

Albrecht, Linda

From: DON LEINWEBER [leinweberdcon@shaw.ca]
Sent: Saturday, December 03, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Councillor Sean Chu: ward
Cc: Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Councillor Jim Stevenson: ward; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Ward 7 Contact; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; City Clerk; Minister of the Environment Shannon Phillips; MLA Craig Coolahan; Premier Rachel Notley.; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenviewcares@gmail.com; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Office of the Mayor
Subject: Proposed Highland Golf Course Development

Dear Sean Chu

My name is Don Leinweber . I am 73 years old. I was born in Calgary and grew up in the Inglewood area of the city. I now live in Thorncliffe-Greenview where I have lived for the past 40 years or so. It is there where my two children grew up, went to school ect. I have seen the Thorncliffe Community Centre grow from a single simple outdoor ice rink to the huge thriving complex that it is today. This was done through the hard work and dedication of its community leaders and residents.

I am sending you this email to voice my concerns regarding the proposed Highland Park Golf Course Development and its potential deleterious effects on nearby communities such as Thorncliffe as well as its effects on the environment per se. It is my understanding that the development will entail the loss of hundreds of trees and loss of large amounts of greenspace to be replaced with high density housing. At a time when a premium is being put on preserving, conserving valuable greenspace in large urban centres around the world such as Calgary, this is a step backward. To replace such valuable greenspace with a high density population development violates all progressive thinking with respect to people versus greenspace allotments either in kind or in spirit. It reminds me of the old Petula Clark song from back in the 70's ??? in which she laments that "they paved paradise and put up a parking lot". I ask you and the other members of City Council as well as other interested parties to delay approval of this project until a more thorough assessment can be made on its effects on the environment as well as its effects on surrounding communities. Maybe there are more creative alternatives to the development of this valuable land, that would benefit generations to come. Thank you for consideration in this matter! Don Leinweber

RECEIVED
2016 DEC -5 AM 9:31
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: JD [deeregrp@telus.net]
Sent: Sunday, December 04, 2016 9:46 PM
To: Crowshoe, Lorna M.
Cc: premier@gov.ab.ca; aep.minister@gov.ab.ca; ir.ministeroffice@gov.ab.ca; david.dear@gov.ab.ca; calgary.klien@assembly.ab.ca; Office of the Mayor; City Clerk; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenviewcares@gmail.com; deeregrp@telus.net; purvisb@telus.net
Subject: Highland Park Valley Redevelopment

Dear Lorna,

I have lived in the neighborhood of Highland Park for the last 23 years and have participated in the community discussions about the redevelopment of the Highland Park Valley. When I see a watershed map showing the multiple creeks that drain into the Highland Park Valley from Nose Hill I can understand the significance of this valley to the Blackfoot Nation.

Although First Nations were not consulted when these creeks were vaulted, it is apparent from the watershed map developed by Daryl Wylie in 2016, that the City of Calgary did maintain wildlife corridors along these buried creeks. The animals and birds were still commuting along their traditional routes to the river. In May 2016, I saw a moose climb out of the Highland Park Valley and trot down 44 Avenue NW. Hawks and falcons still nest along the valley pathways and feed on the gophers along Centre St., as well as the pigeons nesting on the apartment balconies along 44 Avenue NW.

Aside from the vaulting of these creeks in the 1960s, no deep excavation has occurred in the Highland Park Valley ever, and the City annexed this land in 1910. The steep walls of the valley are still dotted with native grasses, and crocuses still bloom every spring near Centre Street. This valley, if properly excavated, has enormous potential to yield artifacts and other evidence of its Blackfoot residency. This location is a "once in a lifetime" ecological, environmental, geological and archeological opportunity for Alberta.

The latest proposal that the CPC is recommending for approval involves the developer, Maple Developments, initially taking on the dredging out and filling in of this unique confluence of creeks and topography under the label "storm-water". Best practices for rerouting storm-water probably differs from practices for creeks. The City claims these creeks no longer exist.

The history of this unique location could be buried before it is even discovered. The Alberta government's position on this tiny piece of land could have far reaching effects. If development must proceed then the Nose Creek Internal Drainage Areas Study, published in May 2013 by the Nose Creek Watershed Partnership, and signed by the City of Calgary and the Government of Alberta should be referenced.

Thank you for being a part of the solution,

Sincerely
J M Deere

RECEIVED
2016 DEC -5 AM 9:31
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Smith, Theresa L.

From: JD [deeregrp@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 11:30 AM
To: Office of the Mayor; premier@gov.ab.ca; calgary.klein@assembly.ab.ca; greenviewcares@gmail.com; aep.minister@gov.ab.ca; irministeroffice@gov.ab.ca; david.dear@gov.ab.ca; Crowshoe, Lorna M.; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; City Clerk; deeregrp@telus.net; purvisb@telus.net
Subject: Highland Park Valley Redevelopment

ear...,

When Confederation Park was created the creek was day-lighted through a garbage dump. The low income houses surrounding Confederation on 30th Ave. NW between 10 St. and 4 St. were bungalows with weeping tile and single car garages draining onto their frontage of 150 ft. In the past decade, the upsizing and gentrification of the houses on the hills above Confederation Park has resulted in the creek flooding multiple times in 2016. (pictures available)

Under current bylaws the increased square footage of multiple-story roofs, improved eaves-troughing and double car garages is allowed to drain into the bordering alleyway, as long as the drainage is within inches of the property line. Because of this bylaw the alleys bordering Confederation Park become rivers and creeks, piling islands of gravel, every time the rain falls for more than 1 day. The flood of this valley reaches the playground on the south and covers the parking lot to 30th Avenue on the north to a depth of 2 feet for days.

The Confederation Creek is losing its banks every year because of the increased watershed. Every rain takes more square footage of the land in the valley. (pictures available). Since this creek becomes storm-water when it goes underground beneath the Queen's Park Cemetery toward 40 Ave NW it seems apparent that the Highland Park storm-water system will have to be enhanced with consideration to Confederation Park's densification.

In 2014 a man drowned on 4 St. NW when a storm-water overflow occurred during a prolonged rainstorm, and 40th Avenue at 4 St. NW became a lake. Our last flood in 2013 destroyed Laycock Park along Nose Creek in Greenview and this park has not yet been rebuilt. The Confederation Creek joins the Queen's Park Cemetery Creek under 40 Ave. NW. The conjoined creeks then traverse through Highland Park Valley, joining the creek below McKnight (48 Ave) and the creek below Trafford Drive NW. From Highland Park the water then travels to Greenview and then Nose Creek.

Because of multiple floods in Greenview in the last decade a holding pond was built to hold and treat the water along 32 Ave. NE before it drains into Nose Creek. The storm-water management through Highland Park is key to the storm-water management downstream, all the way to downtown Calgary.

At this point the creeks and seeps that occur in the Highland Park Valley are absorbed by the trees and grassland surrounding them. Walking on the valley floor feels much like walking on a Northern Alberta peat bog. My sincere wish is that Maple Developments understands that accommodating the increasing storm-water through this watercourse means considering the runoff created by the densification agenda, as purported by the City of Calgary, on the hills surrounding it.

On 44 Ave. NW there is only one bungalow converted to a duplex infill so far. Every spring the perfectly legal runoff from this building creates a river down the alley which has eroded the property 3 doors downstream. Islands of gravel drain into the storm-drains and clog them. (pictures available). This past summer 3 dump trucks worth of fill were required to bring the alleyway back up to its original specifications. When this district's old bungalows are replaced with duplex

infills draining into the alleys and then into the Highland Valley, the storm-water, resulting from the increased runoff and less absorbing greenspace, will become a very expensive problem.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

J M Deere

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Grant Symon [gsymon13@yahoo.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 9:11 PM
To: Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; City Clerk; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6 agni@nucleus.com
Cc:
Subject: Highland Golf Course Development City Council January 9, 2016
Attachments: Highland Golf Course letter to council - Grant.docx

Attached is my letter of concern of this proposed development.

Grant Symon
208 Blackthorn Road N.W.
Calgary, Alberta
403-274-1164

RECEIVED
2016 DEC 21 AM 7:39
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

December 20, 2016

Mayor and Council,

RE: Highland Golf Course Development City Council January 9, 2016

RECEIVED
2016 DEC 21 AM 7:39
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

I am writing to express my concerns over the development planned at the Highland Golf Course which goes in front of City Council January 9, 2017.

My concerns stem from the community perspective of green and open spaces for the communities surrounding what was Highland Golf Course such as Thorncliffe-Greenview, Highland Park, and North Haven.

The lands in question has been a green space since the communities built around it in the early 1950's the creek now known as Confederation Creek was and still does flow beneath this green space since it was re-directed by installation by The City of Calgary of a concrete vault structure in the late 1960's or early 1970's. This natural watershed was a place for kids to play and fish. Many old time residents presently living in surrounding communities remember this creek as part of the beauty of the community and in fact oversaw kids at play as storms often changed water levels dramatically from upstream storm occurrences. This watershed has been and still remains a natural watercourse for weather events from Nose Hill.

It is incumbent of The City of Calgary to send a clear message to the Developer/Owner of this property to not interfere with the green space and beauty of this inner City landscape. As it has been relatively untouched for at least three years wetlands have re-established themselves and this green space is rejuvenating its natural origins with springs, wetlands, plants, birds and wildlife.

The development proposed indicates a 2000 residence density development in what is understood to be built on approximately five metres of fill. This natural watershed has been performing admirably given the continued urban sprawl to the west and north. The affect on this natural watershed due to the proposed development will forever affect the green space's ability to perform as it has for so many years.

Calgary Herald December 9, 2016 through a National Post article on the expected extreme weather events predicted with heavier rain and snowfall. So I take you back to Friday August 5, 2011 with numerous Calgary Herald articles of an extreme hail and rainfall event. This is not June 2013 and we as Calgarians all know what occurred two years later. Flooding and massive amounts of hail and rain fell throughout Northwest Calgary August 5th including as far south as Kensington. 60 year Richard Yeoman who lived in the 4600 block of 4th Street NW which is directly west of the Highland Golf Course lands, attempted to move his car from the torrential water white capping and pouring down the street. Unfortunately Richard was swept under his car. Numerous attempts of Neighbors and people stopping to help could not free Richard, he was unconscious and later died in hospital.

These two extreme weather events showcase The City of Calgary's need to prepare and respond. The result of the June 2013 flood has driven engineering plans lead by the Alberta Government and Alberta

Environment to deal with flood upstream of the river in the Springbank community. Contrary, the results of the August 2011 flood is for the City to allow further urban development in what are the lands that could have been the continual and potential watershed solution. This does not make any sense. There was a loss of life in 2011, it is incumbent of The City of Calgary to not let this occur again or what might be a worse future event. This will sit on the present City of Calgary council shoulders if another death in these surrounding communities should ever occur in a weather event of the future.

Let's get technical.

The underground vault presently handling and aligning the Confederation Creek was built for storm mitigation purposes. It is presently undersized for capacity and there is question whether the concrete reinforced vault can take the five metres of fill that the developer plans to build out the watershed valley. The City needs to expend tax payer's money to deal with the deficiencies of the concrete vault before any development can occur over top of what is a City of Calgary right of way presently planned as a road wider than the present Centre Street width. The cost to uncover and rebuild or parallel/duplicate the existing concrete vault through the Highland Park Golf Course lands is estimated to be \$ 4,000,000. This is an outrageous cost as it does not yet deal with the upstream affect of storm management coupled with the Confederation Creek through Queens Park Cemetery and the Creek exposed in Confederation Golf Course. Both of these properties are City (taxpayer) owned.

What happens upstream if the existing concrete vault collapses under the weight of the earth fill proposed by the Developer? What does West Hillhurst, Brentwood, Collingwood, Triwood, Confederation Park, and other flooded communities say when this natural watershed just doesn't work as it has for so many years?

As you have put a public notice The City of Calgary Water Act Thursday September 8, 2016 for the work associated with the reinstating and restoring historical channels along the Bow River within Quarry Park, what the City needs to do is not spend a taxpayer's dime on any further underground storm management plan and use these financial resources to take a hold of this land. Hand in hand with Alberta Environment re-instate these lands and watershed known as Highland Golf Course extending down through Greenview and the Nose Creek valley and reclaim and enhance the watershed so critical to the management of Confederation Creek and the storm management created by urban sprawl.

Create the green space with storm and Creek management in an orchestrated wholesome plan and while properly expending taxpayer's money for creation of a truly Calgary Community of living, name it Richard Yeoman Park.

Grant Symon

208 Blackthorn Road N.W. Calgary Alberta.

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Steve and Diane [dryers@telusplanet.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2016 10:37 AM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Chu, Sean; elise.bieche@shaw.ca
Subject: Objection to Highland Park redevelopment
Attachments: Highland Park golf course redevelopment issues; Empowerment; flooding.doc; Highland Park redevelopment proposal June 2016.doc

Please find attached my submissions in opposition to this development proposal.

RECEIVED
2016 DEC 22 AM 10:48
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

RECEIVED

2016 DEC 22 AM 10:48

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Highland Park golf course re-development issues: Empowerment; Flooding
December 22, 2016

Mr. Mayor and Councilors:

I would like to share with you a vision I have of our city, its leaders and citizens, as I feel it is fundamental to the soul of our city and relevant to this specific issue of the re-development of the Highland Park Golf Course.

I believe it is the civic level of government which ultimately makes the greatest difference in the lives of citizens because they are the ones most intimately connected to their daily lives. I also believe that civic governments need to have more power to provide for those needs. This will only happen when both civic leadership and the citizens are empowered. When individuals are empowered, they are motivated to take action.

Unfortunately, in Canada, our situation speaks more to a lack of empowerment and the conclusion that participation is useless because: "It makes no difference what I say. They will do whatever they want to do anyway". I hope Calgary can be different.

An example of my own experience of feeling disempowered was after I made a plea to our Provincial government to provide some HOPE to those in the oil industry who were suffering, and out of despair, taking their own lives. My request acknowledged that they were not responsible for causing the situation, but that they were now the ones entrusted with caring for the people of Alberta. I was moved by the report of increased suicides in Alberta that could only be attributed to the dire economic crisis. From the data I've seen, that is over 100 more individuals every year. I spoke to a man in the drilling part of the business and he knew of men who had taken their own lives. I attended the Petroleum Show and could see the despair in the eyes of the sales representatives trying to get people interested in their products. When I left, I wanted to weep for their pain. These are the individuals who make up the creative mosaic of the oil patch of which I am a part. All I asked for is that there would be some expression that the government was going to help. We need to know that our government is on our side. I received back only drivel; and not even directly from my MLA but from his assistant. There is a profound despair that comes from seeing a bad situation and being powerless to make any changes.

Decision making by those in power is not by "divine right". From what I have articulated above, it should be a collaboration of all people, working together to achieve the appropriate and creative outcome. I have written this to argue we need to make decisions based on principles which encourage positive and empowered input. Specifically, I would like to see more empowerment in the decision-making associated with the re-development of the Highland Park golf course.

In this situation, a key member group of the process has been significantly disempowered, specifically the residents of Highland Park and the adjacent communities of Thorncliffe, Greenview and Highwood. While being open to development, the proposals are being rammed down their throats. The developer seems to have assumed that because he purchased the land, it would be automatically re-zoned to his desires. Only his proposals were ever considered from the onset and after the "engagement" process, during which opposition to the scope of the project was continually expressed, the number of proposed

units actually increased almost 40%, from 1600 to approximately 2200 units. If there ever was a demonstration of a lack of empowerment and a slap in the face, this was it.

What has happened is that you now have all the communities around the development united in their opposition to this project, yet all feeling that you ARE NOT listening to their concerns. They are frustrated and feel their needs and fears for its impact on their communities are being dismissed. I saw Council struggle with a decision to approve the development of a recycling centre and the care and attention you gave to it. This decision will have a thousand times the impact and has to be gotten right.

In a separate submission, I have stated more specifically how this process has been flawed and refer you to my submission entitled "Objection to Highland Park redevelopment proposal " which is included below. (and submitted separately)

Above has been my proposition that how we make decisions strengthens the process and gives it legitimacy. However, I feel that I would be negligent as a Professional Geologist not to bring up my concerns about the danger of catastrophic flooding for this development.

I had the opportunity to meet with the member of the planning department who is in charge of doing the storm and flood water study and was very impressed with him. His approach is scientific and he is unwilling, and as a member of APEGA, cannot make any recommendations on the suitability of development until his work is finished. That is planned for late 2017 or first quarter 2018. One of your senior planners was asked directly by a councilor if the results of the study would have any impact on the development and he said: "No". **I emphatically disagree with that assertion and believe that comment could be taken as negligent in the legal sense as it communicated something to Council about the project that has not been determined which they may consider in making their decision.** If the individual entrusted in doing the study is not willing to make a conclusion, before the facts are in, how can anyone else? **It actually seems quite incomprehensible to me that it is legitimate to even consider this application before the study has been completed and then the applicability and scale can be considered.**

Curiously, the developer's solution to the flooding issue seems to be to fill in the valley. The only thing that does is give you a valley approximately the same level as the upstream component which could actually make the risk of flooding even worse. From a community disruption perspective, I have heard an estimate that the removal and refilling process would take 60,000 dump truck trips. If we use that number, assume they work from 8 am to 5 pm and a truck leaves every 5 minutes, which works out to 600 days of hauling. If work doesn't happen on weekends, which is almost 3 years of hauling. The numbers could be adjusted but it is going to be very evasive and in the end, not likely be of any help.

As always, I am available to discuss these issues with you or City staff.

Stephen Dryer, P.Geol.

Objection to Highland Park redevelopment proposal

By Stephen Dryer, P. Geol.

This proposed development by Maple Projects Inc. for the former Highland Park golf course should not be approved.

The location of the proposed development is in a valley which drains an area of at least 23 square kilometers. The amount of water that will flow through that valley during the 100 year flood event is approximately 1 million meter³, as calculated in the 2008 City of Calgary study, which is enough to cover the flood plain portion of the golf course to a depth of 12 meters. It will not look like that, of course, but this number indicates the incredible amount of water that will HAVE to go through the valley. No constructed drainage system will be able to handle that amount of water. Residents and structures will be in severe danger during that event; the residents of dying and the structures of destruction.

The plan to fill the valley with an additional 2-3 meters has the potential to de-stabilize the slopes on either side of the former golf course as there will be a need to remove material from the toe of the slopes into the valley. The vibrations from the heavy equipment could be a trigger to causing liquefaction of the sediments which in parts of the golf course are water saturated by artesian flow.

As a Professional Geologist, registered by APEGA, I have a responsibility as a member of my profession to oppose activities related to my expertise that pose a danger to the public. I have communicated my concerns to City planners and staff and there has been absolutely no response back. I requested documentation concerning why the site was originally designated as being not appropriate for housing and was told the information couldn't be found. I communicated that I was willing to meet with city planners to work on these issues but was never contacted or invited to any meetings. I have put considerable effort into being a responsible citizen and have been ignored. The "engagement" process always advanced the agenda of the developer. It is no wonder that Highland Park residents feel this project is being rammed down their throats.

While safety concerns need to be addressed because it will be the City who is ultimately responsible for whatever happens as it has to be approved by Council, it should be emphatically stated that this project is NOT supported by the Highland Park community. The Thorncliffe community is aware of what is proposed and are definitely concerned. Highwood doesn't appear to have had any notice of the development from a comment from an individual involved with their association. One has to be concerned that Greenview hasn't been informed of what is going to happen. In terms of people travelling along any of the commuter routes around the former golf course, there has been no signage visible letting them know that there are plans to add approximately 2500 housing units and that additional traffic will be added to the already congested routes.

“Engagement” process:

From the onset, the Highland Park community tried to have a positive approach to the development of the former golf course. There was the hope that a combination of new housing and businesses along with green space would be a positive addition to the community.

I am disappointed to say that the whole process has been a farce. The community does NOT support this project. I haven't spoken to one individual who is in favour of it. While described in flowery terms of engagement, anyone who has interacted with Maple Projects Inc has been treated dismissively and concerns that have been expressed have essentially been ignored. That is why I have to argue again at the last minute that this project could literally cause people to die. That is truly sobering! As discussed above, using the City's own data, the amount of water that has to pass through this development is truly staggering. Cougar Creek in Canmore drained a larger area (41 kilometer² vs 23 kilometers²) but is still comparable. The difference is that Cougar Creek goes through an alluvial fan and a channel has been deepened and reinforced to deal with the next flood but the Maple Projects Inc development is right in the valley itself. There is nowhere else for the water to go. These flooding dangers were brought up to them at the first meeting. I think this issue needs to have serious consideration and resolution between City and residents before this development can proceed.

As an example of how the process went with Maple Projects Inc., the concessions which were made were not true concessions. For instance, the green space corridor “given” to the community is on City land. The green space actually provided is what has to be defined by City regulations. The development violates the City's own guidelines on both density and green space. Why have guidelines for making better communities if they are ignored.

During the engagement process, the number of units proposed went from 1600 to 2200 to a minimum of 2471 units. It is hard to imagine that the residents of Highland Park argued for more units. NEVER was the position of the City in the “Highland Park golf course site-Stream water Quality Retrofit Scoping study” which will be discussed below ever put forward as an option. The City, at least, should have presented what was in their own report. The City position was that development would take place in the golf course but that a large portion of the land would be turned over to City Parks for green space. That position of more green space was suggested by the community but never advocated by the City and obviously not by the developer.

The session with the Planning commission was like being on trial without a defence lawyer. The planning commission members asked questions but the answers from the City planners gave the impression that there were no problems whatsoever and opposition to the project was trivial and irrelevant. There has been no legitimate forum for the public to argue the technical merits of this project. The City has legitimately asked for public input for projects like the East Village but this one which has huge implications to Highland Park and surrounding communities and thousands of commuters got a couple hours at a Planning meeting and is now being presented to Council for approval.

Technical Discussion:

The catchment basin which drains into what was once known as the North Hill Coulee has an area of 2292.7 ha or 23 kilometers², according to the Highland Park golf course site-Stream water Quality Retrofit Scoping study produced by the City of Calgary in October, 2008. They give the area of the golf course to be 8.5 ha. The amount of runoff generated which will drain through the valley from this area during the 100 year flood event was calculated to be 1,025,587 meters³. (That is based on 89 mm of rainfall in 24 hours. Given that the amounts of water that fell in parts of Alberta in 2013, that number is probably too low.) That means a depth of water of 12 meters (roughly the height of a 4 story building) has to drain through the 8.5 ha area of the golf course.

The presently enclosed drainage channel cannot handle that amount of water especially when it is likely that the inflow point has a high probability of clogging up with debris. Debris can be seen stuck in the grates that keep people from entering the enclosed drainage channel. (The grates were installed after young boy drowned there a number of years ago during a heavy rainfall.) Once the enclosed channel is unable to handle the water flow, it will travel through Queen's Park Cemetery to 4th Street and 40th Avenue and then into the former golf course. In its present state, the former golf course has a critically significant role in that it has sufficient size to safely retain at least some of this inflow of water. It was precisely for this reason and the preservation of water quality that the above mentioned study was conducted. One conclusion was that the area was insufficient to handle all the water flow which is tacit recognition of how much water will flow through the golf course.

Maple Projects Inc has now proposed FILLING the valley with 2-3 meters of material to supposedly deal with the flooding danger. The flooding danger remains. The developed area will still be the low point and the same amount of water has to pass through the valley. What has changed is that now there is no place for the water to safely accumulate. It is likely that the level of water at 4th Street and 40th will now accumulate to a higher level, flooding the residences and Senior Citizens complex around it. The flood water will then flow through the development (which it will flood) directly to Centre Street, and probably over it, and finally into the community of Greenview. This is not complicated to imagine. Water always flows downhill and will follow the path of least resistance. It also has the ability to remove whatever is in its path and there could easily be erosion of a new, deeper valley through the "filled in" portion of the valley.

What has also been ignored is the frequent short but intense rainfall events. These typically last an hour or two but the usual outcome is to flood the low lying parts of the valley from the former golf course up into Confederation Park. The significance of this is that the former golf course has on its west side the hill that goes up into Highwood. Such a rainfall took place in August, 2011. The amount of water flowing down the hill was at such a rate and quantity that a man who lived in one of the apartments along 4th Street was swept under a vehicle and drowned. That amount of rainfall will occur again and the proposed development is now in its path, with reduced vegetation to absorb the water and being the low point for accumulation. Now, however, there will be residents where the water will accumulate. The risk of flooding is not limited to extraordinary events.

Considering the regular reports of flooding being reported worldwide and the direct experience of Calgarians of two major flood events in the past 6 years, it is very odd that a development in such an obviously flood prone area is even being considered.

In their brochure "Respecting our Rivers" produced by the Government of Alberta, the following statements was made: "We will never be able to completely eliminate the flood risk faced by some communities, but we can take steps to manage it. *Part of this is accepting that sometimes it's more practical to keep people away from water than trying to keep water away from people.*" (Italics mine).

It is my opinion as a Professional Geologist that Maple Projects Inc and the City of Calgary planning staff have not taken this flooding danger seriously. Initially, Maple Projects Inc even denied that the former golf course was a flood plain because the creek had been enclosed. Playing a semantics game to achieve an outcome is unacceptable. It would appear that the flooding issue eventually was considered important and that lead to the plan to fill the valley. As I've commented, it will only change the style of flooding, not the reality.

In addition to flood danger, the proposed development plan involves another geological hazard. That is slumping. Slumping can take place at very low angles of slope. Participants at meetings discussing this development spoke of slumps which were filled in to build the golf course. The danger of slumping is high when the ground is water saturated and as much of the flow in the former golf course, outside overland flow during rainfall events, is artesian, the ground will often be saturated. The plan is to fill the valley but before that can happen the present material has to be removed. Removing the toe of the slope will increase the chance of slippage and slumping from higher areas adjacent to the removal. The vibration associated with heavy equipment could provide the trigger by causing "liquefaction" of the sediments. That is when the internal pore pressure of the water in the sediment is sufficient to support the grains. Then the whole mixture can become mobile and will tend to flow downslope. Slumping is particularly serious if buildings are in the mobile sediments and there are housing developments on both sides of the former golf course. The amount of fill planned for this operation has been estimated to require 50-60,000 dump trucks trips (not counting the removal trips) so the amount of vibrating that will take place is significant and sustained.

Curiously enough, the issue of development was addressed by the City in the storm water study of 2008, the recommendations and benefits being totally ignored and nullified if this development is to proceed as planned. On development issues, it is stated: "There is currently consideration by land developers to redevelop the golf course and convert a large portion of the land to single family and multi-family residential infill developments. *If redevelopment of the site is granted, a large portion of the golf course is intended as open green space to be turned over to City Parks.*" (Italics mine)

This scenario was never presented as an option by the City or developer to the community who from the beginning showed a willingness to work with the developer. Why the City has not had the vision to stay with their own plan for the former golf course is unacceptable. The only option ever presented to the residents of Highland Park initially was to fill the entire area with buildings except for the amount of green space which was forced on the developer. The only thing that has changed over the entire

“engagement process” is that the number of residences proposed has gone from 1600 to 2200 to now a minimum of 2471. The City in approving this will violate their own guidelines on green space and density.

Everything I have heard is that the community is willing to back development but development that is done right. At this point, this development is WIN/LOSE with Highland Park and surrounding communities being the losers. The developer wins, big time.

