, lack of content, as well as additional aspects of the Plan. Most especially we consider the timing of this Plan to be out of sync with the tools that we are told will be coming. It is almost impossible to truly gauge how this Plan, and the associated Guidebook for Great Communities will work without all the pieces in place. We refer most specifically to heritage tools and low density residential provisions that we are advised are to be added or changed. Until those items are fleshed out, we do not support the ratification of the Plan in its current form.

The exercises you had us participate in during the last session, using the Guidebook and the Plan to evaluate a proposed development, brought home what a large leap this will be for the many dedicated volunteers we have, and how it will necessitate even more of their valuable time to fully grasp applying either of these documents. This is concerning and we hope that the City will include training for volunteers as part of the Plan adoption process.

We have organized our feedback into four main categories: timelines; contents; characteristics/urban form; and tree canopy/open space.

## 1. Timelines

As City employees, it is your job to complete work on the plan in a timely manner. As volunteers with multiple other responsibilities and using our “spare” time, we are struggling to find the time to reasonably review and respond to drafts. We respectfully request that review and response times be extended to six weeks or more so that we can properly advise our CA, and allow for adequate time to receive, assimilate and return feedback. This would allow for at least one CA Board meeting circuit between workshops and revision needs.

For example, the most recent draft was submitted to us on December 20<sup>th</sup>. The next working group session was scheduled for January 15<sup>th</sup>. We typically do not do volunteer work over the holidays, so this effectively gave us less than two weeks to review the draft, determine if any changes made reflected our previous feedback and report to the board at our meeting on January 14<sup>th</sup>. Reports to the board on the January 15 session was sent by email. This was followed by meeting with stakeholders to gauge the need for, and nature of, our response. We were asked to provide feedback ASAP. Our board does not meet again until February 11<sup>th</sup>. Wading through multiple responses and suggestions takes time and we want to reflect as large of a segment of our community’s wishes as thoroughly as possible. This is all completed using volunteer time. We hope you can appreciate the need for additional time in assessing and responding to a plan that will significantly change the way our community is envisioned in the future.

## 2. Local Area Plan Contents

In the Guidebook for Great Communities, under Section 2.32, we are provided with direction for what should be included in a Local Area Plan. We see gaps in this direction and the draft Local Area Plan. Below we copy and reference from pages 86-87 of the guidebook (in italics). Most specifically we see the following (our comments are contained in parentheses where applicable):

### *Chapter 1: Visualizing Growth*

#### *a. Identification of attributes:*

- i. Community demographics and trends* (not included either by individual community or by total)
- iii. ecological assets* (park spaces are shown but there is no descriptors or definitions – i.e., school, playing fields, natural area, playground, etc.)
- iv. Heritage or Cultural assets* (no identifications associated with Map 2)
- vii. recreation and community facilities* (not identified, nor their current or potential capacities)
- viii. special view corridors* (not identified)
- x. mobility infrastructure* (roads are shown, no alleys, no pathways or bike routes)

#### *b. The plan should support:*

- iv. protection and enhancement of natural areas and ecological functions* (we do not feel that the Plan has addressed this in any meaningful way)
- v. recreation, civic, arts and cultural opportunities* (not identified therefore not supported)
- vi. architectural, urban and natural features that contribute to a feeling of local identity and sense of place* (since these are not identified in the Plan, the Plan does not support these)

### *Chapter 2: Enabling Growth*

- e. A local area plan shall contain strategies for achieving the vision of the plan, including, but not limited to, community-specific policies for urban form categories, mobility, or amenities that supplement those contained within the Guidebook as necessary* (we do not see any community-specific policies – the Appendix contains some community-specific targets, but is not statutory)
- f. Existing or new landmark sites or gateway sites and key view corridors should be identified, if applicable, and community-specific policy should be included to guide future development in these areas.* (we do not see any identification or community-specific policies)

*j. Local Area Plans are encouraged to conduct water and sanitary analyses to understand the impact of projected growth on the utility network. (a clause or requirement for this analysis has not been included in the Plan).*

#### *Chapter 3: Supporting Growth*

We do not see agreement between the Plan and the direction intended in the guidebook for this chapter. Policies for current and future amenities and infrastructure and strategies for their funding are not included in the Plan. Implementation actions have been identified in an Appendix, but strategies for funding are not identified. In addition, there is no identification of a priority of investments, identification of roles, identification of what tools (planning or financial) can be used, or the the identification of a complete community through the creation of an “Asset Map and List”.

