



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, the information provided may be included in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)	Diane
Last name (required)	Altwasser
What do you want to do? (required)	Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	PUD Committee Meeting PUD # 2021-0015 North Hill Communities – Local Area
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	I am not in support of the plan as written. I believe that the NHCLAP or any local area plan should NOT be passed without the supporting land use bylaw amendments at the same time.



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, the information provided may be included in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)	Teresa
Last name (required)	Tousignant
What do you want to do? (required)	Request to speak, Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	SPC - PUD - Guidebook for Great Communities
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	I would like to speak, and am attaching a written copy of my presentation from the Jan 13 PUD meeting for the record.

January 5, 2021

Re: Guidebook for Great Communities, Statement of Support

To read aloud at the January 13, 2021 meeting of the Standing Policy Committee (SPC) on Planning and Urban Development (PUD).

Good morning, my name is Teresa Tousignant. I am speaking today as resident of Ward 11. I serve as the chair of the Planning Committee for the Haysboro Community Association and am the Haysboro delegate to the 34-member working group for the Heritage Communities Local Area Plan.

I am speaking in support of the Guidebook for Great Communities and asking you to move forward with recommending the Guidebook to the Combined Meeting of Council, and to get this document formalized and available as soon as possible for the Local Area Planning process.

The Heritage LAP is the second of three multi-community plans, in various stages of completion, that are in limbo because of delays finalizing the Guidebook for Great Communities. Thousands of hours of work by community volunteers and paid City of Calgary professionals have been put into North Hills plan, the Heritage plan, and the Westbrook plan. City planning staff have done an amazing job collecting, collating, and applying the learnings from a robust and detailed public engagement process. The resulting multi-community plans document a neighborhood-specific understanding of where development and redevelopment is well suited, and where greater density can be sensitively incorporated.

All of our work on these plans, however, and the momentum of this important planning process, is at risk because the Guidebook for Great Communities has not been finalized and approved by Council.

Why has the Guidebook not been approved? It is a technical reference document of planning techniques and policies that represent the best of our current knowledge about how to sensitively guide growth, re-development, and densification. The initial feedback asking for simplification and clarification of the urban form categories has been addressed by the planners and is reflected in the draft released on January 4. There is also, however, an ongoing effort to repeatedly delay this document by some members of the public who put themselves forward as speaking on behalf of dozens of Community Associations, but refuse us the common courtesy of stating their names. It is my perception that this effort to indefinitely delay the Guidebook is based on a fear that densification will negatively impact the quality of life in neighborhoods dominated by single family homes, and possibly a misunderstanding that our current planning and development process somehow protects us from having a large or ugly building put in next to us.

I live in one of the early suburbs of Calgary. I like my neighborhood, which is primarily made up of single-family homes. I like living in a single-family home, because as a parent of young children, I like having a yard to kick them out into. But I am also keenly aware of how little I can get to on foot. When my husband and I were looking to buy a house, we took a map and drew walking circles around train stations, elementary schools, and grocery stores, and looked for any place you could have all three

intersect. It is extremely rare. It reflects a lack of human-scale functionality in Calgary's urban layout that can only be addressed by greater density.

While Calgary as a whole has grown dramatically in both population and footprint, those of us who live in middle-aged suburbs are currently seeing the results of having our local population dwindle after peaking in the 70's. We have a school in danger of closing due to low enrollment. We have small businesses struggling to survive (even before COVID). We have lost recreation facilities to newer communities further out.

We need sensitively guided redevelopment and additional people to provide the socioeconomic boost that can keep our neighborhoods functional and reverse the hollowing out of the middle ring of neighborhoods. Furthermore, we need a diversification of housing types to allow us greater choice and the ability to stay near our friends and with our community as we move through the stages of life.

Our local area plan can help this re-development happen in a way that respects the individual feel and spirit of our neighborhood. I can tell you that during the urban form and scale mapping exercises we did as part of the working group, at no point did someone plunk down a giant tower in the middle of a bunch of single-family homes. Those areas were naturally respected as reasonably cohesive clusters, and development goals were focused along collector roads and major intersections, which makes good sense. The Local Area Plans built on the framework of the Guidebook for Great Communities will offer a greater protection for groupings of single-family homes than exists under our current system.

Members of the committee, please do not allow fearmongering and a misinformation campaign to prevent you from listening to the recommendations of your professional planners and moving forward with the Guidebook for Great Communities. Thank you for your time and your good judgement in this matter.

Teresa Tousignant

104 Chinook Drive SW

Calgary, AB T2V 2P9

Ward 11



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, the information provided may be included in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)	Jacqueline
Last name (required)	Grabowski
What do you want to do? (required)	Request to speak, Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	PUD2021-0015
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	I would like to attach my letter of support for the Guidebook for Great Communities and ask that the Committee vote in favour of moving the Guidebook forward. I will also request to speak to this letter.

January 25, 2021

Re: File Number PUD2021-0015; February 3rd
Guidebook for Great Communities; Letter of Support

I am writing this letter in support of the amended Guidebook for Great Communities. This is a follow-up on a letter submitted at PUD on January 13th.

The January 13th PUD Committee session brought voices of positive support for the Guidebook, and I would like to continue to ensure that the supporters of this critical framework are heard.

As a citizen, member of an established neighborhood, and individual with professional experience in the development industry, I believe this version of the Guidebook achieves its intent. The Guidebook provides a comprehensive and inclusive approach to ensuring future developments align with the communities' long-term vision of themselves. I am asking that the Committee vote to recommend the adoption of the Guidebook.

I am a member of the Heritage Communities Local Area Planning Group. Our group ranged in demographic, professional background, affiliation to the subject communities, and included business owners, community members and development representatives. We worked through the first stages of planning our community and started at the end of 2019. Throughout the process, our group found the framework workable, applicable and enjoyed talking about the future of the Heritage Communities. At no point were there comments regarding lack of options or appropriate development when we planned our future community.

Our group has not been able to meet since the spring given the Guidebook's delays. We have lost momentum and our group's shared history and process is at risk of being lost if there are further delays.

While waiting for the Heritage Communities Group work to proceed, I participated in the supplementary Guidebook Focus Group to provide feedback on improved Urban Form Categories. The group again included a wide range of interests – personal and professional. Discussions were comprehensive and lively on how to improve the Guidebook Urban Form Categories. I am happy to see the results of the engagement and feel the recent revisions made improvements to usability, clarified where there was confusion and addressed community members concerns over residential categories.

Delaying this framework any longer will result in a loss of resources, hours spent to date by City staff, community members and industry on a project that is complete. Without approving this framework our communities have no unified plan to direct changes as development requests (permits) are submitted.