Summary:

This project as it stands now should not be approved because it is dangerous. Of all cities, Calgary should have learned from past flooding events that construction in the path of water flow is unwise. The danger of potential loss of life is high during high rainfall events is unacceptable. It is not a question of “If” but “When”. The City should neither promote, nor take responsibility for this danger.

As well, this project has not had legitimate, empowered engagement of one important group of stakeholders, namely the Highland Park community, in particular and the surrounding communities, in general. This should not be just a decision of the City and the developer.

The former Highland Park golf course has the potential to be a wonderful development project. With proper planning it can provide green space which enhances the surrounding communities, higher density which makes for a more efficient city and business opportunities which add to the flavour and attraction of the area. This should be done in a co-operative environment with the community, City and developer.

RECEIVED

2016 DEC 22 AM 10:48

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Objection to Highland Park redevelopment proposal

By Stephen Dryer, P. Geol.

This proposed development by Maple Projects Inc. for the former Highland Park golf course should not be approved.

The location of the proposed development is in a valley which drains an area of at least 23 square kilometers. The amount of water that will flow through that valley during the 100 year flood event is approximately 1 million meter³, as calculated in the 2008 City of Calgary study, which is enough to cover the flood plain portion of the golf course to a depth of 12 meters. It will not look like that, of course, but this number indicates the incredible amount of water that will HAVE to go through the valley. No constructed drainage system will be able to handle that amount of water. Residents and structures will be in severe danger during that event; the residents of dying and the structures of destruction.

The plan to fill the valley with an additional 2-3 meters has the potential to de-stabilize the slopes on either side of the former golf course as there will be a need to remove material from the toe of the slopes into the valley. The vibrations from the heavy equipment could be a trigger to causing liquefaction of the sediments which in parts of the golf course are water saturated by artesian flow.

As a Professional Geologist, registered by APEGA, I have a responsibility as a member of my profession to oppose activities related to my expertise that pose a danger to the public. I have communicated my concerns to City planners and staff and there has been absolutely no response back. I requested documentation concerning why the site was originally designated as being not appropriate for housing and was told the information couldn't be found. I communicated that I was willing to meet with city planners to work on these issues but was never contacted or invited to any meetings. I have put considerable effort into being a responsible citizen and have been ignored. The "engagement" process always advanced the agenda of the developer. It is no wonder that Highland Park residents feel this project is being rammed down their throats.

While safety concerns need to be addressed because it will be the City who is ultimately responsible for whatever happens as it has to be approved by Council, it should be emphatically stated that this project is NOT supported by the Highland Park community. The Thorncliffe community is aware of what is proposed and are definitely concerned. Highwood doesn't appear to have had any notice of the development from a comment from an individual involved with their association. One has to be concerned that Greenview hasn't been informed of what is going to happen. In terms of people travelling along any of the commuter routes around the former golf course, there has been no signage visible letting them know that there are plans to add approximately 2500 housing units and that additional traffic will be added to the already congested routes.

"Engagement" process:

From the onset, the Highland Park community tried to have a positive approach to the development of the former golf course. There was the hope that a combination of new housing and businesses along with green space would be a positive addition to the community.

I am disappointed to say that the whole process has been a farce. The community does NOT support this project. I haven't spoken to one individual who is in favour of it. While described in flowery terms of engagement, anyone who has interacted with Maple Projects Inc has been treated dismissively and concerns that have been expressed have essentially been ignored. That is why I have to argue again at the last minute that this project could literally cause people to die. That is truly sobering! As discussed above, using the City's own data, the amount of water that has to pass through this development is truly staggering. Cougar Creek in Canmore drained a larger area (41 kilometer² vs 23 kilometers²) but is still comparable. The difference is that Cougar Creek goes through an alluvial fan and a channel has been deepened and reinforced to deal with the next flood but the Maple Projects Inc development is right in the valley itself. There is nowhere else for the water to go. These flooding dangers were brought up to them at the first meeting. I think this issue needs to have serious consideration and resolution between City and residents before this development can proceed.

As an example of how the process went with Maple Projects Inc., the concessions which were made were not true concessions. For instance, the green space corridor "given" to the community is on City land. The green space actually provided is what has to be defined by City regulations. The development violates the City's own guidelines on both density and green space. Why have guidelines for making better communities if they are ignored.

During the engagement process, the number of units proposed went from 1600 to 2200 to a minimum of 2471 units. It is hard to imagine that the residents of Highland Park argued for more units. NEVER was the position of the City in the "Highland Park golf course site-Stream water Quality Retrofit Scoping study" which will be discussed below ever put forward as an option. The City, at least, should have presented what was in their own report. The City position was that development would take place in the golf course but that a large portion of the land would be turned over to City Parks for green space. That position of more green space was suggested by the community but never advocated by the City and obviously not by the developer.

The session with the Planning commission was like being on trial without a defence lawyer. The planning commission members asked questions but the answers from the City planners gave the impression that there were no problems whatsoever and opposition to the project was trivial and irrelevant. There has been no legitimate forum for the public to argue the technical merits of this project. The City has legitimately asked for public input for projects like the East Village but this one which has huge implications to Highland Park and surrounding communities and thousands of commuters got a couple hours at a Planning meeting and is now being presented to Council for approval.

Technical Discussion:

The catchment basin which drains into what was once known as the North Hill Coulee has an area of 2292.7 ha or 23 kilometers², according to the Highland Park golf course site-Stream water Quality Retrofit Scoping study produced by the City of Calgary in October, 2008. They give the area of the golf course to be 8.5 ha. The amount of runoff generated which will drain through the valley from this area during the 100 year flood event was calculated to be 1,025,587 meters³. (That is based on 89 mm of rainfall in 24 hours. Given that the amounts of water that fell in parts of Alberta in 2013, that number is

probably too low.) That means a depth of water of 12 meters (roughly the height of a 4 story building) has to drain through the 8.5 ha area of the golf course.

The presently enclosed drainage channel cannot handle that amount of water especially when it is likely that the inflow point has a high probability of clogging up with debris. Debris can be seen stuck in the grates that keep people from entering the enclosed drainage channel. (The grates were installed after young boy drowned there a number of years ago during a heavy rainfall.) Once the enclosed channel is unable to handle the water flow, it will travel through Queen's Park Cemetery to 4th Street and 40th Avenue and then into the former golf course. In its present state, the former golf course has a critically significant role in that it has sufficient size to safely retain at least some of this inflow of water. It was precisely for this reason and the preservation of water quality that the above mentioned study was conducted. One conclusion was that the area was insufficient to handle all the water flow which is tacit recognition of how much water will flow through the golf course.

Maple Projects Inc has now proposed FILLING the valley with 2-3 meters of material to supposedly deal with the flooding danger. The flooding danger remains. The developed area will still be the low point and the same amount of water has to pass through the valley. What has changed is that now there is no place for the water to safely accumulate. It is likely that the level of water at 4th Street and 40th will now accumulate to a higher level, flooding the residences and Senior Citizens complex around it. The flood water will then flow through the development (which it will flood) directly to Centre Street, and probably over it, and finally into the community of Greenview. This is not complicated to imagine. Water always flows downhill and will follow the path of least resistance. It also has the ability to remove whatever is in its path and there could easily be erosion of a new, deeper valley through the "filled in" portion of the valley.

What has also been ignored is the frequent short but intense rainfall events. These typically last an hour or two but the usual outcome is to flood the low lying parts of the valley from the former golf course up into Confederation Park. The significance of this is that the former golf course has on its west side the hill that goes up into Highwood. Such a rainfall took place in August, 2011. The amount of water flowing down the hill was at such a rate and quantity that a man who lived in one of the apartments along 4th Street was swept under a vehicle and drowned. That amount of rainfall will occur again and the proposed development is now in its path, with reduced vegetation to absorb the water and being the low point for accumulation. Now, however, there will be residents where the water will accumulate. The risk of flooding is not limited to extraordinary events.

Considering the regular reports of flooding being reported worldwide and the direct experience of Calgarians of two major flood events in the past 6 years, it is very odd that a development in such an obviously flood prone area is even being considered.

In their brochure "Respecting our Rivers" produced by the Government of Alberta, the following statements was made: "We will never be able to completely eliminate the flood risk faced by some communities, but we can take steps to manage it. *Part of this is accepting that sometimes it's more practical to keep people away from water than trying to keep water away from people.*" (Italics mine).

It is my opinion as a Professional Geologist that Maple Projects Inc and the City of Calgary planning staff have not taken this flooding danger seriously. Initially, Maple Projects Inc even denied that the former golf course was a flood plain because the creek had been enclosed. Playing a semantics game to achieve

an outcome is unacceptable. It would appear that the flooding issue eventually was considered important and that led to the plan to fill the valley. As I've commented, it will only change the style of flooding, not the reality.

In addition to flood danger, the proposed development plan involves another geological hazard. That is slumping. Slumping can take place at very low angles of slope. Participants at meetings discussing this development spoke of slumps which were filled in to build the golf course. The danger of slumping is high when the ground is water saturated and as much of the flow in the former golf course, outside overland flow during rainfall events, is artesian, the ground will often be saturated. The plan is to fill the valley but before that can happen the present material has to be removed. Removing the toe of the slope will increase the chance of slippage and slumping from higher areas adjacent to the removal. The vibration associated with heavy equipment could provide the trigger by causing "liquefaction" of the sediments. That is when the internal pore pressure of the water in the sediment is sufficient to support the grains. Then the whole mixture can become mobile and will tend to flow downslope. Slumping is particularly serious if buildings are in the mobile sediments and there are housing developments on both sides of the former golf course. The amount of fill planned for this operation has been estimated to require 50-60,000 dump trucks trips (not counting the removal trips) so the amount of vibrating that will take place is significant and sustained.

Curiously enough, the issue of development was addressed by the City in the storm water study of 2008, the recommendations and benefits being totally ignored and nullified if this development is to proceed as planned. On development issues, it is stated: "There is currently consideration by land developers to redevelop the golf course and convert a large portion of the land to single family and multi-family residential infill developments. *If redevelopment of the site is granted, a large portion of the golf course is intended as open green space to be turned over to City Parks.*" (Italics mine)

This scenario was never presented as an option by the City or developer to the community who from the beginning showed a willingness to work with the developer. Why the City has not had the vision to stay with their own plan for the former golf course is unacceptable. The only option ever presented to the residents of Highland Park initially was to fill the entire area with buildings except for the amount of green space which was forced on the developer. The only thing that has changed over the entire "engagement process" is that the number of residences proposed has gone from 1600 to 2200 to now a minimum of 2471. The City in approving this will violate their own guidelines on green space and density.

Everything I have heard is that the community is willing to back development but development that is done right. At this point, this development is WIN/LOSE with Highland Park and surrounding communities being the losers. The developer wins, big time.

Summary:

This project as it stands now should not be approved because it is dangerous. Of all cities, Calgary should have learned from past flooding events that construction in the path of water flow is unwise. The danger of potential loss of life is high during high rainfall events is unacceptable. It is not a question of "If" but "When". The City should neither promote, nor take responsibility for this danger.

As well, this project has not had legitimate, empowered engagement of one important group of stakeholders, namely the Highland Park community, in particular and the surrounding communities, in general. This should not be just a decision of the City and the developer.

The former Highland Park golf course has the potential to be a wonderful development project. With proper planning it can provide green space which enhances the surrounding communities, higher density which makes for a more efficient city and business opportunities which add to the flavour and attraction of the area. This should be done in a co-operative environment with the community, City and developer.

Albrecht, Linda

From: Lorraine Taylor [muffet1@telus.net]
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 10:09 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Fw: Golf course
Attachments: Golf course.docx

From: Lorraine Taylor
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 10:03 AM
To: ward06@calgary.ca
Subject: Fw: Golf course

From: Lorraine Taylor
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 10:02 AM
To: ward04@calgary.ca
Subject: Fw: Golf course

From: Lorraine Taylor
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 9:54 AM
To: ward02@calgary.ca
Subject: Golf course

Please read attached.

RECEIVED
2016 DEC 30 PM 12:03
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

RE: The proposed Highland Golf Course redevelopment by Maple Projects Inc. and environmental concerns deserving more in-depth discussion by Calgary City Council.

Roads:

- Two bus routes (#2 and #3) are in place to serve this location.
- The future LRT station on Centre Street North is another positive. However, the redevelopment will increase usage on three access roads: Centre St. North, 40 Ave. N.W. and 4th St. N.W. contributing to traffic congestion, particularly during rush hours.
- Calgary Police Service, Calgary Fire Dept. and Calgary EMS need to be consulted for effective response times.

Buildings:

- During the Open House in December 2016, one building within the redevelopment was heard to be fourteen stories tall. This being so, I asked a City of Calgary representative if the Calgary Airport Authority was consulted about high structures. "It doesn't need to be consulted," was the response; no documents were brought forth to explain why.
- Many nearby buildings in Highland Park, Thorncliffe and Greenview, all neighbouring communities to the redevelopment, have had water in their basements and cracks in their foundations. The buildings shown on the map are high density, multi family, accommodating up to four thousand people. New structures built in this natural landscape and even if modified, could continue to be adversely affected by the shifts and movement of the terrain.

Schools:

- No schools are shown on the map. The City of Calgary representative said, "Students from the development area will attend local schools." Thorncliffe Elementary, Corpus Christi, Col. Sanders and Col. Irvine, to mention some, already have school buses bringing students from further afield.

Water:

- The pipe/vault in place beneath the former golf course and Confederation Park was built circa 1955. When asked at the Open House in December 2016, the City of Calgary representative's comment as to whether or not the vault would be upgraded or entirely replaced was "No."
- When the ground is frozen and there is rain and/or melting snow during a chinook, I have observed the water does not soak into the ground but flows into the former Highland Golf Course. At the time of the 2013 flood, I saw water on Confederation Park and the low area of Queen's Park Cemetery – across from James Fowler School. Should that pipe/vault be damaged at the time of proposed redevelopment, I feel more water will collect on both sides of 4th St. N.W.
- The N.W. part of Calgary has had a cap on development due to shortage of sewer capacity.

- At present (December 29th, 2016), at 4th Street and 40th Avenue NW, kitty corner to Maple Project Inc. planned redevelopment, City of Calgary Waterworks trucks and personnel were busy dealing with another waterworks issue.

Inner City Green Space:

- Do we agree to bid adieu to the mature trees, wild animals and birds? Their habitation will be destroyed with this redevelopment.
- The natural occurring aquifers/springs/streams are part of three creeks, integral to wetlands and habitat for hawks, geese and ducks.
- Confederation Park, Nose Hill Park, the Weaselhead, Sandy Beach, Stanley Park, Fish Creek Park -- they are all part and parcel of Calgary's beautiful urban park system. Let us add the former Highland Park to this list of urban parks within our City.

The thought of Maple Projects Inc. claiming financial failure and/or selling parcels of land to other developers is another chapter in this very prolonged story.

I am not in favour of the proposed urban high-density housing redevelopment of the former Highland Golf Course. May future generations enjoy this piece of nature.

Your consideration and comments, please.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Taylor

muffet1@telus.net

cc: Mayor Naheed Nenshi, Ward Sutherland, Joe Magliocca, Jim Stevenson, Sean Chu, Ray Jones, Richard Pootmans, Druh Farrell, Evan Woolley, Gian-Cario Carra, Andre Pincott, Shane Keating, Diane Colley-Urquhart, Counciller Peter Demong, City Clerk

R. Notley, Craig Coolahan, Michelle Rempel

RECEIVED
2016 DEC 30 PM 12: 03
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Albrecht, Linda

From: Julio Savoia [jsavoia@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 2:51 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment - LOC2014-0190

236 43 Avenue NW
Calgary, Alberta, T2K OH6
January 2, 2017

Mr. Mayor and City of Calgary Councillors
City Clerk, #8007, City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -3 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Re: Redevelopment of the Highland Park Golf Course – LOC2014-0190

Dear Mr. Nenshi and City of Calgary Councillors,

As a long time residents of Highland Park, we would like to express our concerns regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Highland Park Golf Course that is coming before City Council on January 16, 2017. At the July 4, 2016 public hearing before City Council, the decision was made to table the proposal by the developer, Maple Projects Inc, in order to facilitate more community engagement and hopefully resolve some of the outstanding issues that still existed. Since that time there has been some community engagement and the Charette on the future 40th Avenue Green line Station has taken place. Unfortunately, even with this consultation, little has changed from the original proposal and as such we still remain opposed to this proposal in its current form.

Ideally, we would like to keep this valley as a natural green space. However, we understand that this is private property and the owners have every right to develop it. We understand the need for transit oriented development and the need for higher density along the future green line. However, all we are asking is that the development is compatible with its surroundings and that it is sensitive to the people already living within the community. We suggest that these developers have shown a lack of sensitivity to the people in Highland Park as displayed by their lack of community engagement and their inability to resolve some of the key outstanding issues regarding density and the DC bylaws. This proposed development will have a disastrous impact on our community and our quality of life.

We would like you to consider advocating against the proposed development as the current proposal gives the developer carte blanche to do as he pleases on the site. Presently, the community of Highland Park does not have sufficient green space and the proposed increase in density would create an unnecessary

burden on the roads and services within our community. We would go further and suggest that the community of Highland Park requires an Area Redevelopment Plan to ensure that any future development occurs in a reasonable and responsible manner and with an interest to listening to the concerns of area residents. Previously, when the Center Street Church proposed a development in the Highland Golf Course in 2001, the City Council of the day rejected the proposed development and then Councilor Sue Higgins recommended that an Area Redevelopment Plan for the Highland Park be created before any future development occurred in the area. We are not sure what happened to her proposal, but it is unfortunate that the City did not follow through with it at that time because we find ourselves going through the whole process again today.

Sincerely,

Pamela and Julio Savoia

Albrecht, Linda

From: Joan Landsiedel [joanlandsiedel@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 1:53 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: LOC2014-0190"

LOC2014-0190"

1. Strict Land Use Bylaws - *We feel very strongly about this it gives way to much latitude to both council and more specifically developers to make radical changes to the plan without community input. Removing relaxation clause is a necessity as well as the next two recommendations.*
2. Greater Green Space - *We always need more green space in the city and as **long-time** residents and **community members** do not support losing park space. The amount of land available is more than sufficient to create a park similar to Riley Park in the NW*
3. Support the Preservation of Existing Topography - *We wholly support the recommendation outlined here for the reasons outlined:" The following recommendations will limit the amount of fill required and making substantial improvements in the overall development."*
4. Support the Existing Community-*We are feeling very left out and helplessly held hostage by developer and the way we are being ignored.*
5. Responsible Development Plan - *The Highland Village Green Development is very clearly not a green field development. As such, special care is required to ensure that the development respects the existing community and residents. We, as home owners and residents of Highland Park agree that the developer does not have the interests of the community and we do nor support the proposal as it stands.*

Joan Landsiedel, Debbie Wiebe
102-4520 4 St. NW
T2K 1A2

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -3 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

DARYL WYLLIE
HIGHLAND PARK
4315 2ND ST NW
CALGARY ALBERTA
T2K 0Z 2

darylwyllie@hotmail.com

403 277-9978

RECEIVED

2017 JAN -4 PM 4: 10

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS



SCHOOL

SCHOOL

64TH AVE

WEST NOSECREEK PARK

LOC 20140190

EGERTS PARK

SCHOOL

THORNCLIFFE

GREENVIEW

LAYCOCK PARK

McKNIGHT BLVD

NORTHMOUNT DRIVE

SCHOOL

HIGHWOOD

HIGHLAND

LEG
OPEN WATERC...
CLOSED WATERC...

CONFEDERATION CREEK

PARK

SCHOOL

4TH STREET NW

CONFEDERATION CREEK

CENTRE STREET


32 AVE

EDMONTON TRAIL

CONFEDERATION CREEK

ELKS GOLF COURSE

I WANNA BE
RIPARIAN
AGAIN
...



LOC 2014-0190

To The Mayor and Councilors;

There is a publicly owned watercourse right in the middle of some prime urban real estate. What is to be done here? To the subjugators of nature there is no problem that cannot be solved with some linear thinking. Treat the watershed like your worst enemy.

Denigrate its value. Deny its existence. It's not a creek, its stormwater. It's not a wetland worth saving, only a class 2. Time to bury it. Entomb the creek in law as well as concrete. Deny the worth of the trees. Cut them down.

We are talking about water that flows at -30 degrees and year after year. Springs and wetlands still existing after decades of drainage.

This proposal has already been considered at several levels. Corporate Planning and the Calgary Planning Commission thought they had dealt with it last Spring. Policy on this matter was already settled when the city signed in support of the Durban Accord, Our BiodiverCity, The Natural Area Management Plan and The Open Spaces Plan, all of which take privately owned open spaces into consideration. And most importantly when City Council passed the MDP. Into Law. The spirit of these documents refers directly to this watercourse.

Decades of public and professional engagement has gone into preparing the City of Calgary to deal with these pressures of development. Over and over in city documents, connectivity of parks, greenspaces and neighbourhoods is stressed. There is mention of important natural assets that may have been overlooked. There is mention of the city acquiring important lands to achieve these goals. In this case possibly it was taken for granted that a watercourse was self protecting by virtue of its undevelopability. Apparently engineers might see this as a worthy challenge .

This valley has a permanent and steady water supply from the creeks springs and groundwater. These are assets not problems. Left alone this environment would revert naturally to a stable valuable naturalized area due to

all the water present. With or without daylighting the creek. It would work to help maintain Nose Hill as a Natural Environment Park. It's not perfect but Nature is resourceful and will make the best of the situation. And this watershed would continue to help maintain water quality and quantity.

The Highland Valley is a place to apply the best management practices for a sustainable and resilient Calgary. Leave the valley bottom to naturalize.

Daryl Wylie



McKNIGHT BLVD

4TH ST


40th AVE

HIGHLAND PARK


← 2015 ICE

CENTRAL STREET

CENT



ICE DEPOSITION IN THE HIGHLAND VALLEY DEC 2016 AFTER EXTREMELY
SEEN FROM ABOVE THIS ICE HAS A FAN SHAPE. IN THE 1929 AIR PHOTO,
IN THE SAME LOCATION, THERE IS AN ALLUVIAL FAN SHAPE AT THE
BOTTOM OF THE RAVINE ENTERING FROM THE WEST...Wolfgang



LOC 2014 - 0190

FUN FACTS ABOUT THE HIGHLAND VALLEY

AND OPINIONS

Nose Creek is situated where the ice free corridor started allowing immigration into the interior of North America Thousands of years ago.

Those old trails often followed the same watercourses that still exist

The Nose Creek Master Plan Map shows a Regional Pathway starting where Confederation Creek enters Nose Creek and states it is to connect with Nose Hill and Confederation Park.

This pathway to Nose Hill would cross McKnight at Simons Road and travel up an existing city greenspace to Egerts Park and Nose Hill.

People from the IBI Group during the 40th Ave Charrett walked up along the McKnight greenspaces and agreed they were important to the environment of the city.

It is important to have a walkable connection between Thorncliffe and the Highland Valley. Whatever the City plans here Nature will ultimately reclaim the watercourse.

The kind of city we want has been discussed for 133 years. A highlight was the Mawson report which would have been wonderful to adopt.

To change the recreational zoning in the bottom of the valley will tie City water managers hands vis a vis responsible water management.

We have already seen in 2013 what the warmer wetter climate of Alberta can do when a Pacific Airmass ran upslope to the Rockies.

WE HAVE YET TO SEE SUCH AN AIRMASS MEET AN ARCTIC HIGH RIGHT OVER CALGARY IN SPRING OR SUMMER WHEN CONDITIONS COULD CAUSE MASSIVE RAINFALL and SNOWMELT

The MDP recommends taking Environmental Reserve when there is undevelopable land ie unstable slopes, wetlands, ravines drainage courses, areas subject to flooding Also "maintain biodiversity integrating and connecting ecological networks throughout the city" "MAINTAIN LANDSCAPE DIVERSITY"

If Alberta experienced drier conditions in the future the Highland Valley could probably get all the water it needed from a couple of wells.

THERE ARE POSSIBLY MORE PEOPLE USING THE VALLEY NOW FOR RECREATION ON A YEAR ROUND BASIS THAN DURING THE GOLF COURSE YEARS, AND THEY ARRIVE ON FOOT And many in Highland Park will not venture onto the developers land

Any park that is available in the future is likely to get a great deal of use, But it needs to be Walkable from surrounding neighbourhoods

Daryl Wylie

LOC 2014 0190

Re Highland Golf Course redevelopment, Calgary Attn; The Mayor and City Councillors

This file contains 3 photos of ice formed during a cold snap in December 2016. The temperature was well below 0 deg. Celsius from Dec 04 to Dec17. The first video showing flowing water and the 2 photos were taken Dec 15, after a week of frigid temperatures. The third photo was taken Dec 21 after 3 days of warmer temperatures. The photo with the skater and the video were taken December 22 and shows flowing water and green plants in the springwater.

Environment Canada temperature and precipitation records for the month are included. The records show 7 millimeters of precipitation during the frigid spell and ice formation.

The City of Calgary planners and the Developer deny all natural features of this watercourse and wetland. Local residents know there is year round water in the valley, year after year. Locals also appreciate that there are many environmental services supplied by the valley despite most of the water being channeled. These include collecting and settling of excess stormwater ,maintenance of the grass, trees and shrubs, recharging groundwater and semi natural greenspace. The result of all this is that the wetlands are permanent, viable and would reclaim their natural area if they were not being drained.

Please consider this information as evidence of valuable natural features to be conserved. Thank You,

Daryl Wylie Highland Park Resident.