These items are listed in the direction provided and are copied below:

*k. Local area plans should:*

- i. identify the elements of a complete community (as referenced in the Municipal Development Plan) over a time horizon of growth and change in the plan area, through the creation of an “Asset Map and List” reflective of continual growth and change as described in Chapter 4 of the Guidebook;*
- ii. provide guidance to The City for future service plan and budget considerations and recommendations;*
- iii. identify the priority of investments for the community, taking into account the current status of the infrastructure and amenities and the plan for future growth and change;*
- iv. acknowledge that the timing of investment may be guided by external factors including service and activity levels, priorities identified in the plan, and the state of existing assets;*
- v. identify the roles for different city builders in supporting implementation (the City, developers, residents and businesses);*
- vi. identify and recognize the range of planning and financial tools that could support implementation; and,*
- vii. be reviewed at a regular frequency as investment and actions are made towards plan goals.*

We also call attention to the following from the Municipal Development Plan:

***“2.3.2 Respecting and enhancing neighbourhood character***

***Objective*** *Respect and enhance neighbourhood character and vitality*

***Policies***

*d. Ensure that the preparation of Local Area Plans includes community engagement early in the decision making process that identifies and addresses local character, community needs and appropriate development transitions with existing neighbourhoods.”*

In our opinion the Local Area Plan does not meet this Objective or Policy. Our Community was engaged, but in our opinion the engagement process was steered entirely to accommodate growth and did not provide an opportunity to identify our local character, or community needs. Appropriate transitions were discussed.

We want to see, as outlined above in the guidebook direction, considerably more community specific details, and the application of community specific policies.

### **3. Characteristics/Urban Form**

For the purposes of our feedback we have grouped these items together. As pointed out above, there has been no effort in the Plan to identify individual community characteristics or assets, or to address the possible need for the recognition of alternate urban forms categories due to a desire to maintain certain characteristics. In our opinion

this is a major failing of the Plan. The process for overlaying new urban form over an existing urban form should include recognition of forms or places where a community wants to see effort to maintain its current state. If identified during the working session process, this has not been transferred to the Plan.

Our existing Crescent Heights Area Redevelopment Plan identifies several Goals, Objectives and Guidelines. Objectives such as:

- *Ensure new development is as sensitive as possible to the neighbouring housing.*
- *Recognize and attempt to preserve the historic character of the community.*
- *The character of the existing low density residential areas should be maintained while appropriate new development is encouraged.*

Clearly these objectives collide with the direction of the Plan. We believe that community residents do not fully understand how the policies in the Plan substantively change these prior directions. Certain areas in our community deserve to have the spirit of these objectives protected and maintained. These areas reflect elements of our community character in architectural style and history of place. They provide perspective and grounding. As a community we are told that policy in the form of heritage tools will be forthcoming, but these can't be guaranteed and the details of how, what, or where these tools are to be applied are not yet available. In our opinion these tools need to be in place and where they would be applied needs to be shown in the plan before it may be ratified.

As a community, Crescent Heights has accommodated growth and welcomed increased density on a consistent basis. According to the City census (2016) 62% of our dwellings are in the form apartments, 8% in semi-detached, and only 27% of our community is in the form of single detached. A certain number of those 885 single detached homes are also newer infill development of various ages. As comparison, Rosedale has 81% of its population in single detached dwellings, 7% in semi-detached and 8% in apartment form. Renfrew to our east has 31% in single detached, 25% in semi-detached and 32% in apartment form. We already provide a significant quantity of denser urban form. We can accommodate more density, there is opportunity to further densify in various parts of our community in land use districts that already provide for additional density. We want tools that allow us to identify and direct densification in particular areas, and tools to encourage maintaining scale, detailing, and massing that helps our community retain a significant expression of its character.

In our letter dated December 12<sup>th</sup> recommended the following: Create another urban form category that reflects the existing historic scale and density and work with communities to define where, or if at all, this category could be maintained. We stand by that request and ask again that it be included. A mere promise that it may be coming is not sufficient.

Much of this desire is tied to our identification of our tree canopy as being one of our most important and valuable assets.

#### **4. Tree Canopy/Open space**

In our previous feedback we made the following requests:

- Include firm policy wording on the protection of the tree canopy. Introduce enforceable legislation that supports this. Develop meaningful penalties if not followed;
- Detail how to "support and expand" the tree canopy in an ever-denser urban form;
- Introduce meaningful and actionable policy and plans to protect, enhance and expand our open spaces.

In Section 3.1 of the Local Area Plan, there are four goals listed. The fourth goal is “Greening the City” which is described as “*Conserving, protecting, and restoring the natural environment...*”. In section 3.2 , objective 15 is: “*Support and expand the tree canopy throughout the plan area.*”

In our opinion the Plan falls short on fulfilling this goal or objective and does not offer enough either in it’s content, policies or tools to accomplish this.

We believe that there is, or should be, universal agreement that tree canopy and open space are some of the greatest contributors to a city. These elements offer ecological refuge, sound deflection, shade, refuge, experiences of joy, social and emotional benefits, and aid in the overall wellness of both the natural environment and the people who live there.

We also believe that with a denser urban form it is virtually impossible not to lose significant trees and vegetation. When a small bungalow on a 50-foot lot is removed and replaced with a four-unit development, it is unlikely that any mature vegetation on that parcel will be retained. Replacement requirements can in no way replace the mature trees and bushes that originally populated that space. We encourage the City to continue its efforts towards resolving this, perhaps by initiating “price per tree” fee that requires developers to have trees inventoried before removal, a price allocated and paid, and a fund created that is used specifically to replace the tree in the general vicinity or contribute to a reciprocal green effort in the community. We would like to see specific policy in the Plan that addresses this.