Personally, as someone who participated in the Local Area Plan and Guidebook Engagement focus groups it is disheartening to think that all of our work may be for nothing.

Following are the key reasons I believe the Guidebook needs to be approved in its current, revised form:

- **The Guidebook is being tested through three concurrent Local Area Planning Groups.** Concerns raised in these groups have been addressed and integrated into the revised Guidebook.
- **Engagement has been extensive** – including additional focus group engagement sessions on revised sections. – always with a mix of citizens, industry representation, and professional planners. We need to trust this work and engagement process and respect the professionals who have contributed to the framework.

- **Communities each self-determine** how the framework is applied through Community Local Area Plans. This is not a top-down direction of development from the City. Using the local area plan approach, as in the case of the Heritage Communities Local Area Plan, North Hill and Westbrook, a mix of community members, planners, business owners and other interested in that community each contribute to the long-term vision. Each of these Local Area Plans include fulsome engagement processes. Any fear of development being forced into an area inappropriately is negated through the rigorous process of engagement, consultation and follow-up engagement. Some members of Council and their teams have participated in the Local Area Planning process and understand how inclusive and engaging this process is.
- **The majority of delays have been due to misinformation** – this includes a website full of incorrect information, fear mongering and even Councillor staff who are feeding misinformation about what the framework is, how it's applied and how development works. Further delays and changes to the policies are catering to misinformation rather than improving the framework. Public policy makers should not be forced to make bad policy due to misinformation. As noted above, engagement has been extensive and inclusive. We cannot waste further resources trying to correct misinformation rather than improving policy. We are spinning our professional planning and communicator's resources in circles as they attempt to please the political jockeying and misinformation.
- **The framework improves un-coordinated policies that overlap creating a one clear place to define development.** Currently, whether you are a homeowner, future homeowner, business owner etc., the ability for you to understand what you can and cannot do with your property can be challenging. We need to remember that the Guidebook applies to all levels of development and that all of us benefit from having one clear set of documents to define our options.
- **Providing options does not equate to certain build out.** The Guidebook provides a framework, with Local Area Plans determining where the Urban Forms apply in the community. Regardless of what is "planned", the change will not happen without a private market desire to make the change happen. We need to hope for a City with more density, more vibrancy, and more choice rather than sprawl. Our established communities face continuing decline to amenities and population, and this will not be corrected without intentional creation of opportunity. Many outspoken voices highlight fears about densification disregarding the fact that development matches the market demand, not that development happens everywhere that it can.

Thank you for taking the time review these reasons of support for the Guidebook.

I would like to thank the City planning and communications teams at the City of Calgary for all of their work in the past year and a half on the Heritage Communities Area Plan and hope we can continue to progress our vision for our community as soon as possible.

Respectfully,

Jacqueline Grabowski



January 26, 2021

Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD)

Reference item # PUD 2021-0030/2021-0015

Re: North Hill Communities Local Area Plan and The Guidebook for Great Communities

We want to thank administration for the opportunity to work on a revised North Hill Communities Local Area Plan (NHCLAP) and the Guidebook for Great Communities (Guidebook). It was our sincere hope that with further work, we would be in a position where the plans would support our vision for our community and further efforts to achieve a more sustainable City. Regrettably, despite positive changes to both documents, the Crescent Heights Community Association (CHCA) cannot support the NHCLAP and the associated Guidebook unless further changes are incorporated that will meet the needs of our community and the people who live, work and love Crescent Heights.

We worked hard to educate and inform our residents about the plans and how they will impact our community, but because neither plan was complete until a few weeks ago, this was an impossible task in the permitted time and with limited resources. City sessions for the public are not to occur until deadlines for PUD submissions are imminent or passed. Committees and Council often disregard community association feedback as not being representational, yet very few residents are likely to sit down and take the time to thoroughly analyze what these plans mean (especially in a matter of weeks). It is up to a group of volunteers to do that. We are confident that our position reflects the wishes of our community and meets our mission and values as an organization representing our current and future community.

We will not support the NHCLAP and the Guidebook, until the following issues are addressed to our satisfaction.

1. Community Character

The Guidebook and NHCLAP focus on how to create great communities but not how to sustain the great communities we already have. There must be an articulated vision for individual communities, one that considers the pattern of streetscape, architectural details, scale and massing, and natural features that create an “experience” that is recognizable as a sense of place. The Plan treats nine communities as one homogeneous group. We consider that the NHCLAP needs to include: “protection and enhancement of architectural, urban and natural features that contribute to a feeling of **local identity** and a sense of place” (Guidebook Section 2.2 c. vi, page 24).

2. Density

There are no targets, trends or demographics included in the NHCLAP (or the Guidebook). Nine communities are again treated alike, without consideration for where density gains are already being encouraged and accomplished, and where they are not. Density targets can be met, if the targets are clearly articulated, by using sensitive infill and available opportunities in nodes and corridors. Ramifications of density (even incrementally) on roads, parking, infrastructure, residential blocks of all types, the pedestrian realm, and open spaces must be adequately addressed and planned for. Additionally, the long term effects of COVID on city structure and population movements need to be explored more fully. The NHCLAP must address these points.

Increased density is expected, but providing latitude for developers and little recourse for existing residents is unacceptable. The NHCLAP places the future built form of our community in the hands of administration and developers who do not live in or experience our community. The Guidebook's division of established communities into Zones A and B, one of which allows for "reinforcing exclusive and stratified areas" (Zone B (PUD2021-0015 Attachment 5)) and another (Zone A) that does not, and assumes that areas with a higher infill market do not have a desire for stability is similarly unacceptable.

3. Heritage

There is little to no cross-reference between the NHCLAP and Heritage Guideline Area Tools for Communities (Guidebook, p. 113). Proposed heritage tools are not yet clearly defined and suggest the need for significant resident buy in using tools such as Direct Control (DC) districts. Without this being more fully developed, we cannot know if it serves our neighbourhood and do not support the adoption of the NHCLAP until it is.

4. Urban Forest /Public space

We appreciate the inclusion of policies to protect and maintain the tree canopy in the NHCLAP. As an important element of sustainability and indisputably one of our community's most important features, we feel that the proposed policies do not go far enough and must be supported with clear and measurable bylaws. This should be further supported in the Guidebook so all communities are included. For any new development, an existing building and associated green space and tree cover is demolished. This is irreversible, cumulative and changes the look, feel, experience, micro climate and biology of a place. Public and private open space and the urban forest should be of equivalent priority to land use and density to aid in climate resilience and sustainability.