Daryl Wylie
MORE PHOTOS AND VIDEO TO COME

LOC 2014 0190



Government of Canada

Gouvernement du Canada

[Home](#) → [Environment and natural resources](#) → [Weather, Climate and Hazard](#) → [Past weather and climate](#) → [Historical Data](#)

Daily Data Report for December 2016

CALGARY INTL A ALBERTA

Latitude:	51°07'21.000" N
Longitude:	114°00'48.000" W
Elevation:	1,099.10 m
Climate ID:	3031092
WMO ID:	71877
TC ID:	YYC

DAY	Max Temp °C 	Min Temp °C 	Mean Temp °C 	Heat Deg Days 	Cool Deg Days 	Total Rain mm 	Total Snow cm 	Total Precip mm 	Snow on Grnd cm 	Dir of Max Gust 10's deg	Spd of Max Gust km/h
<u>01</u> ±	0.4	-5.0	-2.3	20.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.6	2	34	39
<u>02</u> ±	4.6	-10.0	-2.7	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	27	52
<u>03</u> ±	5.2	-4.9	0.2	17.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		27	46
<u>04</u> ±	-2.7	-11.1	-6.9	24.9	0.0	0.0	6.0	4.0	I	35	48
<u>05</u> ±	-10.7	-19.2	-15.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	34	46
<u>06</u> ±	-18.2	-21.4	-19.8	37.8	0.0	I	0.0	I	3	35	48
<u>07</u> ±	-18.6	-25.0	-21.8	39.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	34	33
<u>08</u> ±	-19.8	-26.7	-23.3	41.3	0.0	I	0.0	I	3		<31
<u>09</u> ±	-20.2	-24.4	-22.3	40.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.4	3	16	30
<u>10</u> ±	<u>M</u>	<u>-23.6E</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>		<u>M</u>	3	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>
<u>11</u> ±	-15.6	-23.7	-19.7	37.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	3	35	33
	Max	Min	Mean	Heat Dec	Cool Dec	Total	Total	Total	Snow on	Dir of Max	Spd of Max

DEC. DAYS	MAX	MIN	MEAN	Days	Days	Total	Total	Total	SNOW ON	Air of	Speed of MAX
	Temp °C	Temp °C	Temp °C	Days	Days	Rain mm	Snow cm	Precip mm	Grnd cm	Gust 10's deg	Gust km/h
12±	-9.6	-19.1	-14.4	32.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	31	37
13±	-8.7	-21.4	-15.1	33.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	32	46
14±	-9.1	-20.4	-14.8	32.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3		<31
15±	-15.7	-20.5	-18.1	36.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.4	3		<31
16±	-17.1	-25.7	-21.4	39.4	0.0	I	0.0	I	3		<31
17±	-6.9	-23.1	-15.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	28	50
18±	1.1	-8.2	-3.6	21.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	29	74
19±	2.0	-2.4	-0.2	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	28	87
20±	3.7	-3.8	-0.1	18.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	28	63
21±	5.0	-7.3	-1.2	19.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	29	56
22±	7.3	-3.6	1.9	16.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	I	26	59
23±	-2.3	-11.1	-6.7	24.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	I	11	33
24±	-7.3	-15.7	-11.5	29.5	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	10		<31
25±	-14.6	-22.4	-18.5	36.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	16	33	30
26±	-1.8	-22.8	-12.3	30.3	0.0	I	0.0	I	16	27	37
27±	1.1	-6.5	-2.7	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15	27	69
28											
Sum				755.3^	0.0^	6.0^	17.4^	20.2^			
Avg	-6.5^	-15.9^	-11.1^								
Xtrm	7.3^	-26.7^								28^	87^

Summary, average and extreme values are based on the data above.

Legend

- A = Accumulated
- C = Precipitation occurred, amount uncertain
- E = Estimated
- F = Accumulated and estimated
- L = Precipitation may or may not have occurred
- M = Missing
- N = Temperature missing but known to be > 0
- S = More than one occurrence

1000

LOC 2014 0190

Calgary River Valleys champions and engages the public in the protection, appreciation and stewardship of Calgary's rivers, creeks, wetlands and watershed resources.



CALGARY RIVER VALLEYS

IF YOU READ ONLY ONE THING

PLEASE READ THIS

Don W/ls

April 20, 2016

Attention: Calgary Planning Commission

Re: Proposed Highland Village Green LOC 2014-0190

Members of Calgary River Valleys were advised in 2014 of the proposed redevelopment of the Highland Valley Golf course and in February 2015 at the request of City Planning, submitted comments on the Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan. A copy of that letter is attached. While we received information that a response was prepared, to date Calgary River Valleys has not received a reply to this submission. The concerns and suggestions that were raised in CRV's 2015 letter have not been addressed and are still relevant to the most recent version of the proposed development of the site.

Recently we were advised that the proposal was proceeding and was to be recommended for approval by City Planning. We note from information released by City Planning through Calgary Planning Commission April 14, 2016 that the most recent revised proposal (March 1, 2016?) coming before Calgary Planning Commission involves enormous destruction of a natural landform, a natural watercourse, and natural wetlands. Such a development would forego and negate the wonderful opportunities that would be afforded with enlightened consolidation of parkland opportunities that should arise from the use of Environmental and Municipal Reserves and existing city owned lands.

Specifically, the opportunities to protect the creek corridor for immediate or future daylighting and all the benefits that will offer as described in our previous letter, need to be fully explored. Concerns regarding the treatment of the natural watercourse that runs through the valley of the subject lands remain outstanding. At the root of this are the circumstances or evaluation that has led to no Environmental Reserve (ER) lands having been identified or taken as part of this development proposal. There are two parts to this consideration;

a. Does the City have the opportunity or right to take Environmental Reserve lands?

We have been told, and we are advised by community residents and stakeholders that they have been told, by City Planning staff that the opportunity to take Environmental Reserve (ER) has been lost when lands were previously subdivided and Municipal Reserve land deferred. Recently and after enquiring for the details of those previous decisions, we were advised that in fact for most of the lands at issue, no past Reserves were taken or deferred and that deferred Municipal Reserve was taken in the past, only on the small area represented by Block 5. In accordance with Section 663(d) of the Municipal Government Act, if the Reserve lands were taken through a previous subdivision process the Subdivision Authority cannot take lands or cash in lieu in subsequent subdivisions. However, even for Block 5, if the Environmental Reserve lands were not taken for the contemplation that the lands would be used as a golf course, it would seem that opportunity should still exist when the lands would be intended for urban uses; the spirit and intent of the law would not otherwise be served. Now that the land is proposed for residential development, the taking of ER along the natural drainage course seems an appropriate and available consideration and option. Unfortunately, community residents and other stakeholders were left with the understanding that the City did not have option to take Environmental Reserves and that there are very limited opportunities to create open space and to protect natural features and functionalities and to optimize the open space. Therefore, stakeholders do not have the necessary information to



Calgary River Valleys
www.CalgaryRiverValleys.org
calgaryrivervalleys@outlook.com
403-268-4867

P.O. Box 2100, Station M, #64; Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5



make informed comment on the spectacular opportunities available in the redefining and redevelopment of this site.

b. Are there lands that would qualify as Environmental Reserve?

It was further suggested by City Planning staff that the ER taking is immaterial as there had been a determination by City Administration that the creek is not a “natural drainage course” for the purposes of taking ER under section 664(1) of the Municipal Government Act. It is acknowledged that the creek has been channelized and vaulted. However, the determination that the creek is not a natural drainage course would not seem to have taken into account Subsection 3(3) of the Public Lands Act, which states that the title to the bed and shore of naturally occurring watercourses are vested in the Crown and that a watercourse does not cease to become naturally occurring by reason of its water being diverted by human act. (References to this section can be found in point 2 of the CRV letter of February 2015.) We note that the application and plan *does not* refer to natural watercourse, creek, natural seeps. There is no question that the watercourse has contributed to forming the valley and that the watercourse remains and is still largely fed by natural springs/ seeps, and local precipitation. Many visits in the past, as golfers, residents and recreational users have confirmed the springs/ seeps and wetlands along the west and north of the valley. Similar natural flows also contribute in the upper reaches of this creek going back several kilometres to the south and west.

To date, we have not been able to obtain answers to many of the questions arising from this application to review among our members and partners. Certainly there are cost factors – much related to the Applicant’s intention to develop lower lands that could be protected parkland. Such parkland amenity would justify the much greater intensity of use proposed on the remaining lands and along the expected Centre St. transit oriented corridor. There are no other such opportunities of any significance along the proposed north LRT Green Line until West Nose Creek several kilometres north.

CRV members and partners responding to the application have also noted a very selective use of clauses from the Calgary Municipal Development Plan to justify the Applicant’s concept and City Planning support. We note that those clauses requesting respect and consideration for environmental assets and functionalities and of adjacent neighbourhoods have not been addressed. The longer term vision arising out of other planning exercises including ImagineCalgary and the BiodiverCity Strategy do not appear. A more comprehensive Redevelopment Plan would give a much more holistic planning approach.

Before any decision is made with regard to land use designation, Outline Plan, and subdivision, and before any decisions are made with regard to Environmental and Municipal Reserves, a full assessment of all of the background information, issues and opportunities should be made so that stakeholders, residents, Calgary Planning Commission, and City Council have the ability to make more informed decisions on these matters. Development of these lands deserves a much more comprehensive and sensitive planning approach that will ensure that the public park potential and natural functionalities are recovered and preserved.


We appreciate your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Steve Meadows,
President, Calgary River Valleys

Bill Morrison,
Chair, Watershed Policy and Planning Committee
Calgary River Valleys

cc: Shawn Small, Sr. Planner, Team Lead
CRV circulation





A FROG FOR THE 21ST CENTURY



Lots of saturated soil. Better under 10,000 more dumptrucks



A NICE STROLL OVER THORNCLIFFE CREEK
(SYMONS ROAD)

GREEN CONNECTIVITY FROM LA4COCK DRIVE
TO NOSE HILL
(Wildlife Corridor)



BLUE HYDRIC WETLAND SOIL ?

BLEM

Albrecht, Linda

From: E-mailservice [al.gibbs@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 11:15 AM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; ward; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; greenvviewcares@gmail.com; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com
Subject: LOC2014-0190 - Public Hearing on the Highland Park Golf Course Proposed Redevelopment

City Clerk Pls include this with file LOC2014-0190 - Public Hearing on the Highland Park Golf Course Proposed Redevelopment

I am **opposed** to the amended plan for the Highland Park Golf Course.

I would like the city to approve the Top 5 Proposes from the Highland Park Community Association (CA)

1. Strict Land Use Bylaws (see detailed proposal from the CA)
2. Greater Green Space (see detailed proposal from the CA)
3. Support Preservation of Existing Topography (see detailed proposal from the CA)
4. Support Existing Community (see detailed proposal from the CA)
5. Responsible Development Plan (see detailed proposal from the CA)

Specifically I am opposed to:

- The building heights - too high and do not fit with the adjacent community
- Loss of green space (trees, grass, natural watercourses, springs, wetlands, wildlife) and destroying the
- Changes to the valley and any adjacent green spaces (Greenvview dog park) in terms of future storm water treatment options
- Any approval the land use change prior to a formal water study being complete not to mention the significant concerns about flooding with the loss of the valley as a whole
- The large slope adaptive design that destroys the natural features of the valley

Thank you
Alan Gibbs (member and resident of Thorncliffe/Green)
808 Thornhill DR NW Calgary AB T2K 2S3

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -4 PM 4:09
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Albrecht, Linda

From: H el ene [qchelene@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 1:04 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Highland Park hearing
Attachments: Highland Park Hearing July 4_HDussault.pdf

Hi

Attached to this email there is a document concerning the Highland Park land use redesignation.

Thanks for considering the document for the public hearing in January 2017.

Helene Dussault
24 Laycock Dr.

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -4 PM 4:09
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S



City of Calgary Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan

June 22, 2016

Helene Dussault M.Sc., P.Biol., R.P.Bio.

This document presents concerns, comments, and recommendations related to the Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan (the Project) (Bylaw 139D2016 to Bylaw 144D2016). The Project speaks of redesignate most of the surface area from Special Purpose - Recreation to DC Direct Control District.

The Highland Park is within the Nose Creek Watershed (Highland Park Community) where different fish species including White and Longnose Sucker, Lake Chub, and Brown Trout, a sportfish are found (Trout Unlimited Canada). Highland Park golf course was built on a small tributary running from Confederation Park to Nose Creek. The golf course land is a typical prairie ravine with an oversized, steep walled valley containing a small intermittent stream. The creek was vaulted under the golf course land in the late 1950's through an underground storm water conveyance however, along the valley bottom naturally occurring low areas contain standing water during rainy periods which floods on occasion (Highland Park Community).

Even though the creek was vaulted, we still can easily observe multiple drainages and wetted areas mostly in the northwestern portion of the Project area containing vegetation characteristic to wetlands such as Carex (see photos). Some of these ponds have the potential to be classified as wetlands and should be assessed and classified by professionals based on the *Classification of Natural Ponds and Lakes in the Glaciated Prairie Region* (Stewart and Kantrud 1971) before any alteration of the area. It is important to consider threats to wetlands in the context of the entire watershed. They play an important role in an ecosystem as they prevent flooding and improve water quality by filtering the surface water. The water flowing through multiple drainages in Highland Park has the potential to be filtered before entering in the Nose Creek.

The Municipal Government Act recommended guidelines for Environmental Reserve (ER) setbacks as a means of preventing pollution of a waterbody (Community Services and Utilities & Environmental). Stewart and Kantrud Class 3-6 wetlands are considered to be Environmental Reserve Wetlands under the Wetland Conservation Plan and should have a 30m base setback applied to them. According to the Water Act, no wetland may be drained or altered without first receiving authorization to do so from the province (aep, 2013).

The Highland Park represents an ecosystem where birds of prey and Richardson's ground squirrel (also named gopher) interact and bring a positive impact on the area. Gopher hibernates in complex underground burrows which have an important role in soil formation and provides habitat for a variety of species.



Numerous wetlands in Calgary have already been modified by previous anthropogenic in the agricultural and infrastructural sectors which inhibit normal wetland functions and abilities such as erosion control and habitat diversity. The Highland Park Land Use and Outline Plan identifies the planned land use constraints and states that the wetlands

and drainages noticed on site will be impacted. Impoundment occurs when the natural movement of water is disrupted by an activity which creates a confinement of water. Some of the main activities planned in the Project can negatively impact wetlands including but not limited to draining, and filling wetland areas for conversion to residential lands and urban development.

A City of Calgary's study reported that 90% of wetlands were lost to development (*City of Calgary, 2016*). The City members has noticed that the Nose Creek has experienced degradation to its water quality and riparian areas, as well as an increase in water flow. The Laycock project was then settled up to restore the wetlands in Laycock Park and help addressing some of these concerns. Laycock Park was chosen as a wetland compensation site for several reasons including the fact that it is part of the Nose Creek watershed and that restoration will help address water quality concerns in Nose Creek. By having wetlands, Highland Park should be considered as an asset in the water quality improvement of Nose Creek and not as a valley that can be fill to accommodate a promoter in a massive residential and commercial development. Highland Park represents a substantial portion of community green-space and the beautiful natural scenery provided an important community asset, a particular attention should be brought to it. Considering all the benefits brought by the Highland Park and the particular attention and interest of the entire community scope to the park, the City of Calgary should reject a residential and commercial development of such a magnitude.

Best regards,

Helene Dussault, M.Sc., P.Biol., R.P.Bio.



References

Alberta Environment and Park (AEP), Alberta Wetland Policy, 2013. aep.alberta.ca consulted June 2016.

City of Calgary. <http://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/Parks/Pages/Planning-and-Operations/Protecting-Calgarys-wetlands.aspx> consulted June 2016.

Community Services and Utilities & Environmental, 2007. Community Services and Utilities & Environmental Protection Report to UE2007-15 The SPC on Utilities and Environment Page 1 of 2 2007 April 25. http://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/Parks/Documents/Planning-and-Operations/Natural-Areas-and-Wetlands/environmental_reserve_setback_policy.pdf?noredirect=1 consulted June 2016.

Highland Park Community, Highland Park Statement of Significance Notes. www.highlandparkcommunity.ca/hpca consulted June 2016.

Stewart, R.E. and H.A. Kantrud, 1971. Classification of Natural Ponds and Lakes in the Glaciated Prairie Region. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C., USA. Resource Publication 92. 57 pp.

Trout Unlimited Canada, 2010. Nose Creek Fisheries Investigations, 2010. Trout Unlimited Canada Technical Report No. AB-025. 8 Pages.

Photos



Albrecht, Linda

From: monique gibbs [moniquegibbs@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:45 AM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Highland Park Community Association; Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison - Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14
Subject: LOC2014-0190 - Public Hearing on the Highland Park Golf Course Proposed Redevelopment

Hi City Clerk,

Please include my opposition to LOC2014-0190 (Highland Park Golf Course Proposed Redevelopment) as proposed (amended outline plan).

I feel the best plan was the study that was conducted (Charette)

*it outlined best practices - buildings 4-8 stories - max 4 stories ideal
increased park space by the removal of 3 development sites
no "drive through" road way in the area (no road through the park)*

But if I have to settle I believe the Highland Park Community Association (CA)'s Top 5 proposals should be the redevelopment not the proposed plan.

Highland Park Community Association (CA)'s Top 5 proposals

1) Strict Land Use Bylaw

- ax the 10% relaxation clause (ie remove any relaxation clause from all DC bylaws) - I do not want the developer having free range to do what ever they please
- reduce density cap so developer cannot transfer density from parcel to parcel
- revise building cap 3-6 inclusive from 6m to 16m which was recommended by Community Wide Planning Function and Green Line TOD Team

2) Greater Green Space

- approve an investigation to purchase land on the Highland Park to support a greater amount of park space for our community. To save money

this can be done in conjunction with the regional water study needed to and storm water management system which could cost approximately \$15M

3) Support the preservation of Existing Topography

- preserve the natural and physical features of an area - trees, grass, creek, watercourse, springs, wetlands, and wildlife that live there
- less fill with more effective development for both Highland Village Green and future Green Line development
- require slope adaptive developments (on south side) where the plan meets with the low density residences
- reduce the road width - which will reduce fill AND reduce trees destroyed. This will increase green space with no additional cost to developer.

Approximately 20 linear meters could be given back to the community as greenspace. A Win, Win situation.

4)Support the Existing Community

-require the community enhancement contribution by the developer.

5)Responsible Development Plan

-Approve land use for Parcel 1 (on the east side of the Centre Street). BUT hold off on the remainder of the site approval until the investigation of land purchase and completion of regional water study completed.

-require the Developer to have a staged development plan so the developer does not strip the land and leave it barren for 15-20 years including retention of

perimeter mature trees as a transition

-Require vehicular access to development parcels provided by Highland Drive by adding a clause to each DC Bylaw stating vehicular access must be from Highland Drive

cc our mayor Naheed Nenshi, and Councillors: Ward Sutherland, Joe Magliocca, Jim Stevenson, our Councillor Sean Chu, Ray Jones, Richard Pootmans, Druh Farrell,

Evan Woolley, Gian-Carlo Carra, Andre Chabot, Brian Pincott, Shane Keating, Diane Colley-Urquhart, Peter Demong

Thank you

concerned citizen and community member Thorncliffe Greenview (member # G99)

Monique Gibbs

808 Thornhill Dr NW Calgary, AB T2K 2S3

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -4 AM 11:49
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: Donna Stefura [dstefura@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 6:17 PM
To: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; City Clerk; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1
Cc: Greenview Cares; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com
Subject: Highland Gold Course Re-Development
Attachments: Council Thankyou.docx

Regarding the Highland Park Golf Course re-development

The Right Worshipful Mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, and Council Members

I would like to thank-you for discussing the Highland Park Development issue at your council meeting on July 5, 2016. The council process is quite complex and involved a lot of legalese and parliamentary procedure but when you finally got down to the meat of the issue it was nice to see that, most of you, actually do have your citizen's interests at heart. Most of you do. Two councilor's, however, are unfortunately, lacking in this virtue. Councilor Woolley was ill informed and offensive as he implied that all we ever want to do is stop any and all development from occurring. We are not all NIMBY's, as he implied at the last council meeting of this matter on July 5, 2016. If he had done his homework and read any of the letters put forth to the council he would have known that that is NOT what we are asking at all. All we are asking for is that it include other amenities that would support and, therefore, better our communities. Yes this includes park land, but that is a City initiative, too, isn't it? We just want a balance.

The second councilor who needs to understand the development site better is Councilor Keating. The Green Line is indeed integral to the plans of this area and vice versa. To say that it has nothing to do with it is misguided.

Thanks to Councilor Demong for asking for a reconsideration of Mayor Nenshi's Vote. I must say His Worship Mayor Nenshi has a lot on his hands having to deal with some of his councilors. He proved to be the only one on the Council that saw no sense in discussing this issue until a water study can be completed.

The Council needs to understand that we are all on the same side. You - the City – and we - the Community Members. We all want a better community. Who would know better on how to accomplish that than the community members themselves? We understand that we live in an ever growing city and that means accepting growing density. All we want is thoughtful balance of density, infrastructure and greenspace to support our growing communities.

Donna
Stefura



Highwood Resident

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Regarding the Highland Park Golf Course re-development

The Right Worshipful Mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, and Council Members

I would like to thank-you for discussing the Highland Park Development issue at your council meeting on July 5, 2016. The council process is quite complex and involved a lot of legalese and parliamentary procedure but when you finally got down to the meat of the issue it was nice to see that, most of you, actually do have your citizen's interests at heart.

Most of you do. Two councilor's, however, are unfortunately, lacking in this virtue. Councilor Woolley was ill informed and offensive as he implied that all we ever want to do is stop any and all development from occurring. We are not all NIMBY's , as he implied at the last council meeting of this matter on July 5, 2016. If he had done his homework and read any of the letters put forth to the council he would have known that that is NOT what we are asking at all. All we are asking for is that it include other amenities that would support and, therefore, better our communities. Yes this includes park land, but that is a City initiative, too, isn't it? We just want a balance.

The second councilor who needs to understand the development site better is Councilor Keating. The Green Line is indeed integral to the plans of this area and vice versa. To say that it has nothing to do with it is misguided.

Thanks to Councilor Demong for asking for a reconsideration of Mayor Nenshi's Vote. I must say His Worship Mayor Nenshi has a lot on his hands having to deal with some of his councilors. He proved to be the only one on the Council that saw no sense in discussing this issue until a water study can be completed.

The Council needs to understand that we are all on the same side. You - the City – and we - the Community Members. We all want a better community. Who would know better on how to accomplish that than the community members themselves? We understand that we live in an ever growing city and that means accepting growing density. All we want is thoughtful balance of density, infrastructure and greenspace to support our growing communities.

Donna Stefura

Highwood Resident

Albrecht, Linda

From: Donna Stefura [dstefura@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 6:19 PM
To: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; City Clerk; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenviewcares@gmail.com
Subject: Highland Gold Course re-development
Attachments: Highland Golf Course.docx

Regarding the Highland Village Green re-development plan.

The Right Worshipful Mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, and Council Members,

First off, let me express how disappointed I am at the lack of communication the city has shown to its community associations. I have been involved in our Highwood Community Association for 17 years, been at almost every CA meeting, so imagine my surprise when our neighbouring Community Association President, Elise Bieche of Highland Park attends our meeting and informs us about a development that will have a direct impact on our community! We had heard nothing of this from our city representatives. The traffic increase, alone, is cause for concern. We already have speed and traffic issues through our neighbourhood and, at the level of density planned for this site, the issues will increase exponentially. Why weren't we informed? Perhaps the city was hoping we wouldn't notice.

That said, the purpose of this letter is not to outright oppose the development of the former Highland Park Golf Course; it is to express my disappointment at an opportunity to build something that could be awesome but, instead, being squandered in lieu of a density injection. Yes, something needs to be done with the site, as wonderfully natural as it is, nobody thought it would last. What I didn't expect was a total annihilation of all the beauty of the area.

The attraction for residents living in the surrounding communities and those wishing to join our communities is, well, best described in the names of our communities themselves;

- **HighWOOD**
- **Highland PARK**
- **GREENview**
- **THORNcliffe** (ok, admittedly, that one's a bit of a stretch, but you get my point)

The thought of the developer planning on removing all those beautiful 60 year old, mature, heritage trees is heartbreaking. As Our Honourable Mayor Nenshi said himself "They are members of our community". We've experienced enough of them destroyed during last 'Snowtember'. Replacing those legacy trees with hundreds of saplings is not the same, it only sounds good on paper. It will take another generation to see them the way the current trees are now.

As a community member, I take pride in my community. I often exclaim that we live in one of the best communities in the City of Calgary. Our trees, our cohesiveness, our sense of community are built on the integrity of our surroundings. We are the poster child of the City's initiative of Great Neighbourhoods. What I see is an opportunity to build on that concept by developing the former Highland Golf Course into a multi-use area that would service the surrounding communities. Not just condos. I would like to see more greenspace to walk my dog, more restaurants and coffee shops where I could meet my friends and family, more places to connect with our neighbouring community residents. I would hope that our City would support this; after all, this is how to build great neighbourhoods and a great city.

I would, also, love to see Confederation Creek, a tributary of Nose Creek which runs beneath this valley, restored to its full glory as it is in Confederation Park and, ideally, bordered by those beautifully mature trees. The children of our communities need natural areas to thrive, however, the developers nebulous and shifting plans are, by no means, providing that.

Please reconsider allowing this plan to go through as it is. I ask you to come to the area and see for yourself the potential that this great space offers. More thought needs to be given to this development. This mistake cannot be undone!

Sincerely,

Donna Stefura
Highwood Resident

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 1:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Regarding the Highland Village Green re-development plan.

The Right Worshipful Mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, and Council Members,

First off, let me express how disappointed I am at the lack of communication the city has shown to its community associations. I have been involved in our Highwood Community Association for 17 years, been at almost every CA meeting, so imagine my surprise when our neighbouring Community Association President, Elise Bieche of Highland Park attends our meeting and informs us about a development that will have a direct impact on our community! We had heard nothing of this from our city representatives. The traffic increase, alone, is cause for concern. We already have speed and traffic issues through our neighbourhood and, at the level of density planned for this site, the issues will increase exponentially. Why weren't we informed? Perhaps the city was hoping we wouldn't notice.

That said, the purpose of this letter is not to outright oppose the development of the former Highland Park Golf Course; it is to express my disappointment at an opportunity to build something that could be awesome but, instead, being squandered in lieu of a density injection. Yes, something needs to be done with the site, as wonderfully natural as it is, nobody thought it would last. What I didn't expect was a total annihilation of all the beauty of the area.

The attraction for residents living in the surrounding communities and those wishing to join our communities is, well, best described in the names of our communities themselves;

- High**WOOD**
- Highland **PARK**
- **GREEN**view
- **THORN**cliffe (ok, admittedly, that one's a bit of a stretch, but you get my point)

The thought of the developer planning on removing all those beautiful 60 year old, mature, heritage trees is heartbreaking. As Our Honourable Mayor Nenshi said himself "They are members of our community". We've experienced enough of them destroyed during last 'Snowtember'. Replacing those legacy trees with hundreds of saplings is not the same, it only sounds good on paper. It will take another generation to see them the way the current trees are now.

As a community member, I take pride in my community. I often exclaim that we live in one of the best communities in the City of Calgary. Our trees, our cohesiveness, our sense of community are built on the integrity of our surroundings. We are the poster child of the City's initiative of Great Neighbourhoods. What I see is an opportunity to build on that concept by developing the former Highland Golf Course into a multi-use area that would service the surrounding communities. Not just condos. I would like to see more greenspace to walk my dog, more restaurants and coffee shops where I could meet my friends and family, more places to connect with our neighbouring community residents. I would hope that our City would support this; after all, this is how to build great neighbourhoods and a great city.

I would, also, love to see Confederation Creek, a tributary of Nose Creek which runs beneath this valley, restored to its full glory as it is in Confederation Park and, ideally, bordered by those beautifully mature trees. The children of our communities need natural areas to thrive, however, the developers nebulous and shifting plans are, by no means, providing that.

Please reconsider allowing this plan to go through as it is. I ask you to come to the area and see for yourself the potential that this great space offers. More thought needs to be given to this development. This mistake cannot be undone!

Sincerely,

Donna Stefura

Highwood Resident

Albrecht, Linda

From: Donna Stefura [dstefura@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 6:21 PM
To: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; City Clerk; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; Greenview Cares
Subject: Highland Place development
Attachments: Highland redevelopment Traffic issues.docx

Highland Park Golf Course re-development

Traffic concerns

The Right Worshipful Mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, and Council Members

The communities surrounding this land have seen a lot of density injection over the past decade. We have already absorbed many infills and secondary suites. What we have not seen being developed is the infrastructure to support this density infusion. This is the City's job, your job. Our community of Highwood has not heard anything of any plans to address the imminent problem of increased traffic, for example. I don't need to be an official city planner to realize that with more density comes more traffic and parking requirements. Sadly the proposed new Green Line will not fully mitigate this influx of people.