It is also even more important that in these circumstances the City make every effort to retain, or where applicable, begin replacement ahead of perceived life cycle expectations in City owned lands. The wording in Section 2.1, policy 4 (copied below) remains “should” versus “shall” which of course have very different meanings.

*Existing mature vegetation **should** be retained in City boulevards, in particular heritage boulevards identified on the City’s Inventory of Evaluated Heritage Resources, as well as in private landscaped areas along streets to maintain a consistent streetscape, help manage stormwater, and retain tree coverage along streets.*

We strongly ask that this policy be reworded and that the policy read:

*Existing mature vegetation **shall** be retained in City boulevards, in particular heritage boulevards identified on the City’s Inventory of Evaluated Heritage Resources, to maintain a consistent streetscape, help manage stormwater, and retain tree coverage along streets.*

Linking back to our #3: Characteristics/Urban Form, we believe that by identifying and providing tools that can maintain existing scale, detailing, and massing in specific areas in our community also means that areas with the original housing form will retain some of the private tree canopy that currently exists in many places in our neighbourhood. No one can prevent an individual owner from chopping down trees, but community-driven incentives can help increase awareness of the importance of them to our community experience.

Policy 4 above could be further developed into a companion policy to support this:

*Existing mature vegetation should be retained in private landscaped areas, in particular along streets, to maintain a consistent streetscape, help manage stormwater, and retain tree coverage along streets.*

Lastly, there is very little included in the Local Area Plan that specifically addresses how our parks and amenities will survive and flourish as a significantly larger population accesses these resources.

Under 3.2, item 4 the objective states:

*4. Improve safety and comfort in existing parks and, where feasible, support a broader range of complementary uses that cater to diverse groups of users.*

This objective only addresses “safety and comfort” and further supports increased use and uses. We ask again that the Plan ensures (or at minimum has an objective or policy) that increased use will be matched with increased maintenance and protection and, even more relevant, the creation of new green and open spaces when achievable. How this would be evaluated, and what resources might be available are other strategies we would want to see included.

We thank you for the opportunity to give you our feedback as a board. We hope that you will find our comments and suggestions of benefit to this process. We may want to submit additional feedback at a future date. It is, again, our sincere hope that the Plan can undergo significant changes that will reflect our concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

By email only

Simonetta Acteson, Director of Parks,

North Hill Communities Working Group, CHCA Representative

and

Kirstin Blair, President

On behalf of the Crescent Heights Community Association

cc. Dale Calkins, Senior Policy & Planning Advisor, Ward 7

Renfrew Community Association

Rosedale Community Association

Capital Hill Community Association

Highland Park Community Association

Mount Pleasant Community Association

Tuxedo Community Association

Winston Heights/Mountview Community Association

Thorncliff Greenview Community Association



**From:** [Barbaatar, Davaa](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] Public's Submission for North Hill Local Area Plan  
**Date:** Monday, February 24, 2020 8:15:28 AM

---

**From:** Heather Macdonald [mailto:macdonald.heathermarie@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, February 22, 2020 8:03 PM

**To:** City Clerk ; Farrell, Druh ; Chu, Sean

**Subject:** [EXT] Public's Submission for North Hill Local Area Plan

I am submitting this email for inclusion in the agenda for the upcoming committee presentation March 4 for the North Hill local area plan and understand and wish my comments and name to stand publicly as Council considers this for approval.

As a resident in what is called the North Hill area, I'm writing to express my concerns about the scarcity of affordable and diverse housing options in my community and ultimately express my support for the North Hill local area plan.

Affordable and diverse housing opportunities are especially scarce in our inner city communities. I am a 68 year old retired senior and a long term resident of the community Winston Heights. As someone who was wishing to downsize and have less property to maintain (and snow to shovel) in my retirement years it was nearly impossible to find housing in my community to meet my needs. It took me years as I wasn't willing to give up on my community being my forever home. However, a miracle happened and the only reason I was able to stay in my community is because I happened to find a unit in one of very few new infill multiplex buildings that was newly constructed and that was also affordably priced. While I am amongst the lucky few with secure housing that meets my needs, we need to recognize that there are many seniors, families and Calgarians who are struggling to stay in our community as a result of the high cost of housing and many who are prevented from moving here all together because of the limited diversity.