Detailing how existing parks, the pedestrian realm, and recreation facilities will survive, flourish and accommodate a much denser population must also be addressed in the plan. Consideration must be given for a post-COVID future where remote work scenarios place a greater emphasis on shared public spaces and increased access to nature.

5. Mobility Plan

Section 3.2.3 and Appendix C of the NHCLAP contain direction for future mobility plans. Showing integrated mobility choices and complete multi-modal transportation networks at this stage verses in the future, will help in providing smart targets for public realm improvements and more clearly identify areas to accommodate sensitive density.

We have endeavored to keep our comments as brief as possible, but we are prepared to give a much more detailed analysis of these missing elements should the City or members of council wish.

Thank you for your continuing sustainability progress, efforts to make our communities better, and for listening to the people that live in these communities. We believe there is still work to do, but we can jointly achieve this if we continue to try.

By email only

Simonetta Acteson, North Hill Communities Working Group, CHCA Representative
On behalf of the Crescent Heights Community Association
cc. Troy Gonzalez, RPP, MCIP, Senior Planner | Community Planning, The City of Calgary
Dale Calkins, Senior Policy & Planning Advisor, Ward 7



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, the information provided may be included in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)	Sonja
Last name (required)	Johnson
What do you want to do? (required)	Request to speak, Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	SPC on Planning and Urban Development - Recommendation of the Guidebook
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	

January 7, 2021

Re: File Number PUD2021-0015

Letter of Support for the Guidebook for Great Communities

I am speaking in **support** of the amended, Guidebook for Great Communities. I ask that the committee move forward with recommending the Guidebook to the Combined Meeting of Council and ensure that this document is formalized and available for use as soon as possible for the LAP process.

As a member of an established community in Ward 11, I strongly believe that the Guidebook achieves the intent for which it was written and the principles and guidelines it lays out are essential for the future success of our City. The Guidebook is an inclusive tool that guides communities through the planning process and ensures that these communities are vibrant and liveable for the current residents as well as for future generations.

I served as chair of the Chinook Park/Kelvin Grove/Eagle Ridge Community Association Planning Committee until May 2020 (5 years). I am the delegate to the Working Group for the Heritage Communities Local Area Plan and participated in the Guidebook Focus Group, which helped to clarify and simplify the Urban Form Classifications, as requested by Council in July 2020. The UFC's were thoughtfully and fully addressed and this is reflected in the draft release of the Guidebook on Jan.4, 2021.

I, and many others, have given countless hours to both projects. The momentum we had during the working group sessions is lost and if there are further delays, the entire process may be lost – meaning that the many thousands of hours that volunteers have given will be lost as well. If the Guidebook for Great Communities is not finalized and approved by Council, the LAP process that will bring Calgary communities into the future is in jeopardy.

The City Planning staff have done an amazing job guiding the working groups through the planning process. Their professionalism and knowledge helped the groups create neighborhood specific plans that take into consideration the working group's local knowledge. The sessions in no way encouraged "Free Range" density, in fact Community members were encouraged to think about where greater density could be sensitively incorporated within communities. I am taking a Certificate of Urban Design at Simon Fraser University concurrently with this project. I can honestly say that best practices from around the world are being reflected in our LAP and this is due to **the principles found in the Guidebook**.

The Guidebook:

- provides **direction** on how to create great communities and builds on the MDP
- considers how communities **adapt and evolve** over time – a necessity if we want to attract new businesses and citizens to our city.
- helps communities remain vibrant and prosperous over **the LONG TERM** for **ALL** Calgarians – essential to make Calgary a great place for a diverse population to live AND do business.

As citizens of a City – this is what we should aspire to, and the Guidebook can get us there.

There has been an ongoing effort to delay this document. Efforts to delay the Guidebook are based on the fear that density will negatively impact the quality of life in established neighborhoods. This fear is due to misinformation about the Guidebook and its' purpose. For example, I've seen stated that a 6- storey apartment building can be erected anywhere in a neighborhood. This is simply untrue. As well there may be a misunderstanding that our current planning and development processes protect us from having large or unsightly buildings constructed next to us. It does not.

I live in a single-family home in an established neighborhood. At this moment in time, I enjoy living in this type of housing, however, I am aware of the downsides of living in a neighborhood dominated by single- family homes. I require a car to do most errands. There are few amenities I can walk easily to. Our community has lost many amenities (YMCA, Movie Theatre, schools) over the years because of the lack of variety of housing options in our community. My children are growing up and will remain in Calgary **only if** Calgary has a variety of housing and transportation options available to them. They, like many young adults are leaving now for jobs and for school and they will be comparing Calgary to other places they have lived. Calgary must innovate and grow to attract them back. What we wanted in our communities and cities will be very different from what our children, or grandchildren, will want or even be able to have. The Guidebook addresses this and is a much-needed tool that is able to flex and pivot with the different circumstances in which our city may find itself in the future.

Members of the Committee, any further delays and changes are catering to those spreading misinformation about the Guidebook. The professional planners the City has in its' employ are top in their field and their knowledge and skills must be respected. Please do not have these professionals make bad policy due to misinformation. Do not waste the thousands of hours given by citizens of Calgary who are trying to better their communities and ready them for a bright future. Move forward with the Guidebook for Great Communities. Calgary's viability depends on it. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Sonja Johnson



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, the information provided may be included in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)	Risa
Last name (required)	Desa
What do you want to do? (required)	Request to speak
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	SPC on Planning and Urban Development
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	Please see updated comment letter. Thank you

Jan 26, 2021

To whom it may concern,

I am here to express my strong opposition to the changes proposed in the Guidebook for Great Communities. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

We purchased a home in Elbow Park in 2011. We had previously lived in the Beltline and Marda Loop in a condominium. Once we had children, we felt it very important to move to a single-family home district, as we wanted a yard for our children to play in, a community school and the privacy that a single-family home affords. We did consider other higher density communities, but they felt congested and we wanted a neighbourhood with more space for our growing family. We made a conscious choice to live in a low-density RC1 single family neighbourhood. We were also aware that the neighbourhood that we bought in was old and established, with a Restrictive Covent as old as the City, that specified one home per lot. Our home was terribly damaged by the flood in 2013 but we made the choice to re-build, because we loved our neighbourhood. Our children are now 10, 8, 6, and 2 and feel that our choice in the neighbourhood and community that we live in has been one of the best decisions of our life.

If the City of Calgary goes ahead with its plan to destroy single family, low density neighbourhoods, it takes away an important housing option for young families. Give families choice. Families who want to have mature trees, park space and natural light surrounding them. Families who believe that a low-density community is a safe option to bring up their families.