The following is an example of the fear of what is in store for us as residents.

Just a few of years ago, a project was finally completed in my neighbourhood of Highwood involving a little bump out on 40th Avenue. It was requested due to the increased traffic and behavior of that traffic using this road as vehicles use it to cut through to Northmount Drive or 14th Avenue. Our residents, including children walking to their designated elementary school, were having trouble crossing so a traffic modification was requested, fought for, actually, to manage the traffic so pedestrians could cross safely. IT TOOK 6 YEARS FOR THAT PROJECT TO GET DONE. My child and his friend were almost hit at that intersection walking to school, and it still took 6 years of petitions and prodding to get the city to do something.

We are not looking forward to having to fight for each traffic calming measure that will be needed that this development is sure to produce, again.

All we want is for you and your council members to be forward thinking and realize that this development will impact more communities that just Highland Park, and to prepare us for it.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Donna
Stefura



Highwood resident

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Highland Park Golf Course re-development

Traffic concerns

The Right Worshipful Mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, and Council Members

The communities surrounding this land have seen a lot of density injection over the past decade. We have already absorbed many infills and secondary suites. What we have not seen being developed is the infrastructure to support this density infusion. This is the City's job, your job. Our community of Highwood has not heard anything of any plans to address the imminent problem of increased traffic, for example. I don't need to be an official city planner to realize that with more density comes more traffic and parking requirements. Sadly the proposed new Green Line will not fully mitigate this influx of people.

The following is an example of the fear of what is in store for us as residents.

Just a few of years ago, a project was finally completed in my neighbourhood of Highwood involving a little bump out on 40th Avenue. It was requested due to the increased traffic and behavior of that traffic using this road as vehicles use it to cut through to Northmount Drive or 14th Avenue. Our residents, including children walking to their designated elementary school, were having trouble crossing so a traffic modification was requested, fought for, actually, to manage the traffic so pedestrians could cross safely. IT TOOK 6 YEARS FOR THAT PROJECT TO GET DONE. My child and his friend were almost hit at that intersection walking to school, and it still took 6 years of petitions and prodding to get the city to do something.

We are not looking forward to having to fight for each traffic calming measure that will be needed that this development is sure to produce, again.

All we want is for you and your council members to be forward thinking and realize that this development will impact more communities that just Highland Park, and to prepare us for it.

Thank-you for consideration.

Donna Stefura

Highwood resident

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Albrecht, Linda

From: Patrick Saunders [psaun@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 4:08 PM
To: City Clerk; Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; 13@calgary.ca; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenviewcares@gmail.com
Subject: Highland Village Green LOC 2014-0190

January 4, 2017

Attention: Calgary Planning Commission Members

RE: Proposed Highland Village Green LOC 2014-0190

I am writing with regards to Land Use Amendment LOC 2014=1090 January 16 2017. I am concerned about the proposed development for several reasons.

The 2000 plus new dwellings, including high rise towers and building heights not compatible with the surrounding area and the addition of possibly 4000 new residents in a small area already under stress This will double the number of residence in Highland Park in half the space. Current traffic congestion, density of the development, future roads/ upgrades and future Green Line construction details have not been completed. This makes no sense and will only cause more and permanent traffic congestion.

The creeks, watershed, natural occurring wetlands and floodplain have not been properly assessed or even considered. The green space, 500 mature trees, Confederation Creek, the associated wetlands and natural occurring springs will be lost. The current formal water study underway needs to be completed prior to any land change approvals. This area already provides a huge benefit to the City as a natural flood plain and is part of the West Nose Creek waterway and watershed. Perhaps this would be a perfect opportunity to daylight Confederation Creek.

I am asking that you not move this forward for approval until all studies and all information is complete, accurate and factual.

Sincerely
Patrick Saunders
6323 Travois Crescent NW
Calgary, AB T2K 3S8

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:52
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: Jeanne Kimber [jkimber1@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 4:11 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Letter to Mayor and Council re: Highland Park Golf Course development
Attachments: Letter to Council Jan2017.pdf

Please find attached my letter to Mayor Nenshi and the Councillors pertaining to the development proposal for the former Highland Park Golf Course. This matter comes before council on Jan. 16, 2017.

Thank you

D. Jeanne Kimber
418 – 36 Avenue NW
Calgary, AB
[Jkimber1@telus.net](mailto:jkimber1@telus.net)

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:52
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

January 4, 2017

City Clerk #8007
The City of Calgary
P.O. Box 2100, Station "M"
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

RECEIVED

2017 JAN -5 AM 7:52

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

RE: HIGHLAND PARK GOLF COURSE REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL
Land Use Bylaws 29D2017 through to 33D2017
Council Meeting January 16, 2017

Dear Mayor Nenshi and Council:

I am a 31-year resident of Highland Park, a member of the Community Association Board of Directors, and member of the Association's Planning Committee. As such, I have a vested interest in the well-being and revitalization of my community. I have followed the saga of the Highland Village Green redevelopment proposal with considerable interest, but also with concern.

As I mentioned in my letter to you dated June 22, 2016, I support densification efforts to constrain inefficient urban sprawl while improving housing diversity and choice. I note that the Draft document *Developed Areas Growth & Change 2016* ranks Highland Park 6th on a list of communities having the greatest potential for additional capacity. However, densification in and of itself does not necessarily lead to improvements in urban quality of life. At issue here is how the proposed development will affect the quality of life of the present and future residents of Highland Park. As you may be aware, the community is already undergoing densification through infill development. In 2013, Highland Park had a population of 3,737. According to the 2016 census figures posted on the City of Calgary website, the population is now 4014. That is a 7% increase over three years. The proposed Highland Village Green development will theoretically double the population of Highland Park over 15-20 years. We want to ensure that during that period of time, the development does not adversely impact the quality of life of those who already live in the community.

Characteristics of the Revised Proposed Development:

The Highland Green development proposes the construction of 2070 housing units over a 15-20 year buildout. The built form is all multi-family. I was pleased to note some improvements in the revised outline plan, including a reduction of building height on Parcel 10 (now included in DC Site 3), and the inclusion of some commercial usage on Parcel 7 (DC Site 5). It was also gratifying to see some small increase in park / green space. However, there are still significant concerns with the outline plan and the proposed DC bylaws. Some of the concerns listed below were also mentioned in my letter of June 22nd.

Concerns with the Project:

As many other people in the community have already stated, concerns with the project include:

- Lack of overall area plan – developer's plan is not a substitute for city/community area plans
- Size and scale of the development would nearly double the present number of housing units and potentially more than double the current population

- Road access point onto Centre St. -- Green Line tracks run up the middle of street and the underground portal is very close to the road access. Will the road access onto Centre Street be a "Right In, Right Out" only arrangement?
- Road access point onto 40th Avenue – Is this still intended to be a Roundabout? Please note that the location is at the bottom of a hill and on a fairly tight curve
- Disruption to nearby residents through a 15-year buildout – trucks, dust, noise, weeds
- Lack of proper acknowledgement of the wetlands in the valley. Apparently as "Class 2" wetlands, they do not require or deserve protection, yet the regional water resource study has yet to be completed. The picture below shows the wetland area in the northwesterly portion of the property. As of June 20th, there was water actively flowing in a small stream from out of the ground and down into this wet area.



I observed until a short while ago that a considerable amount of work was done to improve storm water drainage into Confederation Creek, over by 10th Street. All the storm water feeds into this natural watercourse, which then continues in the vault underground the Highland Park golf course site. There are, in fact, several streams running underground that converge on this site. Therefore, it makes much more sense to defer decisions about some of the parcels until the regional water resource study has been completed.

Concerns with Draft Land Use Bylaws:

- No maximum Density stipulated in any of the proposed revised DC bylaws
- The proposed bylaws reference established land use zones with respect to permitted and discretionary uses and other zoning rules unless stated otherwise in the DC bylaws e.g. Bylaw 32D2017 for DC Site 4 references Multi-Residential – Medium Profile (M-2) in the Land Use Bylaw 1P2007. However, the maximum building height proposed in DC bylaw 32D2017 is 20m. It would seem more logical, and also more acceptable to have structures

in DC Site 4 also conform to the maximum building height (16m) allowed under M-2 in the Land Use Bylaw.

- Conversely, by not specifying the FAR for each DC Site, the maximum FAR allowed defaults to that specified in 1P2007 for the relevant land use. For example, a FAR of 3.0 for Parcels 4,5, 8 and 9 (based on M-2 designation) would allow densities more than double what the developer has indicated. Specifying a lower FAR in the DC bylaws would provide greater certainty that the development will not “mushroom” in size and impact.
- 10% Relaxation of building heights and setbacks allowed by Development Authority (subject to Sections 31, 36 of Land Use Bylaw) provide no certainty for community residents. I was told that the usual relaxation granted is in the order of 2%-3%, therefore a 10% relaxation cap is virtually meaningless. Consider that a 20m tall building could be allowed to extend to 22m with a 10% relaxation. Those additional 2m could well cause adverse impacts to the residents in the adjoining low-density residential areas (i.e. obstructed views, greater shadowing)
- Tree Replacement specifies quantity/density only, not caliper

I was pleased to see the Design Guidelines for the development proposal, which include criteria such as the need for a sun/shadow study for buildings greater than 4 stories or the use of step-backs to prevent a monolithic appearance of tall buildings. However, it is noted that Design Guidelines are simply that – guidelines – and have no statutory standing.


What I am Asking Council to Do:

- Require development of this land to integrate holistically with Local Area Plans, Municipal Development Plan, water resource management best practices, and community context
- Strengthen bylaws governing development by removing the 10% cap on allowable relaxations to building heights and setbacks. There should be either no relaxations allowed on building heights and setbacks or they should be specified at a much smaller percentage. Also strengthen the DC bylaws by specifying maximum densities or Floor Area Ratios for the parcels 3 to 11
- Apply the to-be-published Developed Areas Guidebook to all developed areas, not just ones that have existing Local Area Plans

I certainly agree with other residents and the community association that the DC Bylaw 29D2017 pertaining to DC Site 1 (Parcel 1) could be approved and allowed to proceed, pending strengthening of the other DC bylaws and also pending the water resource study.

I look forward to the Council meeting on January 16, when I trust that these concerns will be given due consideration.

Respectfully submitted



D. Jeanne Kimber
418 – 36 Avenue NW
jkimber1@telus.net OR 403-230-8177

Albrecht, Linda

From: sm313735@telus.net
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 4:18 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: LOC2014-0190
Attachments: LOC2014-0190 Letter from Shelley McConnell & James Annand.docx

Please find attached a letter to be entered into the public record for the Public Hearing of Jan. 16, 2017 re: Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -6 AM 7:43
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

RECEIVED

RE: LOC2014-0190

2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54

January 4, 2017

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Dear Mayor Nenshi and Calgary City Councillors,

I am writing to you today regarding the proposed development of the Highland Golf Course.

First, I would like to thank you for your work on this file. I appreciate you reading all of our letters –with a special thank you to those who responded – and taking the time to research this important issue so you can make an informed decision that will impact all Calgarians for generations to come.

When I attended the open house on December 4, I was happy to see that the plan had improved. However, I think that it can be better. The vision that came from the 40 Avenue charette attests to that. Calgarians spoke out and were engaged at the charette, and deserve a better plan.

The Highland Park Community Association has brought to your attention some very real and valid concerns that are on the minds of many residents, including myself. In addition, there are serious environmental concerns regarding the proposed plan. I hoped that when the hearing was deferred in July that these concerns would be addressed, but that does not appear to be the case.

At one time, the site was deemed undevelopable due to the wetlands and natural springs. The wetlands and springs are still there. The creek running under the site, while currently vaulted, is still there. What has changed that it is now viable for development? Stripping and filling a wetland is wrong. It removes the habitat for the plants, animals, birds, etc. that live there. The filling of this wetland would be a blemish on a parks and pathway system that, as a lifelong Calgarian, I am currently very proud of.

Why not make the creek, natural springs and wetlands a feature of the development? A natural water feature. It could be a beautiful and environmentally responsible feature that the community could be proud of.

Additionally, the stormwater study is not yet completed. Why is this issue being voted on now when all the relevant data is not yet available?

This issue is very important to me. I do not live in Highland Park. I live in Highwood, across the street from the golf course. Since we were made aware of the proposed development, my husband and I have attended all the city-led open houses, as many of the community-led engagement sessions as we could, as well as Calgary Planning Commission meetings, the charette and the July 2016 public hearing.

In 2015, like thousands of Calgarians, my job was eliminated. In June of 2016, I was offered a new job. The job would start the week before the public hearing regarding this development. Despite not having worked for seven months, before I had even started working, I asked for a day off to attend the hearing. My new employer was very gracious and said yes.

I am currently recovering from a concussion injury. Unfortunately, it means that I won't be able to attend the January 16 public hearing or watch the live stream. My husband is planning to attend for both of us. Despite this injury, I wanted to take the time to express my concerns and perspective on this important issue. It is not a Highland Park issue. It is a Calgary issue, and one that will impact generations to come.

I hope that when my husband comes home on January 16, he will be able to tell me that City Council truly listened to Calgarians' concerns.

Thank you again for your time and attention.

Heather Knorr

Albrecht, Linda

From: Chris Carroll [ccarroll52@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 12:53 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: LOC2014-0190 Highland Park Re-Development Proceedings
Attachments: HP Jan 2017.odt

Please submit the attached letter to Council before the proceedings to be held January 16th.
Thank you!

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:55
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

January 4 2017

TO: Mayor and Councilors of the City of Calgary

RE: Highland Park Watershed proposed area re-development

LOC2014-0190

I fully support the idea of *Low Impact Development* - an environmentally healthy plan of maintaining the ecological integrity of a natural area with a building vision that fully realizes the concept.

I firmly believe our city has the ability to be a leading edge force in the international, ever- growing sustainable design movement; and that the projected development of Highland Greens should and indeed, must reflect this mentality.

Such Slope adaptive buildings-as were shown in the initial sessions of the developer's first "Re-Imagining" presentations to the Community reflected this...the present designs most definitely do not.

I continue to be dismayed by the city's approach thus far to how it seems to consistently de-value the resiliency of, and benefits inherent within an existing natural watershed area...Also, how it underestimates the possible future negative physical effects of building structures within such an area by lack of proper assessment.

I believe it would be in the best interest of all concerned to wait upon approving the start of on-site construction until full assessment of the city *Regional Waterways / Stormwater Study* (now slated to be submitted in early 2018) and its impact on this particular watershed of Confederation Creek- has been credibly and critically, evaluated.

Special attention must be paid to alleviate future water problems, so that appropriate, long-term safeguards, needed remediations and possible ameliorations be put in place before any type of building goes up.

My above concern has been reinforced, most recently, by a walk I took in the former Golf Course just before Christmas.

The Office of the City Clerk has an aerial view of our city from 1924. The view of what will become Highland Park Golf Course shows the flow of Confederation Creek and an alluvial fan-shaped image by it.

Near this spot, my husband and I saw, and he digitally recorded, groundwater- a possible spring?- that had seeped onto the surface and formed a distinctive ice pond similar in shape to that recorded on the city's 1924 area map - that of an alluvial fan.

I took a photo of a skater on it that day; which a friend later uploaded on Twitter.

We have digital images of the above mentioned occurrences related to a living watershed, which we intend to post more of on social media, some photos of which have been submitted for Council's perusal.

Christina L. Carroll
clcarroll52@yahoo.com

4315 2 St NW

Calgary Alberta T2K 0Z2

403-277-9978

Albrecht, Linda

From: JD [deeregrp@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 11:14 PM
To: justin.trudeau@parl.gov.ca; kent.hehr@parl.gov.ca; calgary.klein@assembly.ab.ca; premier@gov.ab.ca; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenviewcares@gmail.com; Office of the Mayor; City Clerk; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Crowshoe, Lorna M.; purvisb@telus.net; nturner@cbe.ab.ca
Subject: FW: Possible Reconciliation Opportunity?

Hi Readers

Instead of cc I am forwarding what I have already sent. This project is a great chance to “walk the talk” and acknowledge collective goals!

Regards,
J M Deere

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:55
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

From: JD [mailto:deeregrp@telus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:51 PM
To: 'chris@hiddenstory.ca'
Subject: Possible Reconciliation Opportunity?

Dear Chris (and Cowboy Smithx)

I enjoyed and benefitted greatly from your production “An Elder in the Making”. I wonder if you know about the Highland Park Valley rezoning and redevelopment proposal coming before the City of Calgary Council on January 16, 2017? I feel you can offer much insight on the cultural significance of this land to this region’s First Nations.

The site contains a confluence of 4 creeks which run from Nose Hill to Nose Creek, within a steep-sided valley that has not seen heavy development since 1959. Some of the hillsides around the former golf course still have blooming crocuses each spring, and grasses and wildflowers that are prevalent on Nose Hill are scattered throughout this parcel.

Since the valley was farmed using old techniques before it became a golf course, and then never investigated for evidence of First Nation’s residency, I believe this site has great potential for significant findings. I met with Lorna Crowshoe, of the CAUAC, in December and she agrees that this valley has cultural and possibly archeological value.

The “White Goose Flying” Report, published in May 2016, expresses that “archeological sites are not historical, but rather active sites that connect place to culture, language, history and relationships to ancestral knowledge, all via the land itself.” Even without artifacts- and I believe many can be found – this valley qualifies as sacred ground.

The City of Calgary’s Cultural Landscape Policy attempts to acknowledge that “cultural landscapes are vital to contemporary society; they contribute to great communities by enhancing character, identity and a sense of place.” However, the City’s pro-densification strategy is pushing development in the Highland Park Valley before any investigation of its importance takes place. In fact the developer wants to fill the valley flat, and the Calgary Planning Commission has already given their approval.

I sincerely hope that you have the time to consider the implications of this project in conjunction with the White Goose Flying Report and the Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

Although this 40 acre piece of land is small, its value to our shared collective identity and connection to the land, air, water and climate is in no way trivial.

On January 16, 2017 the City of Calgary is holding a public meeting. Thank you for your reflection on this matter.

Sincerely,
J M Deere

Albrecht, Linda

From: Andrea [nerdgirl@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:57 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Highland Park Letter
Attachments: development letter.pdf

Please find attached my letter in support of the proposed development of the former Highland Park Golf Course. Please inform me if there is any difficulty opening this document.

Andrea Taylor-Schryvers

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALOUMBY
CITY CLERKS

RE: Highland Park: LOC2014-0190

January 4, 2016

I am a 6 year resident of the Highland Park community and live very close to the proposed development. My husband and myself plan on staying in this community to raise our three children. I have been following this development through the reimagining website and have given feedback through that website throughout the process. My husband and myself support this development and look forward to the many positive changes it will bring to our community.

The first thing that excites us about this project is the amount of high density housing that will be close to the transit line. Thinking of the physical health costs of pollution from vehicles, we want to see infrastructure and development plans such as this one to allow people a true opportunity to live a car free life. From our experience in this location with three children we only need one car because myself or my husband can efficiently take transit to work (one downtown and one in Brentwood).

The second thing that excites us about this project is the bike and walking paths. Because we are sandwiched between fairly busy streets we currently do not feel safe to travel with our kids on bikes or even walk. The proposed pathways will allow us to use pathways to access shops and restaurants as well as for leisure.

Finally, we are looking forward to having a community with more people out of their houses and living and playing together. When this site was a private golf course, it had extremely limited/no value to families who want to meet up, enjoy time together or just feel that great sense of community that comes from walking down a street and seeing others.

We unfortunately are not able to take time off work to come down to city hall but we are pleased that the City of Calgary has an accessible way for our opinion to be heard.

Thank you,

Andrea Taylor-Schryvers
3816 3rd St. NW
(Highland Park Resident)

2017 JAN -5 AM 7:55
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

RECEIVED

Albrecht, Linda

From: Bruce McLeod [mcleod@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:41 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: LOC2014-0190
Attachments: 2017 letter.pdf

Please find enclosed a letter to be included in the file regarding the Highland Park Golf course and surrounding area zoning change proposal.

Thanks,
Bruce McLeod

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

It appears more time is needed to properly research exactly what can and more importantly, should, be done with the area. I was actually born in the community and have fortunate enough to spend my entire life there, so I had hoped an agreeable solution can be reached. Thus far, that does not seem to have been the case.

The city has let both the surrounding communities, and perhaps to a degree the developer, down by not communicating choices and opportunities for the area. Highland Park, especially, has long suffered from a lack of a cohesive plan and we have been subject to many piece meal changes and orphaned developments. The future development should be a legacy. The plan will determine if that legacy is a positive or negative one.

Initially, it appeared the developer was seeking to engage the community in the planning. Meetings were held, opinions solicited and a few mail outs sent. There were two plans put forward by the developer that members of the community could "vote" on. Then, basically, most of this was modified and an entirely different plan submitted. Densities increased, dramatically and unacceptably. Building heights increased wildly. Multiple entirely new high rise structures were added. Plans were made to terraform the site by filling in large areas and removing many old trees. In essence, it seems the community engagement process was a sham and that a much different development, in no way keeping with the character of the area or the wishes of the community is being sought. As you undoubtedly are aware, there is even debate about the creek that somehow is now deemed not to exist.

I ask that this development not be allowed to proceed in its current state. Please scale back the size, scope and density. Start the process over and require a plan that better suits the needs and wishes of the citizens of Calgary, with more green space and with thoughts towards better alignment with future planning for the area. A master area structure plan is vastly overdue.

This development is going to result in a large cost to city taxpayers for both infrastructure and for long term issues and more consideration is required. It would be a shame to have this wonderful community destroyed by dropping in

this monstrosity in its current state. There is only one opportunity to do something right and that is in the beginning, before construction begins. When the valley has been partially filled, the trees taken down and concrete and asphalt put down it is too late.

The opportunity exists to use this area to connect Confederation Park and Nose Creek pathways, if properly allowed for at the beginning. What a great legacy project that would be a great legacy project for the 150th anniversary of Canada!

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Regards,
Bruce McLeod

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: Cammie Kaulback [ckaulback@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:49 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Chu, Sean; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison - Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Office of the Mayor
Subject: LOC2014-0190
Attachments: Letter re Highland Park Gold Course Redevelopment.pdf

Dear City Clerk,
Please find attached a letter to be put on the public record concerning LOC2014-0190 - Proposed Land Use Re-designation of Highland Golf Course. This matter is to come before City Council on Monday, January 16, 2017. If you have any issues opening this document, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Thanks,
Cammie Kaulback

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

LOC 2014-0190
Proposed Land Use Re-designation
Highland Park Golf Course

RECEIVED

2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Dear Councillors,

I am a resident of Highland Park Community Association and I have taken part in almost every meeting associated with this proposed land use re-designation. Along with my neighbours we have dedicated thousands of volunteer hours to represent our community's point of view. I have spent many evenings away from my family listening to Planning Department representatives and the Developer. I feel I am qualified to offer an opinion on the process and the proposal being put forward by the Developer.

Let me state from the beginning that I am not anti-development. Like most of my neighbours I accepted long ago that this piece of land would be redeveloped. I have also accepted that increased density is coming our way (and for many of us in the existing neighbourhood of Highland Park, it is already here). However, when I became involved I hoped that the needs of our neighbourhood would be considered and balanced against the needs of the Developer. Over and over this hope has been crushed. Most of the time I have felt like a member of the Rebel Alliance in Star Wars up against The Empire. I kept hoping that someone in the City of Calgary would at least listen to our point of view, but instead City of Calgary representatives were firmly controlled by the dark side.

This might seem like a silly analogy, but my point is that as a community volunteer I never once felt like the City of Calgary Planning Department representatives were interested in advocating for our point of view. Perhaps it was naïve to believe that the City would play a neutral role in this whole matter. **But I never would have imagined that the City of Calgary Planning Department would view the Developer as their client and community representatives as an annoyance.** There were times during this process when my mouth literally dropped open in shock. To this day I do not understand how the City can expect a small group of volunteers, with no money and few resources, to go up against the resources of the City and a developer. In my entire life and working career I have never felt so set up and unfairly treated. The old adage, "you can't fight city hall" comes to mind.

I remain perplexed that throughout this entire process the City of Calgary never actually facilitated a true engagement session concerning the development. City of Calgary representatives always characterized sessions as "informational". At no point, did they encourage true engagement or feedback. We were always verbally cautioned by City employees not to press the Developer during our face to face meetings. In most encounters the city employees spoke for the Developer. When we asked to talk to other City departments (such as Roads and Water) we were only allowed to ask pre-screened questions and we were again cautioned not to stray from the questions and enter into any sort of two way dialogue. It always felt like an "us against them" scenario. This is not the way we wanted it, this is the atmosphere that City representatives purposefully created. In the past I applauded the City's

attempts at citizen engagement on various issues throughout Calgary. Now I view them all with cynicism. I have personally experienced how hollow they can be.

The sad thing is that things didn't have to be this way in the case of Highland Park. This is a community that was always willing to participate and engage to help deliver densification. In fact, if we had been allowed to be real stakeholders in the process we could have become the poster children for inner city densification. Instead, we end up feeling bitter and defeated. City representatives never willingly provided our community with the opportunity to truly give feedback in a meaningful way. The City always defended the Developer, as if they were on his payroll. No wonder I am now a cynic.

If you look closely at this file you will find that many of the City's policies, plans, guidelines and principles, which you have endorsed and instructed administration to create and uphold, have been blatantly ignored. The only policy this plan upholds is the drive of the MDP to increase density within the inner city. You are bowing down to the altar of density while ignoring all of your other policies and guidelines. It is wrong for you to ask inner city communities to bear the brunt of unreasonable densification without following your own rules and without at least giving us the opportunity to be real stakeholders in the process.

My most pressing concerns associated with this proposal are as follows:

1. The Need for Greater Green Space

I strongly believe that this development is not beneficial to the existing neighbourhood because it does not provide us with any additional, meaningful green space. Why can't we have a park like Riley Park to support the Highland Park Transit Orientated Development? Our community has consistently stated that this is our biggest concern and yet time and time again we have been told by City of Calgary representatives and the Developer that we should not expect any additional green space out of this proposal. Why is this so? Why should our neighbourhood not receive this kind of consideration? No investment has been made in park space in Ward 4 in many years. Highland Park has always historically lacked green space. Our youth even reclaimed the side of a cliff on the east side of Centre Street because we have no green space. And yet no one will listen. This is the only opportunity Council will ever have to right this wrong. I respectfully submit that you should investigate the possibility of purchasing land on the golf course sight for a large park. If you don't take the opportunity now to rectify this deficiency, the chance will never come around again.

2. Preserve the Existing Topography

Again, from the start the community has asked that the existing topography be preserved. It is unfathomable to think of this valley being filled to the brim and all the existing trees and wet lands being destroyed. What possible planning principle is in play here? Instead Council should require slope adaptive developments on the south side of the development and investigate the possibility of lowering the sanitary sewer to ensure less fill and more effective development.

3. Reduce the Width of the Road

City of Calgary representatives have always pushed for a very wide road to run through the development. I have been told that this is so the City can “service” the site. The width is comparable to that of 4th Street NW. That’s a pretty wide road. If you reduce the width of the road you will once again reduce the need for so much fill and reduce the number of trees that must be removed. It will also potentially increase the green space at no additional cost to the Developer.