Calgary needs a greater level of housing diversity and we shouldn't have to drive an hour to the new suburbs to get it. I worry that the narrative other residents are telling is a story that is not supportive of multi-family housing, and it is prejudiced, to favour the existing, exclusive single family character of some of our existing inner city communities. I worry this narrative is winning and I can't stand for it any longer. It's as if building a multiplex is threatening the existence of families all together. Or that having 2 or more units is going to result in you having to park a mile away from your house because your garage is filled with decades of junk, and we are letting that kind of first-world fear impact how welcoming and inclusive our communities are but I digress... The reality is that most people cannot afford or, if they are empty nesters and retirees like me, do not wish to maintain single family homes anymore. Our housing needs are changing. We need more options that will better accommodate the diversity that make up our communities and that make our communities great, as well as those looking to move up, move down or move in. This is a great community and I want more people to be able to enjoy it too.

If we continue down this same path of being exclusionary this will mean that our community will lose our seniors (who've lived here for many years), downsizers (because they can't find suitable housing), care providers, young families and single professionals (because there aren't enough attainable housing options available). Where are our teachers, care givers, shop attendants, fire fighters, nurses and new grads going to live, who are integral to keeping our communities vibrant? Where are our children going to live in the future? I worry about our children getting pushed out of our community when it's time for them to live independently. This is what will actually threaten the existence of families in our community and will ultimately threaten the livability and vibrancy of our community.

My immediate neighbours are also ready to retire and are currently trying to find something to downsize into within our area and they are having no luck finding something that meets their needs. I worry that I will lose a critical piece of my social circle because we've let our communities be too

exclusive for so long. We actually need condos!

I commend the City on bringing this project forward. As a resident I had a few different opportunities to participate in a the public consultation events and always found the staff helpful and pleasant and appreciated the opportunity to share my ideas and concerns. Council, please support this North Hill local area plan so we can provide attainable housing for all Calgarians no matter their resource level and ensure our communities are inclusive and welcoming well into the future.

Sincerely,

Heather M. MacDonald

Resident of Winston Heights and the North Hill Communities



Renfrew Community Association  
811 Radford Road NE  
Calgary AB T2E 0R7

February 26, 2020

**Attention:** Troy Gonzalez  
Senior Planner | Community Planning  
Planning and Development  
City of Calgary

**Re: North Hill Communities Local Area Plan community association feedback**

Forty years have passed since the last city-led planning exercises to include all of Renfrew, the North Bow Design Brief (1977) and the North Bow Special Study (1979). Consequently, the Renfrew Community Association's Planning Committee is pleased that the City has worked on the North Hill Local Area Plan.

*General Comments:*

In general, we wish Council had approved the Guidebook for Great Communities before releasing the draft North Hill Local Area Plan. The current plan to bring both to Council in close succession exposes us to uncertainty from Council editing the Guidebook or delaying the North Hill Local Area Plan. We are disappointed the Guidebook does not outline the low-density residential district. Though we are more optimistic knowing that heritage tools are scheduled to go before Council on the same day as the Guidebook and this Plan, we are disappointed that it has taken so long to create those tools and there will be a period of risk while the tools are developed and applied in Renfrew. We knew this was part of the risk of participating in the pilot project. We hope and will continue to work eagerly to add those parts to the Guidebook and Land Use Bylaw so other communities with future local area plans will have a complete Guidebook, a renewed Land Use Bylaw that includes Floor Area Ratios, and enjoy the certainty that we do not.

It appears that the Plan directs more growth to Renfrew than to the other neighbourhoods in the Plan area. **We would expect to see similar levels of growth in all areas south of 16th Avenue.**

This project began as “Local Growth Planning in North Central Green Line Communities” (PUD2018-0347). **We are concerned about the implications Green Line’s uncertainty and timing will affect this Plan. What revisions will the Plan require if Council decides to add stations or stop the Green Line south of the Bow River? After this high-level of engagement, how would the Plan be revised? What would that process include?** What would changing the Green Line’s design on Centre Street mean for Edmonton Trail? In recent years, the Renfrew Community Association has worked to make Edmonton Trail work better for area residents. We

enthusiastically support the Plan's proposed implementation options for Edmonton Trail that build on past work and will continue to advocate for safe pedestrian crossings and infrastructure between Crescent Heights and Renfrew. **We are concerned how Council's decisions about the Green Line in the next few months would shape Edmonton Trail in ways that work against the Plan's vision for one of our Main Streets.**

The Guidebook and Plan seem to define "unique communities" by buildings with a higher intensity than the low-density district, public amenities, and public spaces. Some residents will likely be uncomfortable with this definition, and the low-density district in general.

Given the extent of growth that is possible in Renfrew, **we suggest maintaining Renfrew's unique character with a design guideline for buildings outside the Neighbourhood Housing – Local district to encourage references to Renfrew's past and existing structures.** New buildings could rhyme with their antecedents while also being palpably different. Possible methods could be using historic names (like naming a condo 'The Rutledge' if it has a view of the hangar, or 'Arlington' which was a proposed name for Renfrew), materials (like the metals on our churches' domes or touches of brick or sandstone), or shapes (like using a curved awning to play on the curve of the hangar's roof).