We understand that it is a luxury to be able to live in a single-family home neighbourhood. It is something that we have worked hard to be able to achieve. We paid a premium to be able to

live in a low density, single family home neighbourhood. We pay extremely high property taxes for the choice of owning a single-family home. We also looked at our single-family home, as our investment for when we retire and are able to sell our home to another young family.

We are a visible minority family. I understand that the City has good intentions of trying to lift people up whom are disenfranchised. Often these are people who are visible minorities. A single-family home is something that gives you a goal to work towards regardless of what walk of life you come from. It is the dream! If everywhere is the same, what is the point in trying to better your lot in life? Please give people a choice to move upwards in life. Single-family, low density neighbourhood are important to retain.

Calgary should retain some lower density areas of single -family housing for those who want this choice. Consumer choice is important! We have made a significant investment in our home based on specific existing conditions. If we had known about the proposed Guidebook for Great Communities and its impact on our neighbourhood, we would have likely made a different purchase.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration. I hope that I have been able to articulate that consumer choice is important and that single low density family homes have their deserved place in our great City. At the very least, please consider a provision to protect certain historical neighbourhoods in order to provide choice for the future

Yours Sincerely,

Risa Desa

January 28, 2021

Development Committee – Guidebook for Great Communities
800 34th Ave S.W.
Calgary, AB, T2S 0X4

RE: Guidebook for Great Communities 2021

To whom it may concern:

Elbow Park began its history as an upper middle-class suburb of Calgary, one of many neighborhoods created by the explosive growth of the city shortly before World War One. Although most of the area comprising modern Elbow Park was homesteaded in the early 1880s, it was left undeveloped until 1907. The City of Calgary annexed the area that year, and real estate developer Freddy Lowes and his associates bought and surveyed it. Lowes intended to create an **exclusive residential suburb with spacious lots and lovely homes, situated on the pleasant banks of the Elbow River.**

Upon review of the proposed Guidebook for Great Communities, an oxymoron, there are a few sections that have particular emphasis and alignment to the Elbow Park Community. Section, **Heritage Guideline Area Tool for Communities States:**

“A heritage guideline area tool is used to provide policy to conserve and enhance neighborhoods with a concentrated grouping of heritage assets, while allowing for contextually appropriate growth and change. Heritage guideline areas contribute to sense of identity and place for communities. Heritage assets are privately-owned structures, typically constructed prior to 1945, that significantly retain the original form, scale, massing, window/door pattern, and architectural details or materials. Heritage assets may not warrant inclusion on the Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources or consideration as a heritage resource. Heritage guideline areas may be identified through a local area plan. This tool may be used in conjunction with incentives and other heritage tools that are applied through other mechanisms at The City.

4.1 Heritage Guideline Area Tool

- a. A local area plan should identify concentrations of heritage assets as heritage guideline areas.*
- b. Heritage guideline areas should:*
 - i. consists of block faces with 25 percent or greater of the structures identified as heritage assets;*
 - ii. exclude all block faces that contain two or fewer heritage assets;*
 - iii. exclude all parcels near or adjacent to an identified Main Street; and,*
 - iv. consider the inclusion of adjacent blocks that do not meet the above criteria where they provide a logical continuation of the heritage guideline area.*

4.2 Heritage Guidelines

- a. A local area plan should create heritage design guidelines for each specific heritage guideline area.*

October 22, 2020
Page 2 of 4

- b. The heritage guideline area should be named in a manner that recognizes community history.*
- c. New buildings that contain dwelling unit or backyard suite uses should be made discretionary within a land use district in heritage guideline areas.*
- d. Heritage design guidelines may identify character-defining elements that new developments should include, such as the following:*
 - i. roof pitch or style;*
 - ii. front-yard setbacks;*
 - iii. window and/or door pattern;*
 - iv. front façade projections;*
 - v. site access or design; and,*
 - vi. general massing considerations.*
- e. Heritage design guidelines may not include guidance regarding the following:*
 - i. land use designation;*
 - ii. parcel size; and,*
 - iii. number or size of dwelling units or suites.*

Appendix 2: Neighborhood Local Limited Scale

Residential Intensity; The purpose of this appendix is to provide supplementary information to support the limited scale residential intensity policies located in the neighborhood Local urban form. neighborhood Local areas support a range of low-density housing forms when the applied scale is three story's or below (Limited Scale). At this scale, buildings are typically, two to three stories' (as exactly represented in Elbow park) in height and oriented to the street. The Guidebook recognizes that a range of housing types are encouraged in neighborhood Local areas, but the age, layout and physical characteristics of communities may influence how and where these low-density housing forms are developed."

Upon review of these portion of the Guidebook once recognizes that Communities such as Elbow Park do not meet the Cities Planners for the future. Once upon a time the City of Calgary focused on the life and well-being of its Citizens. Based upon current developments the facts depict a new City philosophy which is a degradation of the quality of life Communities have come to expect. Recent actions by the City show that we now have a house development that takes a home lot and inserts another single dwelling house adjacent to the existing house, basically in the back yard and on a property designed for one house. This, to the detriment of safety, 100-year-old trees, pedestrian access, roadway signage, traffic congestion and overall reduction of the neighborhood aesthetics.

Upon review of the entire 131-page Handbook there is not one vision of the future that indicated the City recognizes the value of Elbow park type communities and the preservation of our heritage.

The city reviewers took a position that ignored the needs of the Elbow park community. This community is one of the City of Calgary's most iconic areas and by the City's action in this matter and perceptibly degraded the quality of the community.

October 22, 2020
Page 3 of 4

We understand that this matter is only one of many assaults on iconic neighborhoods in the City of Calgary. The quest for densification will continue unabated, however, the needs of the community cannot be ignored, and we respectfully request the City accept its responsibility to balance the needs of the neighborhood and the development of the City of Calgary.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Scott Updegrave & Deborah Janke

3601 6th Street SW

Calgary Alberta Canada

T2S 2M6

Phone – 403-680-1956

Scott.updegrave@yahoo.com

Cc:

Lindsay Seewalt – City of Calgary

Communications Assistant to Ward 11 Councillor Jeromy Farkas

[Lindsay Seewalt WARD11@calgary.ca](mailto:Lindsay.Seewalt@ward11@calgary.ca)

Elbow Park Residence Association

Margo Coppus

Lisa Poole

margo@coppus.ca

llpoole@icloud.com

January 27, 2021

To: Members of PUD, City Clerk

Re: Guidebook for Great Communities

SPC on Planning and Urban Development, February 3, 2021

Dear Members of PUD:

As a resident of the Elbow Park Community I would like to submit the following comments regarding the Amended version of the Guidebook for Great Communities (Guidebook).