4. Help the Existing Community

It is clear throughout this process that the Developer has no interest in a development that will improve our existing community. He likes to view his development as an “island unto itself”. Although the golf course was privately owned, it was still an important space within our community. We always viewed it as part of our community. Instead of listening to our needs the developer treated us like we were an inconvenience. Surely we deserve more than that? Why can’t Council at the very least ask the developer to create a community enhancement fund for Highland Park? That would go a long way in demonstrating to community residents that our existing community has value.

In conclusion, I am fearful about January 16. I have watched how Council has handled other similar developments and communities. **If I could leave you with one thing I would tell you that your process is broken and you need to fix it. Volunteers should not have to spend thousands of hours of their precious time defending their community’s interests. As a taxpayer, I expect representatives from the City of Calgary’s Planning Department to not exclusively represent a developer’s point of view.** I should not be made to feel like City of Calgary employees work for a developer. This is an issue that you need to reflect upon. This is where your existing process is taking all of us. It is time for you to re-evaluate what role you expect individual citizens to take on in these kinds of situations. You also need to think about what role Planning Department representatives play in these kinds of situations. The way things are now is simply not right.

Yours truly,

Cammie Kaulback
204 – 34 Avenue NW Calgary, Alberta

Albrecht, Linda

From: Paul E [pengler@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 8:07 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Submission for LOC2014-0190
Attachments: LOC2014-0190 Submission.pdf

Hello,

Attached is my submission pertaining to LOC2014-0190 which will go before City Council on January 16th, 2017

--
Paul

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

LOC 2014-0190
Proposed Land Use Re-designation
Highland Park Golf Course

Dear Councilors,

As a member of the Board of the Highland Park Community Association and Chair of the Planning and Development Committee, the proposed land use resignation of the Highland Park Golf Course Lands has consumed a larger portion of my life over the last several years. The Community Association has always been in favor of development of the golf course lands and have sought to be an active participant in helping to produce a result that is a benefit to the Developer, the City, and the community of Highland Park. However, after spending 100s of hours of my time attempting to participate in a cooperative fashion the net result is realization that my efforts were largely a waste of time.

From the beginning of the process, starting with open houses in 2014 through to the facilitated discussions that happened during the fall of 2016, it has become abundantly clear that the only opinion that counts is that of the Developer. The Community was viewed as item to be checked off of a list, saying that they were engaged. The role of Administration was to take what was brought forward from the Developer to place it in front of you at City Council, and to not question if what was brought forward is of a benefit to the City, or even if it meets the guidelines of polices such as the MDP.

The City has invested large amounts of time and money in the Green Line 40th Ave Charrette and market studied. The City's experts from IBI have brought forth plans that meet the best practices for Transit Oriented Development. The City has produced a market study that demonstrates what is viable to be built along the Green Line North corridor. The City is currently undertaking a Regional Water Study that will address the storm water issues in the Confederation Creek basin. Yet, none of this matters. The proposal before you is not TOD by the measure of the City's experts, the densities proposed are unrealistic according to the City's own market research, and the current location of natural storm water mitigation is being re-tasked before the City's planners can complete their work.

In the end I am still supportive of development of these lands, however, it is incumbent upon the City to ensure that the development that will follow is in the best interest of the City, the citizens of Calgary as well as the developer. I believe the following recommendations will provide a positive outcome for everyone.

- 1) Proceed with the re-designation of the lands (parcel 1) that are East of Centre Street North, with density caps that are in alignment with what the City has produced in its market study, and density controlled via FARs. This is the most shovel ready parcel and it allow the Developer to start to see a return on his investment.
- 2) Defer the decision on the remainder of the lands until such time that the water study is complete. Allow the experts in the City Administration to perform their job to the best of their ability, without encumbrances placed upon them by hasty decisions. Furthermore, allow City Administration to investigate the possibility of land purchase within the golf course lands to facilitate storm water management and provide the green space that Highland Park is lacking. This is the fiscally responsible decision.

- 3) Endorse the plan produced by the City's experts as part of the Green Line charrette process and reflects the best practice in TOD. Endorse the plan that will still allow for the density the Developer has asked for. Endorse the plan that aligns with the Community's desire for green space, respectful integration, preservation of the mature trees and existing topography.

The decision on how the Highland Park Golf Course land should be developed is not an easy one. This decision will reshape the character of North Central Calgary for years to come, so it is essential that the choices made are to the benefit the City, the Community and the Developer. On January 16th I encourage yourself and the rest of council to make the choices that will provide a great result for the City, the Developer, and the Community.

Thank you for the consideration of my comments.

Paul Engler
Highland Park resident

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Albrecht, Linda

From: Heidi Ehlers [hehlers@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:04 PM
To: Office of the Mayor
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; Greenviewcares@gmail.com; City Clerk
Subject: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Mayor Nenshi,

I have deep concerns over the proposed redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course in my neighbourhood. My family has lived in the area for 60 years and I am a second generation owner of our home. Having grown up across the street from the golf course, I have enjoyed using it when it was open for business over the years and now as a park for our community. I have attended meetings put on by the Thorncliffe Greenview Community Association and the City of Calgary open house concerning this project.

The impact of the redevelopment on my neighbourhood is more than typically disruptive as a building site. The main roads of 4th Street N.W. and McKnight Boulevard N.W. run on either side of my street. Traffic has been an issue for years as vehicles head north up 4th, or west on McKnight during the afternoon rush hour which seems to start earlier in the day over the years. Having dump trucks add to the traffic to fill the gully would severely reduce the flow of traffic through the area, not to mention the incessant noise it would produce. Since the developer doesn't have a completion date, the redevelopment can go on for years and decades. The developer also has the right to subdivide the property and another developer can come in and continue with the dump truck scenario.

As the golf course stands, we enjoy a view of the park and trees and can still see to downtown without much obstruction. The redevelopment put forth ruins all that and we will have to look at the backsides of highrises. These highrises will literally overshadow the neighbourhood for sunlight, especially in the winter, and will look like an odd afterthought in the development of Thorncliffe. With the proposal of over 2000 units going into the area, once again the traffic will be permanently impacted in a negative way.

It has come to my attention that the golf course has many trees that help with the prevention of potential flooding of the area. Removing such a high percentage of trees would require extra drainage piping and labour. Does this come at a cost to the taxpayer or the developer? Over time is the possibility of flooding and pipe repairs become a taxpayer cost? These are questions I hope will be discussed at the Highland Golf Course land use meeting on Monday, January 16, 2017.

Sincerely,

Heidi Ehlers



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Albrecht, Linda

From: Heidi Ehlers [hehlers@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:43 PM
To: Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14
Cc: City Clerk; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; Greenviewcares@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment

From: Heidi Ehlers [mailto:hehlers@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2017 9:38 PM
To: 'ward04@calgary.ca' <ward04@calgary.ca>; 'ward01@calgary.ca' <ward01@calgary.ca>; 'ward02@calgary.ca' <ward02@calgary.ca>; 'ward03@calgary.ca' <ward03@calgary.ca>; 'ward05@calgary.ca' <ward05@calgary.ca>; 'ward06@calgary.ca' <ward06@calgary.ca>
Cc: 'cityclerk@calgary.ca' <cityclerk@calgary.ca>; 'publicservice@tgcacalgary.com' <publicservice@tgcacalgary.com>; 'Greenviewcares@gmail.com' <Greenviewcares@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Councillors,

This is an email I have sent to Mayor Nenshi regarding the redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course. I would like you to be aware of the serious issue we are facing in the community regarding this project. I appreciate your time to give this redevelopment the full attention it deserves regarding the negative impact it could have on the community.

Sincerely,

Heidi Ehlers

From: Heidi Ehlers [mailto:hehlers@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2017 9:04 PM
To: 'themayor@calgary.ca' <themayor@calgary.ca>
Cc: 'publicservice@tgcacalgary.com' <publicservice@tgcacalgary.com>; 'Greenviewcares@gmail.com' <Greenviewcares@gmail.com>; 'cityclerk@calgary.ca' <cityclerk@calgary.ca>
Subject: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Mayor Nenshi,

I have deep concerns over the proposed redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course in my neighbourhood. My family has lived in the area for 60 years and I am a second generation owner of our home. Having grown up across the street from the golf course, I have enjoyed using it when it was open for business over the years and now as a park for our community. I have attended meetings put on by the Thorncliffe Greenview Community Association and the City of Calgary open house concerning this project.

The impact of the redevelopment on my neighbourhood is more than typically disruptive as a building site. The main roads of 4th Street N.W. and McKnight Boulevard N.W. run on either side of my street. Traffic has been an issue for years as vehicles head north up 4th, or west on McKnight during the afternoon rush hour which seems to start earlier in the day over the years. Having dump trucks add to the traffic to fill the gully would severely reduce the flow of traffic through the area, not to mention the incessant noise it would produce. Since the developer doesn't have a completion date, the redevelopment can go on for years and decades. The developer also has the right to subdivide the property and another developer can come in and continue with the dump truck scenario.

As the golf course stands, we enjoy a view of the park and trees and can still see to downtown without much obstruction. The redevelopment put forth ruins all that and we will have to look at the backsides of highrises. These highrises will literally overshadow the neighbourhood for sunlight, especially in the winter, and will look like an odd afterthought in the development of Thorncliffe. With the proposal of over 2000 units going into the area, once again the traffic will be permanently impacted in a negative way.

It has come to my attention that the golf course has many trees that help with the prevention of potential flooding of the area. Removing such a high percentage of trees would require extra drainage piping and labour. Does this come at a cost to the taxpayer or the developer? Over time is the possibility of flooding and pipe repairs become a taxpayer cost? These are questions I hope will be discussed at the Highland Golf Course land use meeting on Monday, January 16, 2017.

Sincerely,

Heidi Ehlers



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: Heidi Ehlers [hehlers@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:38 PM
To: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6
Cc: City Clerk; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; Greenviewcares@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Councillors,

This is an email I have sent to Mayor Nenshi regarding the redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course. I would like you to be aware of the serious issue we are facing in the community regarding this project. I appreciate your time to give this redevelopment the full attention it deserves regarding the negative impact it could have on the community.

Sincerely,
Heidi Ehlers

From: Heidi Ehlers [mailto:hehlers@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2017 9:04 PM
To: 'themayor@calgary.ca' <themayor@calgary.ca>
Cc: 'publicservice@tgcacalgary.com' <publicservice@tgcacalgary.com>; 'Greenviewcares@gmail.com' <Greenviewcares@gmail.com>; 'cityclerk@calgary.ca' <cityclerk@calgary.ca>
Subject: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment

Dear Mayor Nenshi,

I have deep concerns over the proposed redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course in my neighbourhood. My family has lived in the area for 60 years and I am a second generation owner of our home. Having grown up across the street from the golf course, I have enjoyed using it when it was open for business over the years and now as a park for our community. I have attended meetings put on by the Thorncliffe Greenview Community Association and the City of Calgary open house concerning this project.

The impact of the redevelopment on my neighbourhood is more than typically disruptive as a building site. The main roads of 4th Street N.W. and McKnight Boulevard N.W. run on either side of my street. Traffic has been an issue for years as vehicles head north up 4th, or west on McKnight during the afternoon rush hour which seems to start earlier in the day over the years. Having dump trucks add to the traffic to fill the gully would severely reduce the flow of traffic through the area, not to mention the incessant noise it would produce. Since the developer doesn't have a completion date, the redevelopment can go on for years and decades. The developer also has the right to subdivide the property and another developer can come in and continue with the dump truck scenario.

As the golf course stands, we enjoy a view of the park and trees and can still see to downtown without much obstruction. The redevelopment put forth ruins all that and we will have to look at the backsides of highrises. These highrises will literally overshadow the neighbourhood for sunlight, especially in the winter, and will look like an odd afterthought in the development of Thorncliffe. With the proposal of over 2000 units going into the area, once again the traffic will be permanently impacted in a negative way.

It has come to my attention that the golf course has many trees that help with the prevention of potential flooding of the area. Removing such a high percentage of trees would require extra drainage piping and labour. Does this come at a cost to the taxpayer or the developer? Over time is the possibility of flooding and pipe repairs become a taxpayer cost? These are questions I hope will be discussed at the Highland Golf Course land use meeting on Monday, January 16, 2017.

Sincerely,

Heidi Ehlers



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALICO, NV
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: Heather Sweeney [sweeneyhi@yahoo.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:52 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: LOC2014-0190
Attachments: 2017-01-04 Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment Letter.pdf

Dear City Clerk,

Please add the attached letter to the public record for the public hearing on January 16, 2017 regarding file LOC2014-0190.

Thank you,

Heather Knorr

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:54
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Smith, Theresa L.

From: MAUREEN OBRIEN [gardensgrace@shaw.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 10:23 PM
To: Office of the Mayor; MLA Craig Coolahan, "calgary klein
Cc: Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; City Clerk
Subject: Highland Golf Course re-development

Mayor and Council Members;

I am writing today regarding my concern with the redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course. I have been attending the meetings since they started approximately 3 years ago. Imagine my frustration when attending a follow-up meeting at the beginning of 2016, to find out that none of the things this developer had promised would be happening. Now I realize some changes have been made once again, but this development has so many problems and issues I am not sure where to begin.

I have lived in this community for the 56 years of my entire life. I remember as a child going down to the golf course, climbing the fence and wandering around. For the city to actually suggest that the water that was vaulted in the 60's is not a creek is an insult to my intelligence. I (along with my friends that were with me), remember quite vividly crossing the little bridges on the golf course. One friend actually remembers that there were tee holes in the bridges to hit your ball from. I also remember many times going down there and being knee high in water, and I remember the smell of the golf club, musty and damp, obviously with water issues of it's own.

Now it does not take a scientist to understand that water runs to the lowest land, and looking at the valley the golf course sits in, of course, many creeks meet in that valley. I visit the present site often with my granddaughter and marvel at the beautiful trees, the many birds that I see there and we have held our hands under the spring that runs out the west side of the park. What a beautiful inner city treasure this green space has become. And how amazing that those beautiful trees are managing that water very well, and providing an awesome shelter at the same time. All for FREE!

After (what now feels like) wasting my time at all those early meetings, trying to come to some resolution with Mr. Nehru, I am sure you are not surprised to hear that I do not trust him as far as I could throw him.

This water is a huge concern to the community of Greenview, and could also be a huge issue if there is a LRT tunnel built under McKnight Blvd. That area, as well as along 4th Street NW, has flooded many, many times. In a flood which occurred before the 2013 flood, a man drown.

The statistics provided by the city at the open house at Highwood Community Center on Dec. 8, make no sense. How you remove 500+ mature trees, build a massive development (one of the largest in the city), and yet still have room to replant 500 trees? That is a joke that I do not fall for. And to say (as it does on the city website regarding this development), that adding 2000 residences, which will obviously mean at least 4000 people, is going to increase the green space per resident in Highland Park. What calculator was used for that? With the Green Line coming straight down Centre St., we all know that there will be more loss of our precious green space.

So many people coming and going out of this small space onto streets that are already at capacity, is a recipe for disaster. How could two 16 storey high rises be allowed on this corner? There is not one building over 10 stories, with most being 4 or 5 between 64 Ave. and downtown. After attending the 64th Ave. charrette, it was made clear to us that developers would not be interested in building over 6 stories as there would probably be no market for these residences. Are we to be left with a concrete jungle, that turns into a tenement, as no one desires to live there?

With all these concerns, (and even more that I have not mentioned), you can hopefully understand why so many of us are worried. The future of these affected communities (Highland Park, Highwood, Thorncliffe and Greenview), are in grave danger. I am willing to give you all the benefit of the doubt, that time has limited you to make yourselves aware of these issues. I challenge you to do so before you make this important decision.

You, Mayor Nenshi and all city councillors have an opportunity to make a landmark decision...to buy this green space back from this developer and let nature have it's way. This park would be a huge bonus to these inner city communities. With all the environmental choices that are being made now, it would be the right move. There are many American cities day lighting creeks, as city planners become more and more aware of the virtues of having natural water and green space amongst their communities.

So I ask you to let Highland Park Golf Course be one of your legacies. To set an example to other cities that the health of your citizens and your communities comes first and foremost when making development decisions. And to take the first step in making this corner, a very special part of inner city Calgary.

Your very sincerely,
Maureen O'Brien
208 Blackthorn Rd., N.W.
403.617.2085

Shelley McConnell and James Annand
4119 2 ST NW
Calgary, AB T2K 0Z2
403-266-3326

Re: LOC2014-0190

To: City Clerk, Mayor of Calgary, & City Councillors
For: January 16, 2017 City Council Public Hearing

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -6 AM 7:43
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

January, 5, 2017

Dear, City Clerk, Mayor Nenshi & City Councillors,

Our family would like to submit some comments to be entered into the record for the Public Hearing in response to the proposed rezoning and development of the former Highland Park Golf Course site. In 2016, we sent a letter sharing our thoughts with regards to the development ahead of the original public hearing that was to be held in July, 2016. In that letter, we described what is wonderful about our community. We talked about its multi-generational nature, its walkability and its rejuvenation as a family-friendly community.

Since writing that letter, we have attended all meetings in regards to redevelopment of our community, including the 40th Avenue Charrette and have been given a great deal of education about the benefits of the Greenline and Transit Oriented Development (TOD), which we were told at the July 5, 2016 council meeting would be used to evaluate the outline plan. We have come to have a new view of our community. We understand that with the Greenline, our community is to become much more urban and will evolve from one dominated by single family housing to more dense and diverse housing types. This education has given our family a lot to think about in terms of how we live in Calgary, and we can envision ourselves thriving in this new kind of community that will support a more environmentally-conscious land use and support its residents to do more walking, cycling and transit-commuting. We see this as a positive for the health and well-being our family, for connecting to our neighbors and for Calgary as a whole.

It is because we support TOD that we feel we respectfully submit our request to council to reject the land use amendment of Highland Golf Course Site from recreational to DC and to reject the outline plan submitted by Maple Developments. This is our rationale:

1. One of the goals of TOD is to support a more environmentally-ethical way for citizens to use the lands within Calgary. We do not see how infilling a historical creek valley and current wetlands with a large road and multi-story condo buildings supports this.
2. In our education on TOD, we were shown that successful planning for TOD communities is to have concentric rings of densification, with the highest density nearest transit hubs, and lowering as it moves out from the central core. This plan will put high densities in our community well outside the central core of the TOD zone and move the condo market toward non-TOD occupancy. In fact, the only part of this development within the TOD zone is in the ring that we were told by your experts should have the lowest densities (with "high" density for the core with maximum 6-story wood frame construction). We also cannot support development

that creates a new road for condo users that are not within city-defined walking distance to any Greenline Station. This will only increase automobile usage and traffic congestion in our community.

3. We were told that TOD should bring members of the community together. The plan to put out-of scale large condo buildings in the creek valley coupled with the inevitable similar construction on Centre Street and 40th Avenue will create walls around the north half of Highland Park that is already an island separated by major roadways. It would also be an island surrounded by construction for decades with Greenline construction, 40th & McKnight amendments, and this development. The valley has the potential to be the linkage and meeting place for our community, Thorncliffe, Highwood, and all of the communities in the rest of the Confederation Creek corridor. Building large scale buildings like the ones planned will instead create walls between all of these neighborhoods, particularly if the residents of these proposed condo buildings have indoor parking and use the proposed "Highland Drive" to access their needs by automobile in Calgary. It does not encourage walkability, transit use or community engagement with Highland Park or any of the surrounding communities of Ward 4.
4. Another principle of TOD, we were told, is to create green spaces within walking distance to transit hubs. The outline plan puts one small greenspace at the absolute furthest point to any Greenline stop and the furthest from the South half of Highland Park, which has no public greenspace (save school yards dominated by the buildings/parking lots on them). The Confederation Creek corridor in our community has the potential to be used by all Calgarians if it is accessible by transit via the 40th Ave Station. The small greenspace planned would be visible and most accessible to the new development alone. Councillor Farrell and respected city planners have advocated for green spaces to be open and accessible to the general public realm by foot and transit.

We also have concerns that in rezoning this land, this community is losing an outdoor recreational space. Whether or not it was private, it was still used recreationally by our community and the citizens of the city in general. While planning for a community's redevelopment, the need for outdoor recreational space should be of importance, particularly when considering the needs of lower income Calgarians who rely more heavily on easily accessible multi-use outdoor recreational spaces. The fact that there is a single owner of this land, who purchased it at a recreationally-zoned price should be seen as an opportunity to create publicly accessible outdoor recreation space, considering that trying to negotiate the purchase of this kind of space in already-developed private lands in the uplands would be insurmountable. Given the fact that the valley wetlands would need serious topographical alteration and engineering to create the development, would it not make more sense to focus attention on the densification of the uplands? (which is already in the TOD zone).

In addition to the concerns around this development meeting the goals of TOD, our family has other concerns, which have not been adequately addressed or even allowed discussion. These include:

1. The importance of the site's place within the Confederation Creek corridor (also called the North Hill Ravine) from both an environmental and social perspective.

This corridor has such deep significance to Calgary that it was deemed important enough to save to create Canmore Park, Confederation Park, and the final resting place of thousands of Calgarians at Queens Park. By preserving the valley floor on this site, this would create a contiguous corridor all the way from Nose Hill to Nose Creek and give future Calgarians the opportunity to continue stewarding this corridor, with the potential of one day daylighting the watercourse that runs through it. It would also link to other green corridors that lead back up to Nose Hill via Thorncliffe and communities north. In the city's natural areas management plan, it speaks of the city's vow to preserve contiguous natural lands.

In the 1960s, Calgarians saw fit to fight to save other parts of this corridor in celebration of Canada's 100th birthday. Do we want the legacy of the 150th year of Confederation being the destruction of the remainder of that corridor? One sense of identity for Canadians living in Calgary is the preservation of green corridors that historically were used for thousands of years by people and wildlife. It would be ironic that as we strive to move into a more environmentally-enlightened time by following principles such as TOD, that we do so by destroying natural areas that are already extant, reclaimable and beloved. At many points in the debate over this lands, the example of the Currie Development has been used in comparison. One can hardly compare the redevelopment of an army barracks with the infilling an historically important valley.

2. Flood mitigation and preservation of urban forests have also been touted by the city as paramount importance. Making a decision about the development of these lands before the regional water study is complete seems to be completely counter to the lessons we learned from the floods of 2013 and the urban forest devastation of 2014. Cutting down the site's 500+ healthy mature trees that act as a vertical reservoir and infilling this coulee when it has been clearly identified as part of the NW watershed is puzzling indeed.

These are our family's requests of city council for consideration:

1. Purchase by the city of this site, given its environmental, social, and recreational value to our community and all of Calgary.
2. Retention of the site as a recreational natural area with possible storm water ponds.
3. The regional water study and consideration of the ravine's role flood mitigation to be complete before any decision is made for any type of redevelopment or reclamation of these lands.
4. An **independent** provincial re-assessment of the current wetlands that includes assessment of natural springs as well as informant interviews of long term residents of the area with observational data about the wetlands' permanence.
5. In depth review of the legality of prior vaulting of the creek valley in consultation with the province.

6. Application of modern urban riparian ecosystem management principles to this site by not compounding the past error of vaulting the creek.
7. Environmental rating of the ravine's wetlands as if the city's past error of vaulting the creek had not occurred.
8. Preservation of as much of the valley floor as possible be mandated for any development by the city or any developers. The historic creek bed, its shores and all wetlands be preserved and protected in the valley with the mind for future generations to have the possibility of daylighting and restoring the area to its natural state.
9. True TOD principles be applied to our whole community, which may require rezoning of the uplands for increased density in TOD rings to preserve this highly valued recreational and natural greenspace/historic creek valley, so that it doesn't become yet another "avenue" for vehicle use in the inner city.
10. Barring any opportunity to purchase the entire valley, that low rise slope-adapted development with access from the terraces in the alleyways behind 4th Street and 2nd Street rather than the valley floor be mandated. Any development should honour site topography and have building heights that respect the views of the valley enjoyed (and paid for in higher taxes) by Highland Park residents along the ridge for the past 6 to 7 decades.
11. Reconsideration of higher densities along 4th Street and its neighboring city-owned slopes, since this area is already: rental, multi-family and accessible by the less-problematic 4th Street. Perhaps a land swap for this city-owned side of the valley should be considered for the preservation of the valley bottom.

Before we end our letter, we would also like to express our concerns about the process of public engagement on this file. As was noted by Mayor Nenshi at the Jul. 4 meeting of council, the city's and developer's engagement with Highland Park were "disrespectful". I believe you have received feedback from the community association and members of the community on this, and I concur. I will not rehash all the multitude complaints with that process again, save for noting that all of the city administration's engagement has been in defense of the development. Questions and concerns that could not be answered in favour of the development have not been included on the city's website, and representatives from the city answered all questions at engagement in defense of the rezoning of the valley and of the development. It is understandable to us that the developer's engagement would be skewed to their vision, but it is unconscionable to us that the city we pay our taxes to would come to engagement with no intention of gathering and reporting on public views. We are also very concerned that members of the general public in Calgary who visit the city's website might be given the mistaken message that there have been few concerns in developing this valued and precious piece of land or that all concerns can be easily mitigated.

At the Jul. 4 meeting, we were told that the 40th Ave Charette for the Greenline would be our opportunity to be properly engaged on this site. However, in invitations sent out to attend the charrette, our community was cautioned that we were not to discuss this area at length. That sentiment was repeated often during the charrette, despite the site and greenspace being identified early and decidedly as the most important aspect of the community we wanted to

“vision” about. It was also clear that we were being given the direction that it was inevitable that the golf course site would be rezoned for development, as this area was called “Highland Green” throughout the charrette, despite it never having been approved by council. It was noted by our family that the consultants hired spent a lot of time doing/presenting 3-d conceptual drawings for many private property zones in and around Highland Park, with the exception of one private property - the golf course site. We would also like it on record that many from the community, when shown the TOD concept map on the Saturday of the charette and later as a proposed “TOD” map of the site at the next engagement session, did not feel it fairly represented the small amount of visioning work we were allowed to do at the charrette for the site. For example, no participants, to my knowledge, placed a road or large/high apartment buildings on the valley floor in the area near 40th Ave or anywhere along the former creek bed, for that matter, and for good reasons: it is environmentally unsound and is counter to the education we’d been given at the charrette that the outer ring of a TOD zone should have the lowest not the highest densities. It is for these reasons, that any “voting” done at the charrette on what we wanted for this site was done with the idea presented to us that “Highland Green” was a fait de complete.

We would like to complete our letter by saying that our views are not exactly the same as our community association’s. The HPCA has come to the conclusion that arguing for the preservation of the valley is “unwinnable”, so they have decided to present a compromise proposal. We, however, feel that there is a right and ethical solution for this valley and its slopes, and urban forest, and that is to preserve and reclaim them, with the possibility left open for more enlightened future generations to daylight and restore Confederation Creek, its feeding streams and other artesian springs on site. Barring that worthy decision being made, we respectfully request that at least the valley floor and former creek shores be protected and slope-adapted development be mandated. For our family this latter choice would perhaps impact our enjoyment of our property that borders the site even more than the outline plan or TOD map from the charette, but it would be worth it to us to save the valley we have come to love and want to help steward for all future Calgarians.