**Without heritage tools in place prior to approval, both the Plan and Guidebook are incomplete and should not receive third reading at Council.** Heritage matters in Renfrew. Because Renfrew was initially developed over decades (from the first decade of the twentieth century to the 1950s) and redeveloped incrementally afterwards, our built forms are a unique physical record of Calgary's suburban development over the last century. We lament that the Plan and Guidebook for Great Communities have not discussed heritage in any specific or meaningful way. Words like "encourage" and "explore" used in conjunction with Heritage Resources in the Guidebook do not compel anyone to act in this regard. The Guidebook also discourages copying or mimicking the design of heritage buildings in the area. We value new construction that seamlessly fits into its context. Our fundamental heritage questions remain unanswered: **How will the Plan preserve heritage and make heritage preservation economically viable in Renfrew?**

The Plan directs growth into Renfrew along some of our busier streets rather than being exclusively along Edmonton Trail and 16th Avenue. We feared that a more Main Streets-focused approach would put taller buildings along Edmonton Trail and transition down to 6th Street. It could have been from twelve storeys on the 400 blocks of each avenue, to six storeys on both the 500 and 600 blocks. The proposed Plan opens the possibility of preservation in the historic pre-World War I subdivisions of Regal Terrace and Beaumont between Edmonton Trail and 6th St NE.

Renfrew's planning committee, board, and community members have a range of opinions about the Neighbourhood Housing – Minor areas within the neighbourhood. Some people wish growth was kept exclusively along Main Streets, like other neighbourhoods have done. Others are pleased to see the next level of growth directed about amenities like parks and schools. Some people find the proposed fourth-storey stepback appropriate. Others would like a four storey maximum. Others would like those areas retained as Neighbourhood Housing – Local with a three storey maximum.

A major concern about taller, more intense areas, whether along Main Streets or within the neighbourhood, is how they transition over time. We fear speculation, land swaps, and decay. Consequently, **we do not want a Plan that encourages decades of decay. Correspondingly, we**

**question the wisdom of Policy 2.6.4, and other City policies and bylaws that encourage lot consolidation, discourage fine-grained urbanism, and raise the bar to entry.**

For over a century, Renfrew's land uses have mixed in natural and normal ways that make a neighbourhood. We hope the Guidebook and Plan will continue to allow uses to mix beyond the difficult-to-finance mixed-use districts. We are pleased to see a mix of commercial is allowed in each Urban Form Classification, especially within Neighbourhood Housing – Minor. Residents and applicants may misinterpret housing areas (of any activity level) as excluding these appropriate commercial uses, though the Guidebook states Neighbourhood Housing – Limited "areas will be primarily residential at various scales, and may support commercial uses that primarily serve people living in the immediate area, such as a barber shop or small convenience store" (Guidebook, pg 49). **We gladly support any actions that makes this policy clearer. One solution could be adding commercial modifiers like "Commercial Cluster" or "Commercial Flex" to the Plan. Another would be editing the Guidebook to remove any confusion and add clarity to how much flexibility is possible in each urban form category and in this Plan.**

*Comments about specific policies proposed in the North Hill Local Area Plan:*

We are pleased to see General Policy 2.5.2 added for shadow studies adjacent to parks. **If there is any confusion about this policy, we suggest it be phrased to more explicitly include buildings across from parks as well.** This seems like a reasonable rule for all development above six storeys adjacent to or across the street from parks. **We suggest this be added to the Guidebook** because we anticipate most residents will ask for a shadow study in those locations anyway. A policy that helps applicants be prepared for engagement will keep applications moving, which avoids needless delays and further inflating future residents' house prices.

We are glad to see General Policy 2.5.4 about retaining existing mature vegetation. We note that even with tree protection measures, development often damages root systems and kills trees. Developers often pay Urban Forestry for the trees' value without replacing trees. As trees age, it may be better to replace trees during development than removing them later without replacement. **We would suggest adding a requirement that applicants "will retain or, if necessary, replace per City tree planting standards."**

Past versions have had overly specific policies about stormwater management features. We are glad to see broader references to stormwater, including "green stormwater infrastructure" (2.6.3b and 2.11.1a).

We are glad to see objectives to "protect ... heritage," "support the protection and maintenance of the tree canopy on public and private lands," and "support the planting of trees using methods that will ensure the sustainability and longevity of new trees" (3.1, 3.15, and 3.16).

In section 4 (Implementation and Interpretation), we would like to see a date by which the Plan needs to be reviewed. The current plan is to review these documents every ten years or so. Depending on development, some will be reviewed sooner, and some will be reviewed later. **It seems reasonable to require a review of this Plan by 2035 or 2040.**

*Comments in reference to the appendix:*

In addition to the proposed Edmonton Trail improvements, we are pleased to see improvements to Beaumont Circus. Both of these build on Edmonton Trail Day and Beaumont Circus Block Party, ActivateYYC events that we hosted in 2018 and 2019.

Many of the policies and implementation options are north of 16th and west of Centre, while much of the non-Main Street growth is in Renfrew. **We suggest some timing of the implementation options depend on where/when the growth happens.** It would be disappointing if Renfrew's growth benefited neighbouring communities, without helping Renfrew.