We understand the value of a planning document that will guide the Local Area Plans, and we think it is beneficial for our communities to work together towards a shared vision. The Guidebook is a complex document and we appreciate the work and time it has taken to get to this point.

While we understand that future Local Area Plans will allow us to provide greater input into redevelopment benefits and challenges within Elbow Park and the surrounding communities, we still have many concerns and would ask that consideration be given to the following items.

Last year we asked for the addition of an Urban Form Category to preserve areas of predominantly single-family homes and promote bungalow buildings and small houses. While the Guidebook has been amended to a certain extent, we do not yet see the re-assurance we are looking for in this regard.

What we hear from the City Planners:

1. *The Guidebook is intended to give communities and developers certainty of their future AND to cut red tape and give more certainty and flexibility to developers.*

This last part is what we worry about. Developers are already taking advantage of communities. Even without the Guidebook subdivision applications seem to get approved quickly without consideration of community concerns, all in the name of densification. Developers will see profitable opportunities and bid higher for desirable properties. In stead of one home, we could see a semi-detached or duplex on the same lot. Add secondary suites and all of a sudden there could be 4 units, not necessarily affordable. In the inner-city neighbourhoods, these units will likely be high end.

2. *Development does not happen without a market. The policies in the Guidebook do not determine what gets developed and do not re-zone properties.*

The updated Residential Urban Form Category however, supports options for a greater range of housing forms (duplexes, row housing) that are not allowed according to the land use districts assigned to parcels today. Once the Guidebook is approved, the decision made by file managers on new applications for redesignation or re-zoning will be informed by the Guidebook for Great Communities and we will likely see a proliferation of applications approved for duplex, row housing and multi-family housing in areas that do not currently allow it.

It puts a lot of responsibility on the file managers.

What we read in the Guidebook:

1. *..... a range of housing types are encouraged in Neighbourhood Local areas, but age, layout and physical characteristics of communities may influence how and where these low density housing forms are developed.*

While encouraging, this policy is still too open ended in our opinion. Zone A allows ALL low density built forms and ALL intensities, except in areas that meet certain criteria. What is missing from this criteria list is: heritage asset areas and pockets of single family homes that define the character of a neighbourhood, but may not be heritage assets.

2. *..... redevelopment should consider existing context, parcel layout, building massing and landscaping to sensitively integrate into the community.*

Who will decide whether an application complies with this? Many communities have Development Guidelines, which have been drafted on recommendation of the City, only to be totally ignored when it comes to approving applications. How can we trust the City to consider these aspects when they don't now?

3. *.....ensuring new development contributes to community identity and respects historic resources.*

Allowing row housing in a historic single detached area does not comply with this statement in our opinion.

What we would like to see to ensure the above policies:

1. Add heritage and significant character areas to the criteria list for lowest intensity.
2. Guarantee that the LAP will allow for pockets of single family detached homes to be retained and protected.
3. Add a policy that higher density built forms in R-C1 zones, should comply with R-C1 rules for setbacks, lot coverage and height restrictions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your consideration of our suggestions.

Sincerely,

Margo Coppus
Elbow Park resident

Timothy Holz
1428 1a Street NW Calgary
Crescent Heights Community

January 26, 2021

Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD)
Reference Item # PUD 2021-0030/2021-0015

Re: North Hill Communities Local Area Plan and The Guidebook for Great Communities

I am writing this letter to follow up my feedback and presentation given on February 29th, 2020 at PUD Committee session and to voice my concerns regarding the revised proposed North Hill Community Local Area Plan and The Guidebook for Great Communities. I would like to start off acknowledging the efforts required in gathering input from communities and the drafting of the NHCLAP. I have a firm belief that we are in a time where full awareness, due diligence, full transparency of process and accountability to establish trust and a collaborative working relationship to establish the best Go Forward sustainable plan for our community and city's future.

The Crescent Heights Community Character, Living Historical Reference and Urban Green belt area of Calgary that is known for the large old trees, representation of diversity and balanced mix of existing affordable housing that welcomes all is a community that needs to be protected with an understanding for a need to accommodate more Calgary citizens.

The community acknowledges the need to move forward with planning additional density in a Smart and Transparent approach with active governance and clear lines of accountability.

After dedicating time to review the revised proposed NHCLAP and the Guidebook for Great Communities myself and my Neighbors do not support the plans based on the following feedback and concerns:

1. The North Hill Community Local Area Plan was predicated on the go ahead of the LRT Green Line which now is currently being shelved due to the Province withholding capital funding. The NHCLAP is now pre-mature and not warranted until there is certainty and construction are underway with the Green Line North of Downtown. With the removal of this strategic dependency the NHCLAP needs to be restarted at a later date.
2. A clear disappointment and frustration that the feedback and input presented on Feb 29th, 2020 along with Chairman Drew Ferrell support and commitment to take feedback highlighted and actioned regarding key areas of MDP not adhered too to revise plans accordingly. Revised plan has not taking into consideration any neglect of the urban planning team in following the holistic and integral MDP guidelines. This disregard for community citizens time and valued input is a clear indication the urban planning team has a separate agenda opposite of the community.
3. Furthermore, the ongoing disregard for the Urban Planning Governance and commitment to follow the outline MDP without due consideration of the holistic and integral components is the continued direction of the urban planning team within the city of Calgary. This approach begs the question of who is guiding the city employees if it is not the impacted communities.

The significant concern of the community is the city is introducing functional elements that eliminate oversight, accountability, and recourse to challenge development in our backyards under the Guidebook. In addition, the urban planning team assigned is disregarding other key infrastructure teams such as water services that will increase the costs by allowing developers to bypass critical assessments of sewer and drainage impacts by making core requirements optional with again no recourse to challenge. The city is opening the gates of our community to unchecked development and run by the nights developers to make quick cash.

In Conclusion – The community of Crescent Heights is open and welcome increased density but in a SMART way and with protection of all historical aspects such as century homes and a once in a lifetime tree canopy. Myself and my immediate neighbors do not approve moving ahead with the NHCLAP or Guidebook as it has been presented in the last revisions and recommend the whole effort be shelved until a future date. The Crescent Heights Community would also like to withdrawal from any further planning until the city is open, transparent and adheres to the MDP guidelines in a holistic and integral manner taking into all aspects of what makes out community great and vibrant

Sincerely

Timothy Holz and Neighbors on 1a St NW

February 29th, 2019 Presentation



North Hills
Community Letter to F

January 27, 2021

Richard Cote and Gordon W Ross
918 Lansdowne Avenue SW
Calgary, Alberta
T2S 1A3

Re: SPC on Planning and Urban Development

Dear PUD Committee Members,

I am strongly opposed to the changes proposed in the Guidebook for Great Communities. We purchased a home in a single-family district specifically because of the low-density attributes. We value privacy and want a yard for our families to enjoy. We moved into an established community to be surrounded by mature trees and natural light.