Sincerely,

Shelley McConnell and James Annand, and on behalf of our 7-year old son Declan Annand

Albrecht, Linda

From: agni@nucleus.com
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 8:22 AM
To: City Clerk
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com
Subject: LOC2014-0190 Highland Golf Course
Attachments: TG to YCCC HGC0001.pdf

Please find attached submission by the Thorncliffe/Greenview Community Association for LOC2014-0190

thanks
marvin
TGCA

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 9:48
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

To City Clerk
Re: Highland Golf Course
LOC2014-0190
January 16 Public Hearing

TGCA has been having conversations about the fate of the Highland golf course for years if not decades. Longtime residents have held expectations that there would be an entire preservation of the valley with revitalization of natural watercourses and wetlands. It would serve as a continuation of Confederation Park and a connector to the Nose Creek Valley. Since the sale of the site these long held hopes have touched a broader audience as an sesquicentennial addition to that parkland dedicated on the country's centennial of 1967.

On the other side of the community conversation there are those who welcome a development but generally define it as being of the "right kind" Things that are attractive to this group seem to focus on enhanced retail and commercial along Centre Street, Aging in Place/ Seniors Residence, and quality built residential units of a mixed nature. TGCA appreciates both perspectives as valid and with such a large complex project there will be an inevitable divergence of opinion. Although our public engagement is far from exhaustive it would appear an almost even split between these views. However far from being polar opposites they, are both are reflective of a care and concern for cherishing a quality of life inclusive of this iconic neighbourhood site. By any measure and without exaggeration, this is the largest development for our community since its inception over sixty years ago. As such we hope it will receive the level of scrutiny appropriate for such a generational change.

TGCA would not consider itself a “pro” development CA and therefore we can empathize with the preservationist perspective. We are nevertheless cognizant of the MDP goals of greater density in established communities and considering our own population has been in decline since 1977 we recognize the need for regeneration, so perhaps paradoxically we would not consider ourselves “anti” development either.

Change can be uncomfortable but we are changing regardless of action if only by lack of action into a greater state of atrophy and ennui. The challenge is to achieve pragmatically that “right kind” of development beyond what we obliquely sense it to be.

TGCA has long felt a development could be possible for this site providing it is along the aspects of the “right kind” cited above but perhaps more importantly that it respect the natural contours and aspects of the site. This would include “slope adaptive” low rises largely limited to the periphery, mid rises no greater than six stories along Centre St and a mainly preserved valley with enhanced wetlands/watercourse as part of a naturalized amenity.

In order to fully appreciate the site’s potential it is necessary to break beyond the confinement of dialogue corralled by the process over the last three years. Although attempts have been made, broader discussion has often been reined in by the dismissal that engineering, economic or other practicalities override some of the public’s more fanciful aspirations. Although TGCA would consider itself ever deferential to the authority of expertise, we have nevertheless struggled like never before to understand some of the rationale at play. Although there may indeed be valid reasons for not exploring what we would consider fundamental options, we have not felt that substantive answers have been provided. Ergo we continue to bring forward ideas and questions which in the last three years we sincerely believe have not been satisfactorily addressed.

CENTRAL VALLEY ROAD

We are not convinced the only option for road access is through the middle of the valley. It may be the easiest but not necessarily the best. The rationale we have heard from the applicant and the transportation department is that firstly and most importantly the results of the public engagement demonstrated a desire not to have short-cutting through some of the existing neighbourhood streets. We are curious if those with this concern would see the loss of the valley as potential park space as fair trade off for a valley access traffic pattern. As important as is public consultation its resultant value is proportional to the degree that the public is aware of all ramifications. It might appear to the more cynical that this result of engagement was a phishing exercise to manufacture the consent for a pre-desired conclusion. We have to date found the planning principles to compliment the conclusion somewhat flimsy. TGCA does understand the attraction of a road through the middle of the valley. It would initially be a lesser impact to existing residences, it provides better emergency access/egress, and may prove easier for servicing. It does however double down on an auto-centric pattern and isolates the new development from communities on all sides.

Physical Integration while more complex and intellectually challenging will ultimately provide a better result. There is a significant concern about stripping and grading the entire site as step one with a potential lag time of decades before a full build out is seen. NOT placing a road through the middle of the site provides an option where sites can be developed individually. This would be fundamentally more in line with how a development of this scale should occur in established communities. Stripping and filling the entire site to create the spinal road and ancillary infrastructure is indicative of greenfield development and not demonstrative of sensitive time scaled building at this inner city location.

BUILDING HEIGHTS

We continue to be puzzled by the height of buildings proposed. As we see an accelerating transformation of Centre Street farther to the south much in anticipation of the Greenline, NO buildings exceed six storeys. The emergent TOD result from the Greenline Charrette manages to achieve similar densities for the golf course site with lower heights. This demonstrates the actual buttressed by the academic. The golf course proposal is the antithesis of either.

TGCA has never been in favour of a density cap. We feel it is an unnatural arbiter of development. We have however consistently maintained that whatever the density, the appropriate amelioration should accompany. It needs to come in the form of integration to the existing community through mobility interface as mentioned previously with perimeter road connections but also with pedestrian, cycling, and transit confluence. Furthermore the density needs to be mitigated by the requisite naturalized, amenity, and green space.

Provisions need to encourage a flourish of commercial and retail to compliment the density. The chicken/egg conundrum of density/services is difficult but we cannot entirely be dependent on the expectation that services will automatically deliver a compliment to added density without a rich planning foundation to germinate that market vitality.

NATURAL WATERCOURSES

Perhaps the most confounding in the muddle of obfuscation has been on the question of daylighting Confederation Creek. TGCA fully appreciates that this would be a challenging undertaking but has hardly been convinced that the possibility should be eliminated from the conversation. The Calgary River Valleys is an organization which TGCA respects highly and has looked to for leadership surrounding both the vaulted creeks and wetlands issues. That they continue to have grave concerns is very troubling to TGCA.

It is our understanding that watercourse daylighting is a much lauded planning principle to create amenity, biodiversity and improve water quality amongst only the short list of positives. Admittedly Confederation Creek is not a native salmon stream in the lower mainland but we believe its fate deserves far greater deliberation than it has been given. Ironically while the city of Calgary's own website celebrates the revitalization of Confederation Creek within the park space of the same name, when that very watercourse enters a vault to travel through the golf course site it becomes (to mis-quote Alfred Douglas) a creek that dare not speak its name.

WORKING WITH THE SITE

TGCA regrets that a more comprehensive analysis of the existing living infrastructure has yet to be done. Obviously this would include the regional water study. We hope that this will be more than a simple inventory of pipes and volumes but also includes examination of dynamic groundwater movements in the area. Most importantly we hope the future development of the golf course site will be mandated to adapt to the logical conclusions of the water study and not the reverse of having the water study designed to fit the development.

Evaluating the orthostatic reservoir capacity of the existing cottonwoods on the site should be a part of the study. Their existing benefit cannot be overstated.

Slope adaptive construction as previously mentioned has multiple benefits and should be used more pervasively on the site. Opposite the single family low rise homes of 44th Ave on the south side of the valley and those along Laycock Drive on the north side, slope adaptive would be the sensitive interface to existing communities.

Given that all perimeter slopes of the valley are the most disturbed and have a long history of shifting instability, building into them also satisfies an engineering need to stabilize slopes that are not only challenged by previous loose fill but also the continued migration of water.

Finally this type of build enables more central valley protection and dovetails well with a staggered buildout attached to perimeter road connections. TGCA welcomes the First Street NW connection to the site by the transportation department both as contemplated to connect orphaned parcels with a potential Mcknight widening and as an example for other connections in lieu of a central valley road.

What is going before council we feel a slight improvement to previous plans but is still a tremendous failing of city policy goals, a contemptuous disservice to the history and future potential of the site, and a horrendous burden for the adjacent communities to endure for the short middle and perhaps even long term. It could still be so much better.

Marvin Quashnick
VP Public Service
TGCA

Albrecht, Linda

From: Alison Abbott [alison.abbott@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Chu, Sean; City Clerk
Cc: Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Ward 13 Councillor Diane Colley-Urquhart: ward; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14
Subject: Highland Golf Course Redevelopment
Attachments: HP Golf Course Letter January 2017.pdf

Please find attached a letter regarding the Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment. Thank you for your consideration.

Alison Abbott

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 9:49
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

January 5, 2017

Alison Abbott
327 Greenfield Road NE
Calgary Alberta T2E 5R9

Attention: Mayor Nenshi and Members of Calgary City Council

Regarding: Redevelopment of the Highland Park Golf Course

I am writing in regards to the redevelopment of the Highland Park Golf Course which you will be reviewing on January 17, 2016. As a resident of Greenview, directly adjacent to the golf course, our community will be directly impacted by the development.

Firstly, I want to recognize the support and engagement we have received on this file from our Area Councillor Sean Chu, the Mayor's office and the interest shown by Councillors Carra and Farrell. At no time have I doubted the sincerity and genuine desire of all to help the communities of Highland Park and Thorncliffe-Greenview receive a better outcome for this development.

At this time I would describe myself as disillusioned and disheartened by this whole process. This speaks to fundamental flaws in the process of how city admin interacts and engages with the community members. In a development as complex as this one, community volunteers are up against experienced developers and their consultants who seem to have all the advantages and access. There is really no "neutral" party who can work between all the groups for effective discussion and engagement. Although this may be seen as a planning role, from the frontlines it does not happen that way. Throughout this entire process, the main motivation seems to be to get developments approved, even at times ignoring or disregarding the cities own planning policies. I would classify engagement sessions as "informing" sessions.

I would also comment that the various city departments operate in silos and it was very hard to receive clear or concise answers to many of our questions. Often questions are deferred by that is water or parks or roads. This caused many weeks of frustration for the community. I will note at our last engagement meeting we had representatives from parks, water and roads and it was one of the more productive meetings we had. This was a specific ask from the community and I question why there was such reluctance on behalf of the city to make this happen. Many outstanding questions were addressed and we were able to provide our perspective to the various departments. It was obvious from the discussion that it was the first time they were hearing some of the questions or concerns from the community. Again this speaks to a lack of communication within the various departments.

Overall, the revised plan going before council continues to be disappointing. Although there was some movement to create more green space, it does not go far enough. As a community we are realistic enough to realize that when the golf course closed, the area would be redeveloped. Ourask has always been for thoughtful, enlightened development that enhances our communities. Many of the assumptions being made are looking thirty years out and not necessarily addressing the impact to current residents. Our area is crying out for seniors housing at all affordability levels and styles, where in this development is this addressed? My expectation is a development of this size should adapt somewhat to the needs of the community, instead the needs of the developer seem to hold more weight.

As part of your review, I would ask that you take into account the concerns we as a community have and our desire to be part of an engaging development that will enhance and rejuvenate the area. More specifically my concerns are as follows:

- Building heights on some parcels are still too high and do not fit with the adjacent communities. If you drive north from downtown on Edmonton Trail or Centre Street none of the buildings going up are the size being proposed for this development. Why is there so much pressure on this development when the same demands for taller buildings are not being enforced on Edmonton Trail or Centre Street?
- There has been a lack of attention to working with the uniqueness of the site, in terms of the role it plays in storm water management and trying to preserve the urban forest. Instead the outcome is to cut down hundreds of mature trees and fill the valley with dirt. This inner city gem deserves better and why aren't we protecting the natural springs and wetlands in the valley?
- The city has done an amazing job with the East Village and St Patrick's island. Why is our area not worthy of the same consideration for an inner city park along the lines for St Patrick's or Riley Park. When asked about this, the response is, that was public land this is owned by a private developer. Do we not hold developers to the same standards and expectations? Are private developers not encouraged to be innovative or enlightened in their approaches?
- More use of slope adaptive design could be utilized, preserving more of the natural features of the valley as well as increasing green space. Instead of building on the valley floor why not build along the outer edges, leaving a large green space? A slope adaptive development was very successfully built into the side of a hill in Greenview, which integrated with the area and minimized the impact to an already well-used green space
- The community has many concerns about storm water treatment, potential flooding issues and longer term implications for adjacent green space (within Greenview) which need to be addressed by the upcoming water study. I don't understand why the land use is being approved prior to the completion of this important study. Perhaps approvals could be done in stages
- It was disappointing to see how little of the ideas created as part of the 40th Ave charette have made it into the outline plan. The community was very appreciative of charette and expected more of the concepts preferred to be adopted.

- There could also be a large commitment required by the city to upgrade infrastructure including sewer lines. As a tax payer, this causes me concern, again another reason approval should be delayed until after the water study is complete.

In summary, I don't believe the current plan that is before you, is the best for the community. More work can and should be done to improve this development to one that truly will enhance the area. My ask is you send this back for further review and consultation.

Sincerely

Alison Abbott

Albrecht, Linda

From: Jill Kowalchuk [jillkowalchuk@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 9:23 AM
To: City Clerk; Chu, Sean
Subject: LOC2014-0190
Attachments: LOC_2014-0190_Kowalchuk_2017-01-05.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Dear City Clerk and Councillor Chu,

Please find attached a letter to be put on the public record concerning LOC2014-0190 - Proposed Land Use Re-designation of Highland Golf Course.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

Cheers,
Jill Kowalchuk

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 9:49
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

LOC 2014-0190
Proposed Land Use Re-designation
Highland Park Golf Course

January 5, 2017

Dear Councilors and the Honourable Mayor Nenshi;

I have lived my entire life in Calgary and this has truly been my only home. I have been fortunate enough that in both in my personal and professional life to have traveled to and experienced more than 75 cities in 10 countries. I have had the opportunity to compare our amazing city to many other cities both good and bad. I grew up in Lake Bonavista; I lived in Mission for a few years and I eventually moved to Highland Park with my husband 10 years ago. When we moved we expected this to be a "starter home" for us; something we would sell after a few years to move to Lake Bonavista or a similar community when we were ready to start a family. My oldest child is 4 years old and we have yet to leave.

As someone who grew up in and still loves the community of Lake Bonavista, I am surprised at how much I have grown to love Highland Park and everything it has to offer. When I first moved in I thought the real advantage of where I lived was the location. 10 minutes from each of downtown, the university and the airport. Over the last 5 years I have become amazed at the changing profile of the community and the value the diversity of our residents brings to a vibrant and engaging community. When my daughter was born the tiny park at the Community Hall was always empty. Now, on warm days the children fight to use the little park with two swings, a small slide and a rather unsafe climbing structure.

I looked for an opportunity to capitalize on the changing dynamic of our neighbourhood to create something for my community. With countless hours from many parent and non-parent volunteers we are in the first year of our parent run preschool with more than 35 families registered. Although I am proud of the preschool, I am more proud of the fact that once a month on their way out of the community centre the preschool children have to weave through the more than 25 seniors coming in for the monthly Seniors lunch. The programming our community is able to provide given our size is amazing.

I set my sights to getting involved in the Golf Course Development. When I started on this project to say I had little knowledge of Urban Planning and Design would be an understatement. I am thoroughly impressed with the Charette process and the opportunity it provided our community. I was so grateful that council tabled the decision in July and gave us this opportunity. I didn't know what to expect going in, except that the advice from we were given was to participate with an open mind in the process. I advocated for this with all of my neighbours, many of who had a less than positive outlook on the situation. I was incredibly optimistic in my discussions about the value that the Charette would bring. I had high expectations for the Charette and I am pleased to say, with the exception of

Saturday and the final presentation, the Charette team exceeded all of my expectations. On Thursday night I was amazed that some of the most cynical of my neighbours, those that expected the Charette to be a waste of time and have little of value, had changed their outlook. My neighbours saw how with the others in the room we could change our opinions to see the true value in a Transit Oriented Development. Although the presentation on Saturday was disappointing, the updated plan presented by the Green Line North team at the Information session on December 8th (although it was unfortunate the Charette plan was only given one small board out of 18 with a tiny map of the new plan) went a long way to reflect the community's vision through the week of the Charette.

When I started my involvement I was asked early on by a friend "what did I want from the plan" – I responded with what I knew – "more and better greenspace". That message still stands, but what I didn't know in July that I know now is how I think we can best achieve that. When I saw the plan from the Green Line North team I knew this is what our community needs. The highlights from the TOD plan that resonated with me include:


- Compact urban form, buildings placed closely together;
- narrow, pedestrian friendly street;
- commercial throughout the property;
- slope adaptive design;
- and a resulting bigger, better greenspace.

I understand the Developer has been at this for a while and I understand the city cannot hold up his Development. However, I truly believe that a better plan, like the TOD plan, is achievable. The number of buildings on both plans is the same, the number of units on both plans is essentially equivalent, the TOD plan supports slope adaptive development which would prevent the stripping and filing of the valley (which I have been told is cheaper) – the developer has not provided an justification for why he can't take this approach.

My request to council is the same as that from the Highland Park Community Association. Approve the development on the east side of Centre Street and wait for the regional water study and Green Line North plan to be completed. Investigate the possibility of purchasing land to build an anchor park for Highland Park's Transit Oriented Development like St. Patrick's Island is for Inglewood and Riley Park is for Sunnyside.

Until now we haven't seen what is truly possible on the site. The hard work by the Greenline North team and the participating stakeholders has shown that a better plan is possible. A plan that will allow all stakeholders to win and most importantly will make a great Neighbourhood even better! Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Jill Kowalchuk

Albrecht, Linda

From: Donna Marzolf [dmarzolf@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 9:45 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Re: January 16th City Council Public Hearing - LOC2014-0190
Attachments: Letter of Opposition LOC2014-0190 R1.pdf

Please see attached with correct date on letter.

On Thu, Jan 5, 2017 at 9:35 AM, Donna Marzolf <dmarzolf@gmail.com> wrote:
Please accept my letter in opposition to the proposed land use.

Please confirm receipt of the this email and attachment, and that it is received in time to be included in the Council package.

Thank you
Donna Marzolf

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 9:49
THE CITY OF PALM SPRING
CITY CLERK'S

January 5th, 2017

To City Council

Re: **Highland Park Golf Course Development
LOC 2014-0190**

I am a resident of Highland Park and a member of the Highland Park Community Association. I have participated in the discussions with both the City and the developer over the past two years. I anticipated development of the golf course however I oppose the proposed development for all the reasons discussed in my letter to Council for the July 4th Council meeting and the following reasons:

1. The developer's public engagement process proposed a drastically different development scenario. See the attached concepts presented at that time.
2. The developer's application considered a drastically different built form (**Three to four storey terraced apartments and eight to twelve story apartments aligning the transit orientated Center Street "urban corridor".**) as discussed in their Applicant's submission to Council and communicated to the public (both attached for reference) .
3. The revisions to the built form were based on achieving higher density around a false assumption of the location for the future Green Line Station at Highland Drive.
4. The proposed development is not consistent with the information provided during the Green Line 40th Avenue Design Charette, which is based on a market study commissioned by the City of Calgary which stated this corridor is anticipated to support 4 to 6 storey build-out.
5. The interface with the existing community is not respectful of the existing low profile, slope adaptive design.
6. Despite the Green Line Team confirming the station would not be at Highland Drive, the application was expedited to CPC without adjustments to account for this change.
7. The Relaxation Clause included in the Bylaws significantly compromises the community's ability to successfully appeal the most significant issues of height and setback at the DP stage.

8. The planning rationale provided to the Community by the City to support this development is inadequate and is provided below:
 - a. This is similar to Currie Barracks.
 - b. The entire site is considered part of the Urban Corridor.

9. **The proposed land use bylaws do not achieve the design principles cited by the developer and the City:**
 - a. The lowest density parcels are proposed along Center Street due minimum allowable densities that are lower than on the interior parcels.
 - b. The building envelopes and FAR's proposed for the parcels adjacent to the existing community are more than double the "anticipated density". The "anticipated density" cannot be controlled.
 - c. The cap on density is included in a non-statutory document and is cannot be enforced. The allowable density is more than double the anticipated density and is not in accordance with the policies of the MDP and TOD Guidelines.
 - d. The elimination of access from the existing lanes is included in a non-statutory document and cannot be enforced.
 - e. The proposed landscape area adjacent to the existing community is not described as a "landscape setback" and cannot be enforced. It can be compromised by driveways, garbage enclosures, and surface parking.
 - f. The transition with the existing community is inadequate and not enforceable. The combined effects of the relaxation clause along with Items b, c, d, and e above, will compromise an already inadequate transition.
 - g. The development is not slope adaptive although there is the opportunity to lower the overall grades on the site.

Thank you,
Donna Marzolf

DM
(Attachments 4)



Donna Marzolf <dmarzolf@gmail.com>

Highland Park Land Use Application

reimagining <info@reimagining.ca>
To: Donna Marzolf <dmarzolf@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 23, 2015 at 8:54 PM

Hi Donna, thanks for the note! I checked with the project team about your question, and they provided the following response:

At this time, it is early in the outline plan and land use process and at a conceptual level therefore, exact heights and setbacks on any one parcel will not be determined until a development permit stage whereby more detailed grading is also determined. The proposed land use districts have some of this information as a broader envelope to capture the intent of uses and regulations in the parcel. We have yet to work with the City to determine if those proposed land use districts are appropriate and/or if a DC will need to be looked at. The overall intent of the development is for 4 stories, slope adaptive considerations and higher density parcels along Centre Street which is where 8 stories to 12 stories (the up to 12 stories on the east side of Centre Street) is proposed. There will be no access to the development site area from existing lanes. All access is planned to come from the spine road through the overall site.

If you have require any other clarification of the proposed outline plan and land uses, please feel free to contact Jeanie Gartly at 403-692-4536.

Thanks for your interest and inquiry on the proposed application.

Jackie
[Quoted text hidden]

The current proposal does not achieve any of the design principles cited above:

- slope adaptive*
- higher density along Center St.*
- no access from existing lanes.*
- 4 stories with 8:12 at Center Street.*

OUTLINE PLAN
HIGHLAND PARK (WARD 4)
SOUTH OF MCKNIGHT BOULEVARD NW AND
EAST OF CENTRE STREET N

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION MAP 34C

Highland Village Green is anticipated to accommodate 2,071 residential units and approximately 4,500 square metres of retail space. The plan design implements the following Ten Guiding Principles:

1. Revitalize and regenerate the existing golf course lands;
2. Respect the existing, adjacent neighbourhoods;
3. Prioritize a safe and walkable neighbourhood;
4. Promote pedestrian connectivity through well-designed public spaces;
5. Contribute to a vibrant, mixed-use commercial/residential urban corridor;
6. Accommodate density in order to support existing municipal services (e.g., transit), area schools, and places of worship.
7. Promote uniqueness in built-form and site design due to existing conditions;
8. Target housing markets that offer choice to all residents;
9. Prioritize streetscape and landscaping design; and
10. Create a multi-modal access network.

The "heart" of the neighbourhood is created through the vibrant naturalized park corridor and "outdoor room" parks system. The corridor and parks bring people to and through the neighbourhood while integrating high-quality multi-dwelling residential buildings and retail opportunities for the community as a whole.


[The neighbourhood is a mix of multi-dwelling residential buildings such as street and stacked townhouses, three to four-storey terraced apartments and eight to twelve-storey apartments aligning the transit-oriented Centre Street "urban corridor". Commercial opportunities along Centre Street contribute to the vitality of those living in the neighbourhood as well as those using the open space system as they walk and bike through the neighbourhood. The unique landscape of the lands have created a neighbourhood with a mix of interesting building types and open spaces that respond to natural and man-made slopes, and special connectivity opportunities for the pedestrian or bicyclist to the surrounding residential neighbourhoods and broader community.]

Highland Village Green focuses around an urban central roadway that connects to Centre Street at the north, 40 Avenue NW at the south and 4 Street NW at the west. A pedestrian open space corridor follows the alignment of the roadway spine albeit separated. The combination of the roadway and open space corridor have created a variety of unique residential building parcels to connect and integrate with the landscape and the surrounding residential neighbourhoods and open space connections.

The higher-density building types along Centre Street will provide the opportunity for a potential grocery store and neighbourhood retail opportunities such as coffee shops and personal services. The opportunity exists for the commercial to further support the transit-oriented urban corridor such that local residents can walk for neighbourhood services as well as use this commercial amenity as they commute with transit to and from work to the downtown or elsewhere.

CONCEPT A



1,600 units



IMAGINING
A NEW FUTURE
FOR THE
HIGHLAND GOLF COURSE

1,900 units

CONCEPT B



Albrecht, Linda

From: Naumann, Anne
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2017 12:41 PM
To: City Clerk; Ward 02 Office; Ward 03 Office; Ward 04 Office; Ward 05 Office; Ward 06 Office; Ward 07 Office; Ward 08 Office; Ward 09 Office; Ward 10 Office; Ward 11 Office; Ward 12 Office; Ward 13 Office; Ward 14 Office
Cc: Chu, Sean; Deederly, Scott; Franks, Dustin
Subject: Corrected Submission re LOC2014-0190 for Highland Park golf course
Attachments: Put the Park Back in HPCA corrected.PDF.pdf

I apologize, it was brought to my attention that there was a mathematical error in the submission I provided yesterday, which resulted in some statements being made in the document that weren't completely accurate. I tried to resend the corrected document from my home email address but the delivery failed. I am trying again using this work email address as I and others have found emails from a home email address to @Calgary.ca email addresses often fail to be delivered. Please note this document should not be considered to be the position of my employer.