To repeat, we are thankful for the efforts that have gone into this project, for the willingness and enthusiasm we have had throughout this pilot, and the responsiveness we have seen to our feedback thus far. We hope our final few suggestions and comments will be received in the same spirit.

Sincerely,

**Renfrew Community Association**

*David Barrett*

Vice-President – External

*And*

*Nathan Hawryluk*

North Hill Communities Working Group – RCA Representative

**cc:** Ward 9 office  
Ward 7 office  
Crescent Heights Community Association  
Capitol Hill Community Association  
Highland Park Community Association  
Mount Pleasant Community Association  
Tuxedo Community Association  
Winston Heights/Mountainview Community Association  
Thorncliff Greenview Community Association



## Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through [www.calgary.ca/ph](http://www.calgary.ca/ph). Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

✓ \* I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

* First name	Ian
* Last name	Lockerbie
Email	ian.lockerbie@shaw.ca
Phone	(403) 619-2323
* Subject	North Hill Growth Plan

\* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

I feel that the North Hill Growth Plan consultation with communities was inadequate and that many residents are unaware of the implications. As a resident of Renfrew I believe that the majority of our residents have no idea that this is happening. Developments in neighbourhoods are posted to let residents know what's happening. This rezoning of our neighbourhoods eclipses these small one-off developments and should be clearly outlined to residents. (Front-page news style)

The name North Hill Growth Plan gives no indication of the actual implications. 'North Hill Increased Density Through Rezoning' would be a better and more transparent name for this project, and it would garner more interest for the plans that the City is working on.

Please delay this plan until the public is made aware of it!





February 26, 2020

Re: March 4 PUD - The North Hill Communities Local Growth Plan & Guidebook for Great Communities

Please accept the following feedback from the Mount Pleasant Community Association (MPCA) on the North Hill Communities Local Growth Plan (the Plan) and Guidebook for Great Communities for the Special Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD) meeting on March 4. Further to our December 13, 2019 letter to the City of Calgary (attached), we would like to reiterate the following items:

1. Scale

We have heard from our residents that although the Building Scale and Urban Form maps align in general with their vision of the neighbourhood, the definition of "Limited Scale" is too broad and does not align with our community vision. In 2016, our PTLU Committee reached out to the community and hosted an all-day, open house visioning exercise to gather feedback on the development of our neighborhood. At that event it was expressed that our residents support higher density, including rowhouses, on the busier roads in our community (4<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue) but not throughout the rest of the community. We are requesting that either the "Limited Scale" definition be amended or that a different scale be applied in place of the "Limited Scale" within our community that addresses our community's vision.

2. Implementation

The maximum possible build-out of the "Limited Scale" of development contemplated within the draft plan represents a significant change from the look and feel of Mount Pleasant today. We recognize and appreciate that since our feedback was submitted in December, content regarding implementation has been added to the Plan. However, the MPCA would like to see the Plan prioritize development along 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue as per our community visioning feedback. We feel that this priority would align with the current content of the Plan which calls for higher density along these corridors.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

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





December 13, 2019

Re: The North Hill Communities Local Growth Plan

Please accept the following feedback from the Mount Pleasant Community Association (MPCA) on the North Hill Communities Local Growth Plan, which we recognize as the first of its kind within Calgary. We have appreciated the opportunity to participate in the North Hill Working Group and provide our feedback on the plan development via that forum; we have had a representative in attendance for every Working Group meeting. We also recognize that the public was able to provide input on the draft plan at an Open House on November 28 and 30 as well as online from November 25 – December 8. However, both the MPCA's Planning, Transportation, and Land Use (PTLU) Committee, as well as our residents, have outstanding feedback that we would like to make known to the City of Calgary.

The MPCA Board and PTLU Committee have received numerous comments from our residents since the opportunity for public feedback was provided. We are requesting that City Administration review and amend the draft North Hill Communities Local Growth Plan as per the consolidated feedback below:

1. Scale

We have heard from our residents that although the Building Scale and Urban Form maps align in general with their vision of the neighbourhood, the definition of "Limited Scale" is too broad and does not align with our community vision. In 2016, our PTLU Committee reached out to the community and hosted an all-day, open house visioning exercise to gather feedback on the development of our neighborhood. At that event it was expressed that our residents support higher density, including rowhouses, on the busier roads in our community (4<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue) but not throughout the rest of the community. We are requesting that either the "Limited Scale" definition be amended or that a different scale be applied in place of the "Limited Scale" within our community that addresses our community's vision.

2. Implementation

The maximum possible build-out of the "Limited Scale" of development contemplated within the draft plan represents a significant change from the look and feel of Mount Pleasant today. Regardless of whether Item #1 is addressed, we request that a strategy for implementation be developed to aid in a smooth transition from now to the long-term future contemplated within the draft plan.

3. Community Character

We recognize that the draft plan covers a large area and number of communities, however we request that further work be taken to recognize and respect the unique character of each community represented within the draft plan.