We paid a premium and also incur much higher property taxes to live in our neighbourhood because it offers the lifestyle that we want. Notwithstanding some people's opinion that millennials are on board with increased density, there is still a large contingence of people who will continue to value the heritage and the benefit of the single-family inner city neighbourhoods.

If we had wanted to live in a higher-density community, we would have chosen another location. Calgary needs to retain some lower density areas for those whom want this choice. It is unreasonable and certainly unfair to those property owners who bought single family properties without an expectation of the City planners to change the zoning.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Richard Cote



Gordon W Ross

January 27, 2021

Dear PUD Committee Members,

I urge you not to pass the Guidebook for Great Communities because of insufficient public engagement relative to the magnitude of the potential impact of the proposed changes.

I love Calgary and want our communities to be great. But the Guidebook for Great Communities is not going to get us there. I appreciate the years of work that have been invested in creating this document. However, due to a lack of meaningful public consultation, this project got on the wrong track right from the start. There should have been a greater effort to understand the unique characteristics of EACH community by engaging the residents of EACH community in discussions about the role their community might play in the future of Calgary. Time saved by skipping this important step had led to the creation of an incomplete plan that a growing number of Calgarians oppose.

I first learned of the Guidebook in fall of 2019. There was an information session at our community centre, but it was for the purpose of notification, not consultation - meaning there was no opportunity to provide input. This is hardly public engagement. I was stunned to learn about the plans to radically alter city bylaws and planning principles without involving the people who will be directly impacted. This is not right.

Since that time, I have been trying to understand what the impact of the Guidebook could be on my community. This is no easy task. Despite claims to the contrary, the Guidebook is a vague document with seemingly contradicting statements that nobody can clearly explain. At a recent Guidebook information session, a question was asked regarding the specifics of the kind of changes communities should expect. The response from a city planner was "I don't have a crystal ball and I cannot guarantee that some applicant isn't going to come in and find a loophole in the guidelines". That hardly inspires the confidence needed to support the Guidebook.

Furthermore, the portrayal of those who want to live in single-family homes as "protectionist", "regressive" and "scared of change" and that neighbourhoods of single-family homes are "elite enclaves" is insulting to the many Calgarians who have chosen to reside in a single-family home and does little to inspire trust in the objectives of the Guidebook.

I want Calgary to be an innovative city that is a great place to live and work. But the proposed not-so-great Guidebook for Great Communities will not get us there. Until the implications of the proposed changes can be clearly communicated and agreed upon by all stakeholders, the Guidebook for Great Communities must NOT be sent to council for approval.

Sincerely,
Lisa Poole

January 27, 2021

Subject: Guidebook for Great Communities
SPC on Planning and Urban Development, February 3, 2021

Dear Members of PUD,

I am a resident of Scarborough and below are my comments on the latest version of the Guidebook for Great Communities (Guidebook).

Benefits of the Guidebook for Great Communities

This is an impressive document structured to guide city wide growth making the development process simpler and focusing on optimising the use of existing infrastructure. It is the natural extension of the Municipal Development Plan 2020 (MDP) which emphasises the principles of 1) protecting neighbourhood character and 2) focusing required intensity to high activity areas such as Main Streets and Activity Centres. I support the city's need for continuous growth and increased intensification following these principles.

I am pleased to see the new version provides more detail and clarity on the UFC policies and applaud the addition of heritage guidelines which aspire to ensure new development sensitively responds to existing heritage assets.

There are a number of deficiencies that need to be addressed before the Guidebook meets its stated goals and those of the MDP. Consequently, I cannot support the approval and implementation of the guidebook at this time.

1. Protecting Existing Community Character

The stated goals of the MDP and Guidebook are to respect neighbourhood character sustaining their sense of place.

The Municipal Development Plan Policy "2.3.2 Respecting and Enhancing Neighbourhood Character, Policy

a. Respect the existing character of low-density residential areas, while still allowing for innovative and creative designs that foster distinctiveness."

The Guidebook includes "Identity and Place" as one of the 6 Principles.

"Identity and Place

Neighbourhoods are well-designed and create a sense of place that foster identity and creates pride in community."

The Guidebook focuses on how to create great communities and **not** how to sustain the great communities we already have. Residents of most well-established communities believe they already live in a great community and the question isn't how do we make these communities great but rather how

do we sustain or possibly improve upon these communities in the face of future growth and intensification.

In many of these communities, it's the pattern of streetscape, architectural details, scale and massing that create an "experience" that is recognizable as a sense of place. In some communities it's the historical uniqueness that creates this strong bond. With each new development that does not respect the character of the neighbour identity and sense of place is lost which is irreversible and cumulative. With time the unique identity of the neighbourhood will erode.

Unfortunately, the Guidebook fails in it's goal to respect and protect existing character as it has no mechanism to ensure this happens such as contextual guidelines which can be used as part of the LAP process. Where a rowhouse replaces an existing single detached dwelling the lot coverage on the parcel can be up to 60% where existing single houses are 45% lot coverage or less. The LUBs also allow smaller setbacks and green space for rowhouses than for single dwellings. I simply cannot see how these much larger structures spread throughout the community would contextually fit with areas of single detached homes.

The Guidebook has new and welcomed heritage guidelines. Unfortunately, I have learned that the heritage guidelines do little to protect the low scale and massing of historic communities. A parcel that is designated as single detached dwelling in the inner city, Zone A, can easily be "up-zoned" to row housing by complying with current LUB criteria such as massing, height and setbacks. Blanket up zoning of communities is a "counter-policy" to heritage protection. I expect to see significant tear down of historic buildings if this policy is adopted. The heritage policies do not go far enough in giving communities the assurance they need to believe their community character will be protected.

2. Mis-allocating Intensity

The Municipal Development Plan 2020, Section 2.2.1 discusses the benefits of focusing intensification to defined areas in order to lessen the impact on stable, low density areas.

Section 2.2.1 Vibrant and Transit-Supportive Mixed-Use, Activity Centres and Main Streets.

Objectives:

"Focusing most intensification to defined areas provides more certainty to the development and building industries and makes redevelopment more predictable for existing communities by lessening the impact on stable, low-density areas."