Please replace the document I provided January 5 in your package for the Jan 16, 2017 Council meeting for item LOC2014-0190 regarding the Highland Park golf course with this corrected version. Thank you,

Anne Naumann, Highland Park resident

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -6 PM 2:38
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

To: City Clerk, Mayor of Calgary, & City Councillors

For: January 16, 2017 City Council Public Hearing

General Information about Highland Park & the Golf Course lands

- This inner city community was built in the 1950s, as Calgary spread northward, taking over farmland in the area, including the Laycock Farm, which was on the current golf course lands.
- The farm area included several creeks as tributaries to Nose Creek, multiple wetlands, as well as several artesian springs, all of which ran through the current golf course lands and carved out the valley bottom from the surrounding land. These lands are still exemplified by a steep slope (greater than the 20% angle that is normally classified as "environmental reserve" lands) surrounding the creek bed and shores, and wetlands at the valley bottom. See the aerial photo from 1951, appended, which shows how the creeks and tributaries carved into the landscape and flowed to what is now Confederation Creek in the valley bottom.
- This valley low spot often flooded due to the fact that it drained a very large catchment basin to the north and west, including what is now Nose Hill Park.
- The Laycock family eventually sold their farmland to the Adderson family, who in 1957 signed a legal Caveat with the City of Calgary stating that the land was unsuitable for residential development, but would be suitable as a nine hole golf course, and that if they built that recreational amenity the City would still retain access to the land it owned on the parcel for utility right-of-way. During this time the City vaulted Confederation Creek underground through this site, keeping it underground through to its outfall at Nose Creek just north of 41 Ave NE.
- The Adderson family built and ran the Highland golf course for several decades. The family planted the hundreds of water-loving trees on the site, which thrived in the area despite Calgary's notorious dry climate. The trees acted as living infrastructure to absorb massive amounts of rainfall and groundwater and keep the golf course operational except during very exceptional rain events.
- The land was later sold in 2013 to Maple Projects Inc. for an extremely discounted price, given that much of the land continued to be covered by permanent wetlands, artesian springs, and was considered by all previous interested developers and the vast majority of the surrounding residents to be undevelopable.
- In the remainder of Highland Park, 100% of the homes are zoned RC-2 or higher.
- Highland Park is already densifying at a significant rate from conversion of RC-2 and MC-1 bungalow housing stock into infill or higher density housing, without any development at all in the old golf course lands. See Table 1 below:

Table 1

Highland Park	Census 2010	Census 2015	5 Yr % Change
Population	3579	4139	15.65% ↑
Total Dwellings	2103	2209	5.04% ↑
Occupied Dwellings	1810	2013	11.22% ↑
Avg Residents / Dwelling	1.9	2.1	10.52% ↑
Single Family Homes	897	857	↓ 4.46%
Duplexes	233	289	24.03% ↑
Apartments	411	522	27.01% ↑
Townhouses	20	19	↓ 5.0%
Converted Dwellings	501	476	↓ 4.99%
Community Total Land of 140 Hectares per Population (1000's)	39.12 ha/1000	33.82 ha/1000	↓ 3.52%
Community density: units per ha	15.02	15.78	5.04% ↑

Information from City of Calgary Civic Census & Calgary.ca

City of Calgary Policy on Green Space & Parks

- The City of Calgary's Municipal Development Plan states as part of its policy on **Complete Communities**:
 - "Communities should be planned according to the following criteria for complete communities and provide: ...
 - x. A healthy natural environment with street trees and greenery, connections to the city's open space system and an integration of *local natural systems* with an urban development pattern *that respects the natural function of the landscape*;..." (italics added)
- It goes on to state in section 2.3.4 **Parks, open spaces and outdoor recreation**:
 - "Calgary's most prominent natural open spaces occur on its ridges and hilltops and along its creeks and riverfronts within the river valley system. The City is committed to protecting the value and quality of these assets and will strive to sustain them while ensuring they remain accessible for the enjoyment and outdoor pursuits of all."
- Further in the same section it states:
 - "In addition to these natural areas, The City provides quality public parks, open spaces and other community amenities by:
 - Protecting, conserving and restoring environmentally significant areas, and providing a sustainable, connected and diverse open space system that represents the natural ecosystem of Calgary the region....
 - Providing high-quality open space and neighbourhood, community, regional and city-wide recreation opportunities to service new development or redeveloped areas."
- Under the section **Policies, A high-quality public park system**, it states:
 - "d. Protect and improve scenic landscapes that enhance the amenity and character of Calgary's river valley park system, other waterways and wetlands, natural tree stands and prominent escarpments....
 - f. Protect the basic function of city parks and public open spaces, and prevent parkland conversion to other uses."
- Under the section **Policies, Land use, location and design**, it states:
 - "Ensure sufficient community open space provision in Inner City and Established Areas by maintaining a minimum of 2.0 hectares of open space per 1,000 residents. Calculations should be applied to logical community clusters where parks and recreation amenities are accessible and shared between communities. Community open space includes areas dedicated for schools; community centres; playfields; outdoor performance spaces; community gardens; and habitat areas that offer public amenity..."

Existing & Potential Future Green Space in Highland Park

- With regard to existing public open space or green space, Highland Park has only 4.8% of its 140 hectare land base as green space.
- Part of this total includes the footprint of the Buchanan school building, which can hardly be considered public green space.
- The City Planning department reps advised us this 4.8% is equivalent to 1.7 hectares / 1000 residents, which is already below the target of 2.0 hectares of green space / 1000 residents in Calgary neighbourhoods.
- Assuming the City Administration used 2015 Census figures, this calculates out to 7.04 hectares of existing public open / green space in Highland Park.
- Given that all single family homes in Highland Park can be converted to duplexes or small apartment buildings (6 or 8-plexes), there is a significantly high existing density potential for the neighbourhood that puts further pressure on our existing small amount of green space.

- Table 2 below illustrates the current density potential of Highland Park due to existing zoning of R-2 or higher:

Table 2

Dwellings	Current Units	Max Current Potential Units
Single Family	857	0
Duplexes	289	1831 (from 90% of SF)
Apartments (i.e. 6-plex or more)	522	1038 (from 10% of SF)
Townhouses	19	19
Converted Dwelling	476	476
Other	46	46
TOTAL UNITS	2209	3410 (a 54% increase)

Information from City of Calgary Civic Census

- Given Highland Park's existing maximum density potential is 3,410 units due to housing conversion, and using the City Administration's estimated average of 2.2 residents / unit, this results in an existing density potential of 7,502 Highland Park residents, which represents an 81% increase of our community's current population, **all with NO DEVELOPMENT of the golf course.**
- With that existing density potential, the community of Highland Park needs a total of 15.0 hectares of open / green space, or another 7.96 hectares, just to hit the *bare minimum* target of 2.0 ha / 1000 residents before a single unit is built on the golf course lands.
- We have also been advised that with the proposed Green Line LRT station planned for 40th Ave & Centre St N, an additional estimated 5,000 residents should expect to be housed within 600m of the station location. The land use development proposal before Council doesn't take into account the densification effect from the Green Line's "transit village" that will grow around the new station, and the resulting green space needs of those future Highland Park residents.
- We also know that the Bylaws, as proposed, contain no maximums for density on any parcel except Parcel 13, and therefore any future owner of the parcels can build out the density **much more** than has been suggested by the current owner would be the maximum number of units on the site.
- So, there are 4 pressures driving the need for much more green space in Highland Park than has been proposed in this land use change proposal:
 1. **Existing shortage** of public green space for the **current** resident population,
 2. A **magnified shortage** due to **ongoing densification** from existing zoning conversions of single family (SF) homes,
 3. A **further magnified shortage** due to Green Line LRT "transit village" future zoning high density build out, and
 4. A **catastrophic shortage of green space** once the future residents of the **high density development on the golf course lands** are included.
- The **only place** any significant green space can come from for the community of Highland Park is the golf course lands.

- See Table 3 below for population projections & green space allocation comparisons:

Table 3

Highland Park	Existing 2015	Add est. max SF home conversion (ongoing densifying)	Add est. Green Line "transit village" (+5000 residents)	Add est. golf course devel'mt as proposed (+4556 residents & 5.5 ha greenspace)	Add instead est. golf course devel'mt as Bylaws are written (+8000 residents)
Population	4139	7502	12,502	17,058	20,502
Dwellings	2209	3410	5683	7710	9,319
Avg Residents / Dwelling	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Green space (ha)	7.04	7.04	7.04	12.9	12.9
Green space (ha) / 1000 residents	1.7	0.94	0.56	0.74	0.61
Total green space req'd to maintain 2.0 ha / 1000	8.28 ha	15.00 ha	25.00 ha	34.12 ha	41.00 ha
Total green space req'd to come from golf course lands to maintain 2.0 ha / 1000	1.24 ha	7.96 ha	17.96 ha	27.08 ha ^a	33.96 ha ^a

^a even if the entire golf course parcel was converted to green space it would be insufficient

- Providing only 5.55 hectares of green space wouldn't be anywhere close to sufficient to meet City of Calgary green space targets even if no one ever moved in to the proposed golf course development.
- Because Highland Park is already well below the City's policy standard for green space, and the green space that is proposed to be added with this development is grossly insufficient, and given the proposal also can also add up to 8800 new residents, this proposal, if approved, would result in cutting the already insufficient green space per 1000 residents in Highland Park from 1.7 to 0.6 ha per 1000 residents, representing a cut of 64% of our existing substandard per capita green space.
- The potential for 0.6 ha of green space per 1000 Highland Park residents represents a mere 30% of the normal standard for other communities in Calgary. This will certainly not help support the residents of Highland Park which is one of the City's 8 Neighbourhoods of Promise. These neighbourhoods are communities at risk of significant poverty, and have been identified as being in need of additional City supports and considerations that would normally not be offered to other communities. This permanent sub-standard amount of per capita green space **would also violate the Durban Commitment** signed by the City of Calgary, in that "Ecosystem services can play an important role in poverty alleviation and as a result the consequences of biodiversity loss and ecosystem disruption are harshest for the poor;" (Section 2.5).

- In addition, adding this amount of additional population to our community without including planning for any additional significant amenities, including **no plan for a school for the estimated approximately 2500 more school-aged children** out of the additional 16,000 potential new Highland Park residents can in no way be considered "sound planning".

History of Green Space Discussions with Developer & City Administration

- In early discussions with the developer and the City, community residents were willing to accept the trade-off of higher heights of buildings adjacent to the major transit nodes of Centre St N, 40 Ave, and McKnight Blvd in order to:
 - Preserve a large open space in the valley bottom that could be used as a small playing field, or a space to throw a Frisbee with friends and family, or a space to have outdoor theatre performances, etc. (we wanted as much green space as we could get because we knew we needed it),
 - Create a pathway to help connect the Confederation Park pathway near the southwest end of the parcel all the way to the east side of Centre St via an underpass across Centre St (similar to that under 14 St NW) or an overpass to join up to the existing City pathways that run south and east and link to the Nose Creek pathway system and thereby support the MDP goal of Connecting the City,
 - Re-naturalize or "daylight" Confederation Creek to create a beautiful water feature as a community asset, enhance and protect the existing environmentally sensitive (and undevelopable) wetlands on the site, and to assist with flood mitigation in heavy rain events and develop the edges of the property with slope-adaptive housing that respected the historical topography of the site,
 - Provide a location for storm water pre-treatment before the water joins Nose Creek a few hundred metres to the east, and
 - Receive some community benefit of density bonusing to be applied to community improvements.
- The community was promised something akin to "Confederation Park East" with the green space for this development, and in exchange the community believed they would be agreeing to somewhat higher heights than were originally put forward, i.e. 5 to 6 storey condos vs. the 3 to 4 storey condos that had originally been proposed during the developer's original engagement sessions.
- In the end, the proposal subsequently put forward by the developer and City Administration, and eventually agreed to reluctantly by the Calgary Planning Commission did the following:
 - Eliminated the large central open space (and drastically reduced the green space for the whole parcel while dramatically increasing the density across the entire parcel – a lose-lose scenario for the community, and a violation of Calgary's Open Space Policy, and Transit Oriented Development principles),
 - Eliminated any effective access to the small green space allotted in the parcel by any of the existing Highland Park residents because it was all to the north of the "Highland Drive" roadway that was proposed to be wider than Centre St N without justification,
 - Included an orphan 3 and a half block long section of "commuter bike lanes" on the side of Highland Drive, which connected to nowhere, and would run adjacent to the linear multi-use pathway through the site, but would chew up a large portion of land that could otherwise be green space,
 - Proposed a linear pathway on the existing City-owned utility right-of-way land on the parcel – making it seem like they were graciously "giving" the community land that already belonged to all of us,


- Proposed to have the multi-use pathway on the southwest portion of the parcel flow onto the sidewalk at 40th Ave NW, which runs directly in front of the community's Seniors' Centre, thereby creating a recipe for disaster,
- Proposed to have the multi-use pathway adjacent to Laycock Drive on the north end of the parcel dead-end at Centre St, forcing cyclists, pedestrians, and those in wheelchairs to travel in a U-shape along the sidewalk to cross Centre St at the crosswalk that would be installed at the newly proposed traffic signal at Centre St and Highland Drive N, and travel back north again in order to rejoin the existing City pathway behind the proposed tower on the east side of Centre St, and
- Removed any further mention of density bonusing without explanation.
- For the subsequent meetings (I won't characterize them as negotiations) in the Fall of 2016 between community reps, the developer, and City Administration, the community reps were advised that **every issue of importance to the community was "off the table" for discussion:**
 - Building heights,
 - Density of the units on the site,
 - Amount and location of public green space,
 - Massive width of the road through the site,
 - Location and connectivity of the multi-use pathway,
 - Preservation of the wetlands on the site,
 - Preservation of more of the hundreds of mature trees on the site, and the list goes on.
- At these meetings, the community reps were presented with a series of "fait accompli" plans for the design guidelines for the buildings on the site, and only a few extremely minor changes put forward by the community reps that amounted to "nibbling around the edges" with regard to building setbacks, stepbacks, and buffering were eventually included, at the cost of adding in the **permissive 10% relaxation clause into each Bylaw which was worse than the original wording.**
- At these same meetings, community reps were advised by City Administration that the justification for not considering any of the community's requests for more reasonable building heights and density in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, for preserving the wetlands and a large portion of the valley bottom and the resulting trees on the site was NOT due to some little-known City policy but **in deference to the developer's economics!**
- We citizens of Calgary rely on City Administration in municipal planning to apply City Policy in an equitable and balanced way for all communities in order to achieve "sound planning" outcomes, and not let how much money a developer can make from a parcel be the deciding factor in this kind of massive change to the character of any neighbourhood in Calgary, especially one that is a Neighbourhood of Promise.
- Given all that, it does not meet the test of "sound planning" that this major developer with this request for a land use change that will drive a massive proposed development, one that is designed to accommodate at least 5000 and up to 8800 people (which, in itself is a violation of TOD principles because the vast majority of the site is outside the 600m walk zone to the future LRT station), was not even required by City Administration to meet the basic goals of the Municipal Development Plan such as:
 - Meeting the bare minimum target of 2.0 hectares of green space, especially usable green space, per 1000 residents (**Greening the City goal**), even for the development itself,
 - Incorporating a pedestrian overpass or underpass to properly link the proposed new pathway to the existing pathway infrastructure across Centre St and to allow safe passage for wildlife (**Connecting the City goal**),
 - Retaining the possibility of "daylighting" Confederation Creek, both as a means of flood mitigation, and storm water pre-treatment (**Greening the City goal**),

- Maintain and protect the spring-fed wetlands in the parcel, which had been erroneously classified as Temporary Wetlands, apparently so as to more easily justify their destruction (**Greening the City goal**).
- It also makes no sense that the community's request for density bonusing to help it accommodate this potential massive project was rejected, given the major impact it will have on our developed inner city community.
- In our discussions with **City Administration** representatives in the Fall of 2016, and my own personal discussions with some Parks Planners and Water Resources Planners, these City representatives stated that while they truly wanted a better final product for this land use change proposal, but they felt they could **NOT enforce City policies or the Municipal Development Plan if the developer wasn't willing to agree**. They felt their hands were tied.
- We were advised that City Planning's only consideration in this case was to ensure the proposal did not violate the Municipal Government Act, and all other City Policies could be ignored. Further, **we were advised that the only body that could enforce City Policies would be City Council**.

Win-Win-Win Opportunity

- It is clear in this case that both City Administration and many members on the Calgary Planning Commission recognized and stated that this land-use proposal was sub-standard, but they felt they had no choice but to recommend it for approval and have City Council make the final decision.
- So, it's your turn. This is a **make-or-break moment** for our community, and the surrounding communities. You can choose to approve this sub-standard proposal, which doesn't meet the goals of the MDP, which violates multiple City Policies, and which doesn't meet the test of "sound planning", **OR you can implement a more creative win-win-win solution** that can result in a legacy that all Councillors and the community can be proud of, is fiscally prudent, and will allow the developer to benefit as well.
- This Win-Win-Win solution is this:
 - Approve Bylaw 29D2017 with amendments to reduce the height of the buildings on Parcel 1 east of Centre St to a maximum of 4 to 6 stories to be in line with TOD principles and the Municipal Development Plan (i.e. there is no Major Activity Centre at this location to support the currently proposed higher building heights and higher density),
 - **Benefit to the developer** → this will allow the developer to move forward with part of the development and begin to get a return on his investment,
 - **Benefit to the City** → upholds the City Policies of transit-oriented development because this location is too far away from the future LRT station to justify the highest density in the entire area, and upholds the City's Municipal Development Plan targets for high density developments as more appropriate around Major Activity Centres,
 - **Benefit to the community** → this will allow for more community buy-in with this more reasonable height of building.
 - Defer approval of all other Bylaws and pursue the purchase or expropriation of land on the site on the west side of Centre St to allow for public green space and on-site storm water pre-treatment in the existing valley topography so as to ensure water flowing to Nose Creek meets the requirements under the Nose Creek Watershed Water Management Plan,
 - **Benefit to the developer** → this will put some cash into the developer's hands to fund his development on the east side of Centre St, and will save him a significant amount of money on the fill that would otherwise be required in order to make the site on the west side of Centre St developable,

- **Benefit to the City** → this will allow the City to install the required regional storm water treatment infrastructure on City-owned land, to use the existing valley topography as an aid in water collection, and will allow the City to ensure it is abiding by the requirements set out in the Nose Creek Watershed Water Management Plan for water flowing into Nose Creek,
 - **Benefit to the community** → this will provide the required additional green space the community so desperately wants and needs, and will protect much of the valley bottom, the on-site wetlands, and many of the trees on the site as residents have been asking since this site was purchased.
- So please, City Councillors, **put the "Park" back in Highland Park.**



Albrecht, Linda

From: Calgary River Valleys [calgaryrivervalleys@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 11:01 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Revised CRV submission to Council re Highland Park
Attachments: Dec 5 2017 CRV let to Council re Highland Park.pdf

As per our phone call a few minutes ago,
many thanks for replacing CRV's previous submission with this corrected version.

Patty Munkittrick MCIP, RPP (*We've moved! Please update our mail code to #64*)
Coordinator
Calgary River Valleys
www.CalgaryRiverValleys.org
403-268-4867
P.O. Box 2100, Station M, #64
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

Calgary River Valleys champions and engages the public in the protection, appreciation and stewardship of Calgary's rivers, creeks, wetlands and water resources.
We are the voice of our rivers.

If at any time you would like to be removed from the Calgary River Valleys general mailing list please reply to this email with a subject line stating "remove me" and we will update our records.

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 11:37
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S



Calgary River Valleys champions and engages the public in the protection, appreciation and stewardship of Calgary's rivers, creeks, wetlands and watershed resources.

We are the voice of our rivers.

January 5, 2017

Office of the City Clerk
City of Calgary

Atten: His Worship Mayor Nenshi and Members of City Council

Re: HIGHLAND PARK: Proposed By-laws 29D2017 to 33D2017 and
Proposed Highland Village Green Design Guidelines

Please find attached letters that Calgary River Valleys (CRV) has submitted to Administration and the Calgary Planning Commission with respect to the proposals made by Maple Projects Inc. for the redevelopment of the Highland Golf Course lands in Highland Park.

From the perspective of responding members, the revised plan being brought forward and the proposed amendments have not addressed the concerns set out in these earlier letters. Existing watercourses and wetlands with protective setbacks would be lost or further compromised and their local functionalities/contributions essentially eliminated. Their regional contributions as now existing and potential would be lost.

Our members are not satisfied that the legal status of the creek has been fully or fairly addressed including the opportunity that the City of Calgary has as the local planning authority to take Environmental Reserve (ER) adjacent to watercourses. They also are concerned that the Level 1 BIA Preliminary Natural Site Assessment completed July 2014 by the Applicant for the purposes of this development proposal would be used as defining the significance of these wetlands. Some characteristics/features/ contributory factors, historical elements and artificial physical restrictions were not fully addressed. These include the relatively permanent /sustainable water supply (artesian spring fed), the observations by biologists suggesting that the wetlands and their vegetation have continued to recover after the 2014 assessment (the wetlands had been controlled/alterd as a part of the golf course management for many decades), and the very obvious drainage engineering that was installed many years ago to restrict the size and nature of the wetlands (appears easily removable with possibility of significant renaturalization).

During the planning consultation process, Administration advised members of CRV and others including members of the local Community Associations, that the City of Calgary had no option in terms of abilities to protect and restore these important ecological assets. In early stages we were told that the opportunity to take Environmental Reserve as allowed under the Municipal Government Act was lost decades ago at times of earlier subdivision, but after our enquiry it was determined that the loss of opportunity to take ER applied only to a small piece of the land and for most of the land the opportunity to take ER under the Municipal Government Act remains available today. We were told that the watercourse (referred to by City Administration reps as the "historic creek" but from our assessment there are at least three identifiable watercourses) is not a watercourse because it is in a pipe (actually a vault) containing an underground stormwater system. Our members have noted that there are watercourses in the valley that are not in a vault or pipe and further that the "historic creek - non watercourses" including Confederation Creek and Nose Hill Creek have functioned and continue to function as natural drainage courses for a large watershed of over 15

Calgary River Valleys
www.CalgaryRiverValleys.org
calgaryrivervalleys@outlook.com
403-268-4867

P.O. Box 2100, Station M, #64; Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5





Calgary River Valleys champions and engages the public in the protection, appreciation and stewardship of Calgary's rivers, creeks, wetlands and watershed resources.

We are the voice of our rivers.

square kilometres. We are not aware of any higher order streams within the City of Calgary that do not function as part of the stormwater system in one form or another. Information to date indicates that these watercourses remain as property of the Crown under the Public Lands Act and the City of Calgary has the opportunity to reserve these features and the lands necessary for their protection and restoration.

Viewing the valley and its existing landform with its defining watercourses and wetlands, the question should be, what opportunities do we have to utilize the tools available through existing legislation and policy to protect and enhance the natural features and contributions locally and downstream. Over the past twenty years the City of Calgary has developed legislation and policies to protect and celebrate our natural features, their contributions to our lives, sense of place and providing for the green space that would justify the very significant residential urban density and intensification of use on portions of these lands and in the nearby neighbourhoods including the green line corridor which bisects these lands. Our assessment of the proposed redevelopment of these lands is that *none* of the three obvious ecological features of these lands including creek, wetlands or valley landscape have been protected.

Given the results of the Green Line charrette in October 2016 that suggested that significantly more green space and less roadbed;

Given that the open green space being presented in the proposal relative to the known projected build out of the site will actually result in a reduced open space quotient per 1000 residents as recommended in the Municipal Development Plan policy 2.3.4 h);

Given the opportunities that are available and not utilized in this plan;

Given that important technical studies have not been completed or approved;

Given that the Province has not approved destruction of landforms, wetlands or more permanent loss of watercourse assets;

Given our concerns that the potential for restoring and protecting natural features and functionalities has not been given adequate consideration;

Given that a significant portion of lands subject to Provincial assessment would through this plan, ultimately be under City jurisdiction including much of the Municipal Reserve and Public Utility lot lands,

It is recommended that this proposed development be rejected and returned to the planning process with direction to create a plan that is more worthy of the attributes this site has to offer. Our organization would be pleased to participate in any such visioning and planning process with these communities.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Morrison", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Bill Morrison,
Chair, Watershed Policy and Planning Committee
Calgary River Valleys

cc: CRV Circulation

Attach.



Calgary River Valleys
www.CalgaryRiverValleys.org
calgaryrivervalleys@outlook.com
403-268-4867

P.O. Box 2100, Station M, #64; Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5



Calgary River Valleys champions and engages the public in the protection, appreciation and stewardship of Calgary's rivers, creeks, wetlands and watershed resources.

We are the voice of our rivers.

April 20, 2016

Attention: Calgary Planning Commission

Re: Proposed Highland Village Green LOC 2014-0190

Members of Calgary River Valleys were advised in 2014 of the proposed redevelopment of the Highland Valley Golf course and in February 2015 at the request of City Planning, submitted comments on the Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan. A copy of that letter is attached. While we received information that a response was prepared, to date Calgary River Valleys has not received a reply to this submission. The concerns and suggestions that were raised in CRV's 2015 letter have not been addressed and are still relevant to the most recent version of the proposed development of the site.

Recently we were advised that the proposal was proceeding and was to be recommended for approval by City Planning. We note from information released by City Planning through Calgary Planning Commission April 14, 2016 that the most recent revised proposal (March 1, 2016?) coming before Calgary Planning Commission involves enormous destruction of a natural landform, a natural watercourse, and natural wetlands. Such a development would forego and negate the wonderful opportunities that would be afforded with enlightened consolidation of parkland opportunities that should arise from the use of Environmental and Municipal Reserves and existing city owned lands.

Specifically, the opportunities to protect the creek corridor for immediate or future daylighting and all the benefits that will offer as described in our previous letter, need to be fully explored. Concerns regarding the treatment of the natural watercourse that runs through the valley of the subject lands remain outstanding. At the root of this are the circumstances or evaluation that has led to no Environmental Reserve (ER) lands having been identified or taken as part of this development proposal. There are two parts to this consideration;

a. Does the City have the opportunity or right to take Environmental Reserve lands?

We have been told, and we are advised by community residents and stakeholders that they have been told, by City Planning staff that the opportunity to take Environmental Reserve (ER) has been lost when lands were previously subdivided and Municipal Reserve land deferred. Recently and after enquiring for the details of those previous decisions, we were advised that in fact for most of the lands at issue, no past Reserves were taken or deferred and that deferred Municipal Reserve was taken in the past, only on the small area represented by Block 5. In accordance with Section 663(d) of the Municipal Government Act, if the Reserve lands were taken through a previous subdivision process the Subdivision Authority cannot take lands or cash in lieu in subsequent subdivisions. However, even for Block 5, if the Environmental Reserve lands were not taken for the contemplation that the lands would be used as a golf course, it would seem that opportunity should still exist when the lands would be intended for urban uses; the spirit and intent of the law would not otherwise be served. Now that the land is proposed for residential development, the taking of ER along the natural drainage course seems an appropriate and available consideration and option. Unfortunately, community residents and other stakeholders were left with the understanding that the City did not have option to take Environmental Reserves and that there are very limited opportunities to create open space and to protect natural features and functionalities and to optimize the open space. Therefore, stakeholders do not have the necessary information to



Calgary River Valleys
www.CalgaryRiverValleys.org
calgaryrivervalleys@outlook.com
403-268-4867

P.O. Box 2100, Station M, #64; Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

make informed comment on the spectacular opportunities available in the redefining and redevelopment of this site.

b. Are there lands that would qualify as Environmental Reserve?

It was further suggested by City Planning staff that the ER taking is immaterial as there had been a determination by City Administration that the creek is not a "natural drainage course" for the purposes of taking ER under section 664(1) of the Municipal Government Act. It is acknowledged that the creek has been channelized and vaulted. However, the determination that the creek is not a natural drainage course would not seem to have taken into account Subsection 3(3) of the Public Lands Act, which states that the title to the bed and shore of naturally occurring watercourses are vested in the Crown and that a watercourse does not cease to become naturally occurring by reason of its water being diverted by human act. (References to this section can be found in point 2 of the CRV letter of February 2015.) We note that the application and plan *does not* refer to natural watercourse, creek, natural seeps. There is no question that the watercourse has contributed to forming the valley and that the watercourse remains and is still largely fed by natural springs/ seeps, and local precipitation. Many visits in the past, as golfers, residents and recreational users have confirmed the springs/ seeps and wetlands along the west and north of the valley. Similar natural flows also contribute in the upper reaches of this creek going back several kilometres to the south and west.

To date, we have not been able to obtain answers to many of the questions arising from this application to review among our members and partners. Certainly there are cost factors – much related to the Applicant's intention to develop lower lands that could be protected parkland. Such parkland amenity would justify the much greater intensity of use proposed on the remaining lands and along the expected Centre St. transit oriented corridor. There are no other such opportunities of any significance along the proposed north LRT Green Line until West Nose Creek several kilometres north.

CRV members and partners responding to the application have also noted a very selective use of clauses from the Calgary Municipal Development Plan to justify the Applicant's concept and City Planning support. We note that those clauses requesting respect and consideration for environmental assets and functionalities and of adjacent neighbourhoods have not been addressed. The longer term vision arising out of other planning exercises including ImagineCalgary and the BiodiverCity Strategy do not appear. A more comprehensive Redevelopment Plan would give a much more holistic planning approach.