Thank you for your time and we look forward to continuing to work with you on this ground-breaking plan for our community.

Sincerely,

Alison Timmins  
Mount Pleasant Community Association Board Director  
Planning, Transportation, & Land Use Committee Chair

**From:** [Barbaatar, Davaa](#)  
**To:** [Public Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] North Hill Communities Local Area Plan letter - PUD - 4 March  
**Date:** Thursday, February 27, 2020 9:48:53 AM  
**Attachments:** [North Hill letter - PUD 20200226.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Nathan Hawryluk [mailto:nhawryluk@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 27, 2020 9:00 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>  
**Cc:** Gonzalez, Troy C. <Troy.Gonzalez@calgary.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXT] North Hill Communities Local Area Plan letter - PUD - 4 March

Hi,

Will you please include my attached letter about the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan with the report for the Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development on March 4th?

Sorry for the delay, it took longer than expected to write my Guidebook letter, Renfrew Community Association's North Hill letter, and this letter.

Thanks,  
Nathan Hawryluk

26 February 2020

Planning and Urban Development Committee

North Hill Communities Local Area Plan, 4 March 2020

Succinctly summarizing my personal experience and thoughts about the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan's process and proposed plan is difficult. I have been involved with this project as Renfrew Community Association's Director of Transportation and Mobility (May 2017-May 2018), Director of Planning (February 2018-November 2019), and Community Association Representative on the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan Working Group (September 2018-present).

#### Process

I found the Working Group excellent and effective. **The Working Group's diverse membership has been essential** to its success. Having residents who have lived in each neighbourhood for different lengths of time helps us see our existing strengths and weaknesses. Community associations, by virtue of their role in the planning process as groups that are circulated on applications, have their place in the working group. And, though some Calgarians might be surprised by my experience, it has been beneficial to have industry on the working group. **Having people who understand finance, utilities, and other development constraints, helps residents create a local area plan where it is possible for the area to grow in ways that work for existing and future residents.**

The Working Group's online portal was useful, though Working Group members did not use it as much for discussion as I had initially hoped. Aside from a character limit in fields, which discouraged complete thoughts and was easily circumvented by email administration, its user interface worked like I thought it should. I received a complaint about the public online feedback format from one resident, but personally found it satisfactory.

**Our Working Group meetings were thoughtful and productive.** We added further context to residents' input from the City's online and in person engagement. Our facilitators, who were City planning staff and engagement consultants, helped us have difficult discussions and consider the potential long-term effects of our work. In hindsight, we spent more time introducing planning, and forming a vision than I found necessary, though may have helped residents who had not been involved with planning. I have been told newer groups have spent less time on the early meetings. **Key meetings about activity level, scale, and local details were well-designed and highlights of the project.** I wish community association representatives were given two minutes at the end of those key planning meetings to check briefly with other representatives from their community about how they think it is going. Quick feedback from those residents would give community association representatives more confidence that the plan was proceeding well.

I have been pleasantly surprised how much the **North Hill Plan's Working Group helped shape the Guidebook for Great Communities**. For example, when talking about street activity levels, Working Group members suggested that traditional cities are built up to six storeys, so a six storey street wall is appropriate on busier streets. This is reflected in the Guidebook's Mid, High, and Tall building scales. During our scale activity, when discussing visions for busier streets within Renfrew, we suggested some form of Calgary-specific town- or rowhouses, like New York's brownstones, Chicago's greystones, or Great Britain's terraced houses. Consequently, the Guidebook's Urban Form Category for Neighbourhood Housing – Minor states “the units along this building frontage each have a protected, direct entrance that offers comfort and convenience throughout the seasons” (page 44, September 2019 draft). I hope our Working Group has benefited the rest of Calgary.

If I have a criticism of the entire process, it is in the final participant demographic breakdown. I am pleased that 17% of participants live Renfrew because Renfrew makes up 17% of the North Hill area's population (excluding Thorncliffe-Greenview to avoid counting the area north of McKnight Avenue) in the 2019 census. However, **85% of participants own; 15% rent. According to the 2019 census, 46% of residents own** in Capitol Hill, Crescent Heights, Highland Park, Mount Pleasant, Renfrew, Rosedale, Tuxedo, and Winston Heights-Mountview; **54% rent**. I do not know how engagement could have been improved so participants' demographics would be more reflective of the area's demographics. **If homevoters have been overheard in this process, the result may a more cautious plan** than if we had been able to engage more people who rent, may be in more precarious financial circumstances, and are more concerned about housing affordability rather than increasing property values. If that is true, the North Hill Plan may already factor in concerns about housing obstructionism. **I hope residents will not fight when an applicant proposes building according to the Plan.**

## Results

I will highlight two positives, one disappointment, and one concern about the Plan's proposals.