The City's own statistics make it clear that blanket intensification is not needed to achieve the growth goals of Calgary's Municipal Development Plan. The City's website entitled "Calgary is Growing" indicates that by 2039, 70,500 more housing units will be needed in the "developed areas" of the City in order to reach MDP goals. Up to 57,200 housing units could be developed without rezoning any land. In addition, if we were to develop the lands that Council has already approved for multi-unit development in the Local Area Plans, we could add 62,700 units, providing us with 120,000 units, when the MDP says we only need 70,500. If we were to add the legalization of secondary suites to this equation, which Council approved in 2018 for all low-density districts, then we can explain why blanket intensification is not needed to achieve MDP goals. All this makes it difficult to buy into the need to spread intensity broadly across communities. There should be more than enough opportunity in the existing up zoned and high activity areas such as Main Streets and Activity Centers to fill the gap over the next 20+ years.

With all this potential up zoning and intensity there is a significant risk of MDP and Guideline goals not being reached in the high priority areas as it creates tremendous latitude and opportunity for mid-scale developers to up zone lots and flip properties, in the core of communities, while reducing the incentive to prioritise the high activities areas such as Main Streets and Activity Centers.

The MDP seeks to foster multiple activity centers outside of the Downtown Core. Without higher intensity around activity centers and corridors, this won't happen. It makes more sense to initially focus the intensity on priority areas, Main Street and Activity Centres, as well as existing up zoned areas and only broaden up zoning and intensity to the rest of the communities if it proves necessary.

3. Single Detached Dwelling UFC

The issue of low-density residential policies was recognised by the Committee on *Planning and Urban Development* who at their March 4, 2020 meeting discussed.

"While the committee acknowledged the need for all communities to have a diversity of housing types, questions arose regarding the preservation of areas of communities that are made up predominantly or exclusively of Single Detached Dwellings. As a result, Council directed Administration to explore options to address the concerns that Councillors and some community members had raised." (PUD2021-0015 Attachment 5).

This led to four options that administration explored, ultimately recommending Option #4, "Policy Based on Community Lifecycle Zones" which includes two impact zones, Zone A and B, as well as the new policy for low density in terms of a range of intensities. This Option #4 deals with Council's concern by exempting most of the city referred to as "Remaining Areas" on Map 1 from the impacts of intensification.

Discussing Option #4 the administration writes: "This approach also balances areas with higher infill market demand closer to inner city, with the desire for more stability in newer communities" This incorrectly suggests these inner-city areas with a higher infill market do not desire stability.

I believe Option #2 "Policy to Identify Areas for Single Detached Dwellings Only" is a superior solution as it allows for areas restricted to Single Detached Dwellings all across Calgary, not simply the "remaining areas" outside Zone B. This option is described as:

"Local area plans would not be able to use this policy tool widely to simply prevent other forms of housing. The policy would instead only be applied in limited areas that met a set list of criteria and the identified areas would be a mapped element of the local area plan. The criteria would provide consistency and the ability to consider site-specific limitations, while allowing redevelopment and investment in the balance of the community."

Option #2 would provide the granularity needed to maintain their sense of place and community character as the Single Detached Dwellings category would use criteria such as massing, height, set back and scale already defined in the LUBs. The only concern would be if the city's list of criteria on how and where it can be used is so restrictive that it makes the option impractical to use as intended.

Creating an additional Single Detached Dwelling UFC also helps administration ensure that intensity is located as intended by the MDP and Guidebook, around high activity areas. Data will demonstrate how much extra up zoning and intensity is required and the LAP process will ensure intensity is prioritised around the Main Streets and Activity Centers as required by the MDP. Creating areas of Single Detached Dwellings reduces the incentive for developers to focus intensity on non-priority areas.

Apparently, Option #4 was chosen by administration without exploring the variety of options with the stakeholders that were part of the working sessions (Aug-Nov 2020).

4. Community Engagement

Administration has listed the numerous community engagements they have done with impressive statistics about the number of people they have engaged and the number of workshops they have held. The simple truth is that the vast majority of Calgarians have no idea that the Guidebook exists, what it is designed to do and how they will or will not be impacted.

Given the "once in a generation type impact" the Guidebook can have on these communities, administration needs to go beyond the typical workshops and presentations and go directly to residents in the same way they do for by-law changes such as letters to residents and community bill boards and workshops. This communication needs to fully outline the rationale for the changes and their potential impact on specific communities.

5. Recommendations

- 1) Administration to strengthen the heritage guidelines and introduce contextual development guidelines (eg massing, height, set backs) allowing reasonable limits to these types of developments.
- 2) Administration ensure intensity is prioritised in high activity areas such as Main Streets and Activities Centres and not focused on the broader residential communities before it is required.
- 3) Administration fleshes out Option #2 defining the criteria on how and where it can be used and then review it with stakeholders of Zone A and B. If acceptable administration and Council implement Option #2 allowing for a Single Detached Dwellings UFC.
- 4) Administration reaches out to communities, especially those in Zones A and B, and undertake an extensive community and education program in order to engage these residents.

I congratulate the progress administration has made on the Guidebook for Great Communities. Implementing the recommendations above will assist them to reach the goals for the Guidebook and the MDP and smooth the process of buy-in by impacted residents.

Sincerely,

J. Brent Fraser



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, the information provided may be included in the written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 230 and 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

- I have read and understand that my name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council agenda. My email address will not be included in the public record.

First name (required)	Tracey
Last name (required)	Johnson
What do you want to do? (required)	Request to speak
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD)
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021

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

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Tracey Johnson and I am here to speak to the importance of protecting and preserving Calgary's neighbourhoods of historical significance. I sit on the Board of the Elbow Park Residents Association (EPRA) as Director of History and Heritage so I speak from both the lens of the community as well as my personal view.

My community of Elbow Park is one of the oldest in the city. Most of the area was homesteaded in the late 19th century, as early as 1875. Then in 1907 the City of Calgary annexed the area and it was developed into an exclusive residential suburb with spacious lots and appealing homes, situated by the banks of the Elbow River. For more than a century since the community was established, it's residents have come together time and again, working tirelessly and passionately to maintain the original look and feel of the neighbourhood, as developers tried to change it, repurpose it, to commercialize it, and densify it. By working together for the greater benefit to the community, it's residents have been relatively successful in protecting the original vision and heritage, along with the style and elegance of a bygone era.

Let me be clear, I am not against progress. Development, redevelopment, and commercialization helps to build cities up and keep them relevant. But it must be appropriate. It must be planned. And it must not erase, but instead complement the existing landscape, as no building stands on its own but is related to its surroundings and to other buildings around it. This does not mean converting our communities into museums or that every single old building must be preserved, but that the process of renewal should not mean the destruction of our built heritage*. Calgary, being a relatively young city, doesn't have a lot of history, and over the last decades, many of its original historic buildings have been, and continue to be torn down, in favour of newer and bigger aesthetics. No one will deny the need for growth in today's modern world. But when badly conceived developments disfigure and transform areas beyond recognition*, it obliterates cultural identity and historic continuity, and we need to speak up.