Before any decision is made with regard to land use designation, Outline Plan, and subdivision, and before any decisions are made with regard to Environmental and Municipal Reserves, a full assessment of all of the background information, issues and opportunities should be made so that stakeholders, residents, Calgary Planning Commission, and City Council have the ability to make more informed decisions on these matters. Development of these lands deserves a much more comprehensive and sensitive planning approach that will ensure that the public park potential and natural functionalities are recovered and preserved.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,


Steve Meadows,
President, Calgary River Valleys



Bill Morrison,
Chair, Watershed Policy and Planning Committee
Calgary River Valleys

cc: Shawn Small, Sr. Planner, Team Lead
CRV circulation



Calgary River Valleys champions and engages the public in the protection, appreciation and stewardship of Calgary's rivers, creeks, wetlands and watershed resources

We are the voice of our rivers

February 27, 2015

Attn: Heather Dybvig

Planning, Development & Assessment
City of Calgary

President
Steve Meadows

Vice President
Michael Kenny

Secretary
Bill Morrison

Treasurer
Dave McIver

Director
Muhari Guna

Director
Terry Klassen

Director
Mike Murray

Director
Sarah Nevill

Re: Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan Application

Dear Ms Dybvig,

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on the Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan Application.

Members of Calgary River Valleys have reviewed the proposal and ask that you consider the following comments:

- 1. Observations:** The lands proposed for redesignation and development are primarily a creek and creek valley which have functioned to carry water flows from a considerable watershed to the west. We are advised that the drainage area is in excess of 15 sq km of mainly developed communities. The valley is also a natural repository for ground water flows from the more immediate surrounding district. The lands have been used for many years as a golf course and have provided an important element of open space amenity for the development of the local residential communities of Highland Park and Greenview.

The creek has been channelized and vaulted to provide some protection for the former golf course but under high flow events the lower valley does flood and the valley is the obvious overland flow corridor and retention area that protects adjacent and downstream developments.

Members note that the City owns a 30m wide utility corridor through the length of the valley. We understand that Municipal Reserve remains owing from past subdivisions of adjacent lands and that an earlier motion of City Council has directed that the Municipal Reserve should be taken and remain in Highland

Advisor
Brian Pincott
(Councillor Ward 11)

Advisor
Harpreet Sandhu

Advisor
Darrell Sargent

Advisor
Robin Seuve

Advisor
George Stalker



February 27, 2015

Park. There should also be Environmental Reserve relative to the Creek and springs.

2. Concerns: The development proposals would build the main service vehicle carriageway directly over the lower and historic creek bed and meander belt. The proponent landowner proposal does not recognize the creek and floodplain although the proposed 3 to 4 meters of fill appears to be an obvious attempt to defeat or reduce the flooding potential and would likely have other adverse impacts. We understand this creek, bed and shore does exist and should be respected (see Public Lands Act Excerpt below). See attached map of the City of Calgary compiled by the Surveys and Mapping Branch, Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Government of Canada, 1958.

Section 3 of Public Lands Act states:

3 (1) Subject to subsection (2) but notwithstanding any other law, the title to the beds and shores of
(a) all permanent and naturally occurring bodies of water, and
(b) all naturally occurring rivers, streams, watercourses and lakes,
is vested in the Crown in right of Alberta and a grant or certificate of title made or issued before, on or after May 31, 1984 does not convey title to those beds or shores.

(3) For the purposes of subsection (1), a river, stream or watercourse does not cease to be naturally occurring by reason only that its water is diverted by human act. RSA 1980 cP-30 s3;1984 c34 s3

3. Opportunities: All members and associates responding to our report / request for information have noted that this Highland Valley is a natural continuation of the Confederation Park Corridor (formerly known as Centennial Creek Ravine) which serves communities to the south (see attached air photo). A first priority for higher and better use of these lands would be to preserve all or most of this valley as a park, as floodway and for at least some interception, retention and pre-treatment of stormwater. Such uses would provide desirable open space for existing communities which currently have less than the standard of 10% open

February 27, 2015

space and would better encourage and provide quality of life amenities to justify more build-out, density and intensity of use in the inner city.

If the full valley cannot be utilized as suggested above then consideration should be given to consolidation of City owned lands, Municipal Reserve and Creek Environmental Reserve to the lower valley. Within the consolidated lands in the valley bottom, connection to open storm ponding areas should be required for this development to ensure a more natural and optimal functioning of the valley while maintaining a significant regional parkway corridor connecting Confederation Park to the Nose Creek Valley.

4. **Other Comment:** Calgary River Valleys is an original participant in the Imagine Calgary process, there are elements agreed to through Imagine Calgary which should be incorporated into any significant development within the inner city to better ensure that the existing adjacent communities will more closely experience the “complete communities” environment envisioned by 2036 (walkable access to everyday necessities and services, seniors housing, affordable housing, recreation, schools, etc.)

We understand this proposal is being reviewed internally within the City of Calgary. Calgary River Valleys would like the opportunity to discuss the proposal with the City Planning team. To ensure a more robust assessment we request the City consider the following in the review of the proposal:

- Provide cross sections of the Valley in its natural state and post development sections demonstrating the extent of the proposed infilling of the Valley.
- Within the cross sections, include subsurface elements as well (storm pipe, utilities, road bed etc) and building massing.
- Locate and identify all springs and wetlands within and adjacent to the proposed lands.
- CRV suggests the City consider future potential for daylighting or partial daylighting of the creek. Partial daylighting can increase stormwater capacity, provide for improved water treatment, provide wildlife habitat and provide pleasing water features in a community. By allowing the infilling and paving of the valley bottom, the potential for any of this restoration work would be lost. Although there may be limited potential

Comment Re: Highland Park Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan Application

February 27, 2015

for immediate daylighting (or partial daylighting) of this buried tributary to Nose Creek, consideration should be given for future improvements.

- CRV suggests City departments consider the lands of the Highland Golf Course valley as part of a larger drainage system flowing to Nose Creek. Upstream of this location the City of Calgary is pursuing restoration and daylighting activities. Restoring this drainage in one location, and filling it just downstream seems counterproductive.
- Develop a study of opportunities for consolidation of City owned lands, Municipal and Environmental Reserve to optimize natural functionalities, water quality, flood control and open space amenity in this valley.

We would appreciate being advised on any further decision on this matter. Calgary River Valleys is prepared to participate in future consultation processes. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Steve Meadows, President, Calgary River Valleys

Bill Morrison, Chair, Watershed policy and Planning Committee, Calgary River Valleys

Encls.

cc: CRV circulation
Calgary Ward Matrix contacts

Albrecht, Linda

From: Ken Scott [scottke@telusplanet.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 11:44 AM
To: Office of the Mayor; City Clerk; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison – Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; calgary.klein@assembly.ab.ca; premier@gov.ab.ca
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenciewcares@gmail.com; Ken Scott
Subject: Highland Park Golf Course Site Redevelopment
Attachments: Higland Park development.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam:

I would like to say a few words regarding the proposed Highland Golf course redevelopment project. My thoughts are detailed in the attached document and are repeated in this email. I am opposed to the proposed development and I would like to ask the city's councilors to also oppose it during the upcoming City of Calgary meeting.

Thank you,

Dr. Ken E. Scott, P.Eng.

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 PM12:03
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment

As a homeowner for over 20 years and as a resident of Highwood for over 50 years, I would like to voice my concerns regarding the proposed redevelopment of the old Highland Park Golf Course site. I have attended a number of community based meetings which have focused primarily on water issues, i.e. Nose Creek and flooding, etc, and traffic issues.

While these issues are very very important and I think are key considerations, rather than repeat these arguments, I would like to highlight some of my economic thoughts. Development cannot go on increasing indefinitely. As every Calgarian (older than 30) has experienced, the local economy is quite cyclical, based on the oil industry in Alberta. Developments such as that being proposed seem to be based on the assumption of a "normal" return to growth, following the current recession (or slowdown). Continued growth is not always the case. For example, there are several cities, mostly in the U.S. experiencing not only a reduction in growth, but even a decline. "From 1950 to 2010, the population of the City of Chicago declined by 25.5 percent, that of Philadelphia by 26.3 percent, that of Cleveland by 56.1 percent, that of Detroit by 61.4 percent, and that of St Louis by 62.7 percent. [1] These numbers seem large, and I do not expect Calgary's population to decline by that amount but big growth may be a thing of the past. Vacancies are at high levels right now.

References:

- [1] *The Rise And Fall Of American Growth*, Robert J. Gordon, Princeton University Press, 2016.
- [2] Google images, internet

I am opposed to the proposed development, as I am afraid of it ending in dilapidated, crime ridden and perhaps even in some urban ghetto style buildings. My strong preference is for the development of a natural park which would aid in the reduction of flood damage, green house gases, etc. There are other areas where the development can occur. This area is close to the LRT leg that is being developed and wouldn't it be nice if there was easy access to an attractive park, from the new LRT leg?



This picture [2] is from our own city (Confederation Park) and the redevelopment could and SHOULD be an extension of this. Let's take this opportunity to bring more beauty into our home city!

Some questions which come to mind: Will the oil price continue to increase, returning to "normal" growth? Will the Alberta economy be successfully diversified into more sustainable energy practices? Even with that perhaps being true, what do we want and what do the community residents want? The area was a golf course which was a park type environment. There is an expectation of the community to continue to have this park like setting.

Since 2017 is Canada's 150th birthday, would it not be most appropriate to take such a "once in a lifetime" opportunity to make the most out of continuing to beautify the city and extend Confederation Park as a legacy of something beautiful, rather than to just fill it with average developments? What type of development of this area would most accurately exemplify the legacy that the City of Calgary leaders and it's citizens would like to pass on to our future generations??? This is an ideal opportunity to extend such a beautiful park: A Confederation Park extension for Canada's birthday and also for Calgary!

Sincerely,

Dr. Ken E. Scott, P.Eng.

Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment

As a homeowner for over 20 years and as a resident of Highwood for over 50 years, I would like to voice my concerns regarding the proposed redevelopment of the old Highland Park Golf Course site. I have attended a number of community based meetings which have focused primarily on water issues, i.e. Nose Creek and flooding, etc, and traffic issues.

While these issues are very very important and I think are key considerations, rather than repeat these arguments, I would like to highlight some of my economic thoughts. Development cannot go on increasing indefinitely. As every Calgarian (older than 30) has experienced, the local economy is quite cyclical, based on the oil industry in Alberta. Developments such as that being proposed seem to be based on the assumption of a "normal" return to growth, following the current recession (or slowdown). Continued growth is not always the case. For example, there are several cities, mostly in the U.S. experiencing not only a reduction in growth, but even a decline. "From 1950 to 2010, the population of the City of Chicago declined by 25.5 percent, that of Philadelphia by 26.3 percent, that of Cleveland by 56.1 percent, that of Detroit by 61.4 percent, and that of St Louis by 62.7 percent. [1] These numbers seem large, and I do not expect Calgary's population to decline by that amount but big growth may be a thing of the past. Vacancies are at high levels right now.

I am opposed to the proposed development, as I am afraid of it ending in dilapidated, crime ridden and perhaps even in some urban ghetto style buildings. My strong preference is for the development of a natural park which would aid in the reduction of flood damage, green house gases, etc. There are other areas where the development can occur. This area is close to the LRT leg that is being developed and wouldn't it be nice if there was easy access to an attractive park, from the new LRT leg?



This picture [2] is from our own city (Confederation Park) and the redevelopment could and SHOULD be an extension of this. Let's take this opportunity to bring more beauty into our home city!

Some questions which come to mind: Will the oil price continue to increase, returning to "normal" growth? Will the Alberta economy be successfully diversified into more sustainable energy practices? Even with that perhaps being true, what do we want and what do the community residents want? The area was a golf course which was a park type environment. There is an expectation of the community to continue to have this park like setting.

Since 2017 is Canada's 150th birthday, would it not be most appropriate to take such a "once in a lifetime" opportunity to make the most out of continuing to beautify the city and extend Confederation Park as a legacy of something beautiful, rather than to just fill it with average developments? What type of development of this area would most accurately exemplify the legacy that the City of Calgary leaders and it's citizens would like to pass on to our future generations??? This is an ideal opportunity to extend such a beautiful park: A Confederation Park extension for Canada's birthday and also for Calgary!

Sincerely,

Dr. Ken E. Scott, P.Eng.

References:

[1] *The Rise And Fall Of American Growth*, Robert J. Gordon, Princeton University Press, 2016.

[2] Google images, internet

.

Albrecht, Linda

From: Elise Bieche [elise.bieche@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 10:08 AM
To: City Clerk; Chu, Sean; Deederly, Scott; Franks, Dustin; Community, Highland Park; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Calgary Klein
Subject: LOC 2014-0190
Attachments: Elise Bieche Response HPGC.pdf

Please find attached my personal response in regards to the land use re-designation of the Highland Park Golf Course. Public Hearing January 17, 2017

Should you have any questions in regards to the information I have presented please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Regards,
Elise Bieche

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 11:41
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

LOC 2014-0190
Proposed Land Use Re-designation
Highland Park Golf Course

RECEIVED

2017 JAN -5 AM 11:41

Dear Councilors,

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

I am the President of Highland Park Community Association, however this letter is not on behalf of my CA, you will have received that as a separate note. I write this note as a volunteer, as a "hyper-engaged" advocate (as my family lovingly calls me) and as someone who is committed to quality redevelopment and the transition of our inner city communities into spaces and places more Calgarians can chose to call home. I am also someone who has been involved in the engagement process, and is willing to speak my mind. I am shocked and disappointed by the manner in which the Planning Department treats volunteers and community advocates. I am challenged by the lack of administration's willingness to actually uphold policies, plans, guidelines and directional documents that taxpayers have paid for, departments have developed and should be using as their "north star" to guide redevelopment. I have sacrificed time with my family, including my birthday to dedicate efforts to impacting the proposed development of the former golf course. I look back on losing my job in June as the opportunity to focus efforts on this golf course. Being a volunteer became my full time job. I have grown for this experience, but I do not think the proposed plan has improved significantly as a result of my efforts.

A file for a site that has been deemed, by the City of Calgary, through a caveat on title, to be "unsuitable for development" has had its fair share of stumbles along the way. What strikes me most of all is that the City lead opportunities to discuss the file have been deemed "information sessions"- which means they are not engagement sessions, but rather sessions to deliver information- not gather feedback. (Jan 22 and 24 2015, Mar 14, 2016 and December 8, 2016) I also find it telling that the 4 face to face meetings we held with the developer and administration are not considered engagement... in fact the timeline posted by administration demonstrates that there has been ZERO City hosted engagement with the community on this file. Yet we, in Highland Park demonstrated early on that our interests were to have sensitive development on the site. A 50 acre site, with a community who is willing to participate and engage to help deliver densification has not once been afforded the real opportunity to impact change on the proposed development. This approach creates NIMBY's.


Our one and only opportunity to provide feedback and enjoy the luxury of true engagement was through the Charette process for the 40th Avenue Station for the NCLRT. I commend the Councilors who graciously went out of their way to facilitate the delivery of this Charette. It was such a positive community experience. It was the first time sine the creation of the North Bow Design Brief in 1976 that our community has been given the platform to discuss, as subject matter experts, alongside planning experts and City staff what is important to us, and how we can densify while holding on to what this community values. The plans that came out of the Charette are a closer compromise between community objectives and planning principles. The applicant's plan is none of the above.

So to the heart of my request of this City Council on January 16, 2017. Take the time, listen to the community, reflect on the policies, the plans, the guidelines and principles you have endorsed and instructed administration to create and uphold. The plan before you upholds only the drive of the MDP to increase density within the inner city. A plan founded in one

principle. Achieving one goal. While I sympathize with the developer, we cannot protect the interest of one party while threatening the integrity of an entire system. You cannot ask inner city communities to bear the load of densification without the opportunity to be meaningful stakeholders in the process. As such I do not feel the parcels on the west side of Centre are ready to be re-designated. The Regional Water study is not complete, the Green Line North Charette report is not complete. There are unanswered questions in regards to sanitary sewer. Measured responses have been seen at all levels of government over the last 6 months, I urge this Council to take the time and deliberate on the best measured response for this site, for this community and for our City.

I would like to extend my personal thanks to the Green Line Team, to Gary Anrishak and IBI, to Katie Gusa, individuals in the Mayor's office and the Ward 4 office who gave the community time and attention. I would like to also extend my sincere thank you's to Thorncliffe Greenview, they have shared in our frustration, and have worked unbelievably hard to engage their neighborhood. A thank you to individuals in Highwood who have gone to lengths to raise the profile of this development with the understanding that this proposed plan will have ripple affects across our neck of the woods. Last, but not least, I would like to thank all those who have stood beside me working on this file. The proposed development has brought our community together around an issue, however the relationships we have built will last beyond the decisions made today. This is an incredibly dedicated group of volunteers and community activists and the City of Calgary is lucky to have you and I am fortunate to now call many of you friends.

Thank you for your consideration today.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elise Bieche". The signature is stylized with a large, looped initial "E" and a cursive "Bieche".

Elise Bieche

Albrecht, Linda

From: Donna Stefura [dstefura@telus.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 12:47 PM
To: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 10; Constituent Liaison - Ward 11; City Clerk; Communications Liaison - Ward 13; Ward 7 Contact; Constituent Assistant Ward 8; Community Liaison - Ward 9; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 3; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Office of the Mayor; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 5; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 6; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 12; Commn. & Research Analyst Ward 1
Cc: publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; greenviewcares@gmail.com
Subject: Highland Golf Course
Attachments: Highland Golf Course Plan.docx

For the Council Meeting on January 16, 2017

Highland Golf Course Re-Development Plan

LOC2014-0190

Dear Mayor Nenshi and Councillors,


In October, I attended the 4 day Greenline Design Charette. It was very well presented and well attended by all parties involved, City Planners, some Council members, the developer and many community members from Highland Park, Thorncliffe/Greenview and Highwood. During the four days of discussion, conversation, deliberation and input I felt that our views and concerns were listened to and addressed and a fair and balanced compromise was met. I, genuinely, felt encouraged that the City truly is listening to us, the community, and cares about our views

At the final day of the Charette the organizers presented a plan for the former Highland Golf Course that incorporated all input by the interested parties. Considering the somewhat diverse views of the communities involved, as well as the developer, compromises we made by all parties. Some would have liked to see more green space allocated. Some not too pleased at having their house eventually expropriated. Some would like to see more amenities like shopping and restaurants included. Of course the developer would like to raise the whole valley and have no limit to the amount of development he can build.

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 PM 2:26
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

In the end of the week a plan was presented and agreed to by the community. What was agreed was that green space would be created in the centre of the valley allowing for the wet lands to remain, keep as many mature trees as possible and create the much need park space. Development would be relegated close to the transit zones along Centre Street and along 40th Avenue. This is what that design looked like (Figure 1)

Figure 1



On December 4, 2016 an open house was scheduled and well attended in the Highwood Community

Hall to inform residents as to what the City is putting forth as a plan for the Highland Golf Course. I was dismayed and appalled at seeing this plan that the City is actually proposing. It is NOT the plan we all worked hard to create at the Charettes. It clearly favors the developers plan and not what the communities want (See Figure 2)

Figure 2



What was the point of the Charette? Why waste all that money to conduct it if it meant nothing? It's obvious that the City doesn't really care about the communities and its residents and is only looking forward to the property taxes it can gain from this density injection.

Donna Stefura
Highwood

Albrecht, Linda

From: Gisela Rohde [serious@telus.net]
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 2:52 PM
To: City Clerk; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 4
Cc: aep.minister@gov.ab.ca; calgary.klein@assembly.ab.ca; premier@gov.ab.ca; publicservice@tgcacalgary.com; 'Tara Rindfliesch'
Subject: Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment

Re: Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment

I attended the City of Calgary Information session for the Highland Park Golf Course Redevelopment that was held at the Highwood Community Hall on Dec. 8th, 2016.

In all the information, there was no reference in the city's presentation posters or even on the City of Calgary website to the underground water issue. It was only when I got to the table manned by local residents that I found any information, and they are concerned that the issue has not been addressed.

As a resident of Landmark Gardens, a large condo on the north side of McKnight between Center St. and Edmonton Trail, I am concerned about drainage issues and flooding in our underground parkade if the golf course land is filled up. I was assured by a City of Calgary "water specialist" that everything was fine, but 1) he had not seen a map of the (partly underground) water systems in the area (that was available at that session), 2) he said that I had nothing to worry about since our property was at a higher elevation than the proposed development (but I drove downhill all the way home), and 3) he said that the City had a vested interest in not causing problems for surrounding residents, since if they allowed a problem situation to occur, they would be responsible for fixing it. However, the City has known about potential flooding of our building during heavy rains due to the slope of McKnight Blvd. for many years. I was told that there was even a project number assigned to correct the problem with changes to the storm sewers, but nothing has been done, possibly due to lack of funding, and we had to build something in front of our building ourselves since we did have flooding in 2012 and 2013.

I brought this up to our condo board, and they asked me to also write on their behalf that we are **concerned about drainage** since we are on lower ground and already have drainage issues (from McKnight).

Sincerely,

Gisela Rohde

RECEIVED
2016 DEC 30 PM 2:57
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Albrecht, Linda

From: Deb Heap [debheap@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 7:32 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Deb Heap
Subject: Submission regarding LOC2014-0190
Attachments: Public Hearing Jan16.pdf

To The Office Of The City Clerk.

From Deb Heap
124-44th Ave N.W.
403-970-0114

Please find attached my submission for the Public Hearing regarding LOC2014-0190

Best Regards
Deb Heap

RECEIVED
2017 JAN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Submission for LOC2014-0190. My name is Deb Heap. I own a low profile, slope adaptive, legal 4plex adjacent to the former Golf course on 44th Ave. N.W. If you have not had the opportunity to visit the site, you should. The existing residential development around the golf course respects the environment and neighbouring residents. Development is slope adaptive to ensure maximum enjoyment of the greenspace by as many residents as possible.

Fifty years ago, Confederation Park was created in celebration of Canada's 100th birthday. My hope is for Canada's 150th birthday, this council approves a development plan for the Eastern extension of the park system which recognizes its potential and its value to the community and the city of Calgary.

I would like to provide some context on the history of this application as well as where it ended up.

In 2012 I became the lead for Highland Park Community Association Planning and Development. I attended most FCC courses offered to ensure an informed and positive contribution. I established a Planning Committee for the Community, with regular meetings and formal documentation. We developed a template for reviewing land use and DP circulations, responded in a timely, thoughtful, consistent manner and we recently completed a Community Statement of Significance. In all matters, feedback from city staff was that our input was thoughtful, balanced and reasonable. We did everything CA's should to ensure we made a positive contribution. We believed we were partners in the process. Unfortunately that was not the case.

Although we offered to do the lion's share of the work, we were refused an ARP. We partnered with the University of Calgary Environmental Design Class. Their work was creative and thoughtfully dealt with issues of the environment, transit, density and design. Thom Mahler stated "Once a draft document is completed by EVDS, we would be happy to brainstorm ideas for "concluding the project" and how it could be acknowledged by The City in some way." He was reassigned shortly after that. Constant changes to file managers and area managers ensured the community never made progress on this front.

We participated in Greenline sessions, Main Streets sessions for 4th Street NW, Centre Street and Edmonton Trail. We were yet again assured by various city staff our feedback would be considered and affect outcomes for Highland Park. We partnered with Thorncliffe Greenview on a project by the U of C's Urban Studies Class. The planning committee was also a cornerstone of the group that worked to make positive change in the community as part of the ongoing Neighbourhood of Promise initiative.

I represented the community on the golf course file from its inception, with developer and city engagement sessions and one on one meetings, up until the July 4 council meeting. Since then my work chairing the Advisory Committee for the Sicomous Official Community Plan kept me away from Calgary.

We did everything we were advised to do by the city, to ensure the best planning outcomes for our community. After 4 years of discussions with the developer and the city, very little of what the community asked for is included in the application. Recently the Community participated in the Greenline Charette on the understanding the developer would reflect the outcomes in their amended application. The charette plan is still more aligned with the Community's vision than the developer's, supporting the community's position.

I have reviewed the CA's current top 5 requests on this file and they are consistent with the reasonable requests originally made and reiterated over the evolution of this application.

I understand it is unlikely council will turn this application back again, but it should be recognized that delays with this file have been largely due to the developer and they should not be given carte blanche because timeline targets have been exceeded. **At a minimum please consider the top 5 requests of the Community:**

Relaxation Clause / Certainty of built form: The land use districts summarize intended outcomes, but the specifics do not support those outcomes. DC land use is difficult for the Community to influence at the DP stage. Adding a 10%

relaxation clause to DC conditions is unreasonable. The developer already has more than enough flexibility and the existing residents have little protection. Our first file manager made a commitment that the Community would have certainty of built form with development. This relaxation does not give certainty. There should be specific commitments to how the Design Guidelines will be applied for DP's or they are meaningless.

Building Heights: The community was assured from the beginning that DC bylaws were being proposed to support 6 story wood frame buildings not allowed under the standard bylaws. The charrette supported this limit and the outline plan should reflect this.

Greenspace: At the July 4 council meeting, a motion arising as amended was approved to bring forward Amendments to the proposed Bylaws, or if necessary a new Bylaw, in consultation with the Applicant and the community, for consideration and adoption by Council in regard to: Ensuring the preservation of open space in the Highland Village Green as far as reasonably possible.

This was recognized as a problem by council, but this issue has had very little movement. There is nothing to preclude maximum build out of most of the parcels with minimal greenspace. City policy targets for greenspace are not being met. It is poor planning to significantly increase density with insufficient green space to support that density. If legislation does not support the city asking for more Municipal Reserve and the DC bylaws do not dictate amenity space and specific limits on parcel coverage, then the city needs to step up and facilitate acquisition through purchase or swaps of park space for this development and for the community.

Sensitive / Intelligent Development: Good planning works with the existing environment and with the surrounding community, it does not ignore them and make changes to suit short sighted, low cost development. As per the Community's request, development should be sensitive to the existing community, minimize stripping and filling of the site and retain mature trees as a natural buffer to the development.

Community Enhancement: Development of this magnitude should be a partnership which benefits everyone involved. It is reasonable for the Community to ask the developer to fund basic improvements in the community to support the increased demands of a doubled population. Administration received support for this position from the law group early in the application and backed the Community's request. Administration dropped this condition when the file manager changed and did so without consulting the community. Density bonusing is a basic expectation of development which takes advantage of zoning changes to increase the value of the property. Commissioner Roy Wright commented that in a green field development of this magnitude the developer would be expected to make significant contributions. We are receiving none.

Staged development plan: It is understood that economics require development to move forward within a reasonable period of time. Development of parcel 1 could be approved immediately while outstanding issues and a plan for sensitive development for the rest of the site progresses, to ensure the site is not an eyesore for the community and the city for the foreseeable future.

Intelligent planning would connect the East West park system corridor and development would enhance and support the environment, the community and the city, while giving the developer a superior product. It was what was originally promised. This application does not deliver on that promise.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Deb Heap
124 44th Ave N.W.

RECEIVED
2017 JUN -5 AM 7:53
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S