I am pleased that the Plan directs growth around, not through, Renfrew's historic subdivisions of Regal Terrace and Beaumont. **This leaves most of the oldest parts of Renfrew as low-density districts, ready for heritage tools to be applied.** I suspect many Renfrew residents will be upset if, after this much work and allowing this much growth elsewhere in the neighbourhood, those heritage areas do not have tools applied or those heritage homes are lost while those tools are being developed.

Secondly, allowing more height on 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue should make it possible for people to build on its narrow lots and turn a profit, which should help us **fill in this Main Street's vacant lots and make it a better place for people.**

**I wish the Working Group had retained an early draft's vision of 'trick-or-treatable' neighbourhoods.** It added personality and described concisely the kind of neighbourhood in which I would like to live. This is an example of how working groups remove language with character and create bland statements.

I fear **the plan may be too focused on corridors and has too steep of transitions**, but I accept concerns about transitions from Main Streets into the rest of their neighbourhoods. This **may encourage speculation near Main Streets** as applicants test the resolve of administration and Council to hold to this Plan when individuals propose more intense buildings within the adjacent Neighbourhood Housing – Local area.

Overall, I hope, but am not certain, that the proposed plan will produce results that benefit many Calgarians. Though I do not know the contents of a perfect plan or how close we are to having achieved one, presumably a perfect plan would be based on perfect knowledge of our area's future. It is difficult to make predictions, especially about the future. Fortunately, as Charles Marohn wrote, "**projections are not necessary ... when things are built incrementally with ongoing feedback driving adaptation.**"<sup>1</sup> Widespread, incremental missing middle housing, through new low-density district(s) should allow adaptation. Thus, those involved in creating the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan do not need to have been able to predict the future as precisely as those involved in past area redevelopment plans.

Thanks to Council for allowing all of Renfrew to participate in this Plan, administration for organizing an effective process, Working Group members for working through difficult discussions, Renfrew Community Association's board for assigning me to be their representative, and North Hill areas residents (especially those from Renfrew) for giving their input to create this Plan. **If the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan works the way it is envisioned, it will be because of the many people involved.**

Thank you,  
Nathan Hawryluk

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles L. Marohn, Jr, *Strong Towns: A Bottom-up Revolution to Rebuild American Prosperity* (Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2020), 75.



Rosedale Community Association  
901 11 Ave NW  
Calgary, AB T2M 0C2

February 26, 2020

Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development  
Calgary City Hall

Dear Sir/Madam,

Rosedale Community has closely observed the North Hill Local Area Plan unfold and acknowledges the engagement with residents, the attention to detail and effort expended by the Team. We have appreciated the opportunity to be part of the Working Group, where we feel our concerns and contributions were acknowledged and feel as a City, we are heading in the right direction with this Plan along with the principles and goals set out in the Guidebook for Great Communities.

Growth that results from smart planning can improve our daily life, the economy, and the environment. When a city plans carefully for future development and engages with citizens, they can improve existing neighbourhoods with attractive, convenient, safe, and healthy results. They can foster thoughtful design that encourages social, civic, and physical activity. The environment can be protected and economic growth can be stimulated. Most of all, it can create more choices for everyone - choices in where to live, how to get around, and how to interact with the people around them. When a city does this kind of planning, they preserve the best of their past while creating a bright future for generations.

Rosedale, as an established and unique community, would like to touch on a few points that we feel of utmost importance to us. We realize that the North Hill Local Area Plan is the first step to these above goals and with resultant renewed Land Use Bylaw changes to come, which ultimately could introduce change to the character of not only our community but to the whole of the North Hill and the City as a whole, the following are even more vital.

#### Established Communities

The North Hill Plan covers a large area and many communities; it is important to Rosedale that the unique character of each community is recognized. Development must be compatible and should respect and enhance established communities through good design and innovation and it must coexist with existing development without causing undue adverse impact on the surrounding properties. Parking, traffic shortcutting, access issues in inner city neighborhoods are areas that need to be addressed as density increases. Greenspaces and tree canopies should be preserved at all costs. Development should 'fit well' within its physical context and 'work well' with the existing and planned function. Generally speaking, the more a new development can incorporate the common characteristics of its setting in the design, the more compatible it will be.

Page Two

Heritage Conservation and Planning

The community of Rosedale is comprised of single family dwellings, with clusters of heritage homes in its inventory (as shown in Administration's 'windshield survey'). The proposed Heritage Conservation initiative is thoroughly supported; we see this as an important and positive step to preserving character and history in existing older areas which enhance the sense of community by creating and maintaining places with their own distinct identity. These new incentives and regulations are crucial in ensuring Heritage preservation in the City's planning - introducing new development and higher densities into existing areas that have developed over many years requires a sensitive approach and a respect for established characteristics.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments for this presentation.

Yours very truly,



Angela Kokott  
President, Rosedale Community Association

Cathie Dudge  
Rosedale Community Association & North Hill Working Group Rep

cc: Troy Gonzalez, Senior Planner, City of Calgary  
Rosedale Community Association Directors  
Druh Farrell, Ward 7 Councillor, City of Calgary