As you know, The City of Calgary, in recognition of the importance of protecting of heritage, created the Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources, which is a list of sites that have been evaluated by Heritage Calgary according to city policy. I quote from the city's own website, "Preservation of these sites is considered to be to the greater benefit of Calgarians". This demonstrates to its citizens that the city of Calgary understands that the preservation of historic structures and landscapes is a valuable endeavour. Aside from their architectural value, the presence of the past physically embodied in structures built by our past citizens, connects us to the legacy of the past and helps us gain understanding of history. Preserving heritage neighbourhoods protects the city's memories and contributes to civic pride. They are a reflection of our history, and helps us to understand and respect people who lived in different eras with different perspectives and traditions.

People value the craftsmanship, human scale, and design of historic buildings and communities. By not taking a planned and deliberate approach to building and densification we risk erasing our history - that inheritance which past generations have handed down to us as stewards of the city's collective memory. Thank you for your time.

*<https://ph.asiatatler.com/life/opinion-how-important-is-the-preservation-and-restoration-of-historic-landmarks>



January 28, 2021

**SPC on Planning & Urban Development
City of Calgary**

PO Box 2100 Stn M
Calgary AB, T2P 2M5

Dear Committee:

Re: Guidebook for Great Communities & North Hill Communities Local Area Plan Letter of Support

Heritage Calgary, in accordance with its role to advise Council and Administration on heritage matters in the City of Calgary, would like to take this opportunity to support the Guidebook for Great Communities (“the Guidebook”) & the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan (NHCLAP).

The Guidebook and the pilot NHCLAP (the tool to implement the Guidebook in 10 unique neighbourhoods) are the product of substantial work and effort by The City of Calgary. They are both highly visual, easy to read, visionary documents that utilize an effective storytelling method to envision a prosperous and vibrant future for Calgary’s communities. The NHCLAP shows the Guidebook in action specifically for the 10 North Hill communities that participated in the NHCLAP – communities which are simultaneously experiencing redevelopment pressures while trying to retain and enhance the elusive “sense of place” that make these neighbourhoods special and desirable places to live.

Heritage Calgary’s mission is to identify, preserve, and promote Calgary’s diverse heritage for future generations. We recognize that heritage is one of many components in the overall city building process. It is an important component, integral to the sense of place these established communities foster, but an element that must be balanced with needs of the present and the future – needs such as increasing the density of our desirably located communities, preserving our legacy green spaces, and enhancing the vibrancy of established communities.

Calgary has been behind the proverbial 8-ball for many years when it comes to preserving our heritage. Some significant heritage buildings have been lost due to neglect, or through demolition – the result of a lack of investment into learning about our heritage coupled with growth and redevelopment pressures. Beyond our built heritage, little effort has been put into understanding our intangible heritage – the things we cannot see or touch, cannot walk by every day, but contribute to our modern identity as Calgarians. Through the creation of this Guidebook and the NHCLAP (and the suite of Heritage Tools and Incentives affiliated with these documents), The City has demonstrated its commitment to the identification and preservation of both our tangible and intangible heritage, showing that visionary future redevelopment plans can still respect, integrate, and make space for history.

Heritage policies in the Guidebook provide overarching guidance to property owners, communities, developers, and local advocates that pushes for the retention of heritage resources through permitting bylaw relaxations and additional development potential (where appropriate). Where preservation of the resource is not possible, documentation is required through the submission of photo documentation and interpretive or commemorative features are recommended. Retaining that indefinable sense of place of these historic communities can be, in part, achieved through encouraging contemporary interpretations of historical design. Some policies do double duty and work to achieve multiple City goals –for instance, sustainability is advanced through adaptive reuse (which both preserves an historic resource and keeps historic building materials out of landfills).

The NHCLAP presents Calgary's first Heritage Guideline Areas, which include eight unique locations throughout the Plan area with significant concentrations of heritage assets: privately owned structures, typically constructed prior to 1945, that significantly retain their original form, scale, massing, window/door pattern and architectural details or materials. Some of these heritage assets may be on the Inventory (such as the Balmoral Workers Cottages on 20th Avenue NW), and some may be further formally designated as Municipal Historic Resources (such as the Upshall (Corson) Residence [TBD March 2021]). However, not all historic structures may qualify for this level of heritage protection, leaving many of the pre-1945 buildings in our communities unprotected.

By broadening the definition of what is considered "heritage" and including structures that may not qualify for the Inventory but still have heritage value, the City has demonstrated that they understand that heritage preservation is more than simply preserving one-of-a-kind buildings or structures that retain a high level of heritage integrity and value. The collection of heritage assets in these heritage areas is one of many things that contributes to the intangible sense of place established communities have, and by offering broader protections for these areas the City demonstrates they are actively preserving this element of our intangible heritage together with the tangible (built) heritage.

The NHCLAP identifies four goals that will help achieve the Plan's vision – one of these goals is "Creating Great Communities". This goal has six "Implementation Options", or actions the community can undertake in order to help the communities achieve that goal. Heritage Calgary noted that four of the six Implementation Options relate in some way to Calgary's heritage – our built heritage (Tuxedo School), and our landscape heritage, both cultural (Balmoral and Beaumont Circuses) and natural, which connects us to time immemorial (Confederation Park & McHugh Bluff).

The fact that these sites attracted attention during the writing of this Plan and are identified as catalyst locations to create great communities is not surprising. Fundamentally, heritage is valued by everyone. These sites identified in the NHCLAP are unique elements of our city's heritage – they reach back in time and tell us something about the past. They draw us to them. They define us. They are each a part of what makes this place "Calgary". These Implementation Options give us opportunities to understand better where we have come from and from who we have inherited these lands, and to learn about the layered and overlapping histories of these four heritage sites. Pouring our collective passion, effort, and care into these areas will contribute to giving that mysterious sense of place shape and definition, something we can point to and put a finger on, and ensure that intangible aspect of these communities is preserved well into the future.

We look forward to seeing the Guidebook and NHCLAP in action over the coming years and working with The City to ensure its success. We hope that the implementation of these Plans is as effective in practice as they are in theory, and that this is just the beginning, with more thoughtful and unique heritage preservation policy and tools to come.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration on this matter. Should you or your staff require more information, please contact me at jtraptow@heritagecalgary.ca.

Sincerely,



Josh Traptow
Executive Director
Heritage Calgary