



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)	Lynn
Last name (required)	Engel
What do you want to do? (required)	Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	PUD Committee Meeting
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	Please review my attached letter. Thx

Lynn Engel
209 8th Ave NE
Calgary AB
T2E 0P8

22 January 2021

Re: Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD)
PUD # 2021-0015

North Hill Communities – Local Area Plan – Final Proposed Plan

I **do not** support this plan in its current form. I would like the supporting land use bylaw amendments especially pertaining to Heritage planning to be addressed in parallel.

I support and agree with my neighbor, **Isabelle Jankovic**; with details found in her letter.

There has been some poorly designed and large/multi dwelling residences built in my neighbourhood. On some streets, there are apartment buildings and so in some areas, this is ok.

But my main concern is that on the streets that have traditional single residence homes there have been a few developments that are very much over the scale of what I feel is appropriate for that area.

Sincerely,

Lynn Engel
Resident, Crescent Heights



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.



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)	Isabelle
Last name (required)	Jankovic
What do you want to do? (required)	Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	PUD 2021-0015
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	I do not support the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan because it does not meet the requirements of the Guidebook for Great Communities, also under review at this meeting.. Please refer to the attached letter for details.
---	--

26 January 2021

Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD) 3 Feb 2021

Re: PUD # 2021-0015 North Hill Communities – Local Area Plan – Final Proposed Plan, 4 Jan 2021

I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS 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.

Having successfully gone through the development appeal process last year, I think there are still too many unknowns in this plan. Since it will replace the current Crescent Heights ARP (Area Redevelopment Plan) once it is passed, the missing elements and lack of direction is of grave concern. While there are some improvements over the last proposed plan, there is not enough information to guide the Development Authority, developers and residents in the development permit requirements. As residents, if we were going to challenge a development permit again, or rezoning for that matter, the NHCLAP and the Guidebook do not offer the same level of support for detail and community specific objections as our current ARP.

According to the City's Heritage Planning website (<https://www.calgary.ca/pda/pd/heritage-planning/heritage-conservation-incentives-and-programs.html>), amended Land Use bylaws are scheduled for "2020-2021" on the website although I have information from a member of the NHCLAP working group that it will be delayed until Q1 2022, a year from now. We have not seen any information about what is being proposed. There is no link to Heritage planning website on the NHCLAP website even though it is an important part of section 2.12 (p 48). According to this section, *"These guidelines will be informed by **the character-defining elements** of heritage assets in these areas with the **intent** of ensuring that new development fits into the **historic fabric and context**. In identifying these areas, the Plan recognizes that **further work** is required to both identify and draft the appropriate guidelines."* (Italics and emphasis added)

There is no reference in the NHCLAP to the "Heritage Guideline Area Tool for Communities" on page 113 of the "Guidebook for Great Communities", 4 Jan 2020 (Guidebook) which outlines what a Local Area Plan should contain regarding heritage assets.

There are several elements in section 4.2 Heritage Guidelines that have not been included in the NHCLAP:

Note: Sections in italics are direct quotes.

4.2 (a)" A local area plan should create heritage design guidelines for each specific heritage guideline area."

While the heritage planning areas have been identified and named in accordance with Section 4.1, so far there are no design guidelines for any of these areas.

4.2 (b) "The heritage guideline area should be named in a manner that recognizes community history."

This has been included in the NHCLAP.

4.2 (c) "New buildings that contain dwelling unit or backyard suite uses should be made discretionary within a land use district in heritage guideline areas."

First, there is no bylaw amendment to support this statement. Second, from what I understand, the pilot project in Bridgeland- Riverside has not been very successful.

4.2 (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."*

Large portions of Crescent Heights have been identified as heritage planning areas (pg. 49, Map 5: Beaumont/Regal Terrace, Crescent Heights and Mount Pleasant). There is nothing in the NHCLAP that defines any of the characteristics of the pre – 1945 development for any of the eight heritage areas identified. Is the intent to develop design guidelines for each of the areas or a general guideline for all the areas? Guidelines for each of the areas could become an administrative nightmare for the Development Authority even with a checklist for each area. What is the intent to ensure these guidelines are taken into consideration by builders and the Development Authority? Will they apply to all types of developments within the heritage planning areas? As the current land use bylaws contain nothing related to heritage conservation or heritage design guidelines, there is nothing that requires the Development Authority to take heritage into consideration and absolutely nothing in the current NHCLAP except the two policies on page 48. There is no commitment to a date for completion. As heritage conservation is very high on residents' concerns, these guidelines need to be developed before the NHCLAP is passed. It is difficult to approve something that is not yet existing. The current ARP has an extensive list of characteristics in an appendix.

4.2 (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.*

NCHLAP Policy 1 on p. 48 states:

*"Land use redesignations for higher density development are **discouraged** until heritage policy tools have been explored in the Plan area."* (Italics and emphasis added)

As section 4.2(e)(i) in the Guidebook states that land use designation is not to be part of the Heritage design guidelines, this must be addressed in the amended land use bylaws. The current land use bylaws contain nothing related to heritage conservation and are not sufficient to guide the Development Authority until the new amended Land Use bylaws are passed. As of this date, there is no clear timeline as to when that will happen and how long can a developer expect to wait? In our experience, the City will not expect them to wait. The Development Authority needs bylaws that provide clear direction on how to proceed and under what terms. Otherwise, anything can be approved and the historic character of our inner city neighbourhoods will be eroded even further.

Blanket statements like “further work is required” (p. 48) and “developing heritage policies and/or guidelines [pg. 69, 4.3.2 (a)] are not acceptable. The NHCLAP needs to comply with the statements outlined in the Guidebook Section 4.2 before it is passed. These need to be part of NHCLAP Section 2.12, not an appendix. Amended land use bylaws to support heritage policies and guidelines need to be passed at the same time as the NHCLAP even if the total review of the residential land use bylaws is not complete. This is the first local area plan to be passed, and since it is the prototype for future local area plans, it is very important to have a document that will clearly guide developers, builders, residents and the Development Authority.

While a lot of time, money and effort has already gone into this document, there is still a lot of work required before this document is ready to be passed.

Regards,

Isabelle Jankovic

Resident, Crescent Heights

Cc: Dennis Marr, Crescent Heights Community Association Planning Committee

Druh Farrell, Ward 7 Councillor

Ian Harper, City of Calgary



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)	Dan
Last name (required)	Evans
What do you want to do? (required)	Submit a comment
Public hearing item (required - max 75 characters)	Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD) Reference
Date of meeting	Feb 3, 2021
Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)	Please find our letter attached.

Marie Semenick-Evans and Dan Evans

*202 9 Avenue NE
Calgary, AB T2E 0V4*

To: Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development (PUD)

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

We're writing this letter to express our concern over the new North Hills Community Local Area Plan. We support the position of the Crescent Heights Community Association and encourage the Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development to delay approving the plan until the following key issues can be resolved.

We would like to echo the points made by the Crescent Heights Community Association:

Recognize and respect the local identity of communities.

The Plan must articulate a vision for individual communities within the greater North Hill area. Treating nine distinct communities as one homogenous group doesn't consider the local identity that's so important to maintaining the great communities that we have.

Establish clear density targets by community.

We agree that increasing density is important, but there has to be a clear plan on how that will be achieved and a recognition that Crescent Heights already has a highly dense community compared to other surrounding communities.

Complete mobility planning prior to adoption of the plan.

One of the key aspects of any plan is mobility and how our community streets are impacted by higher density. Unfortunately, this work is scheduled to be done in the future. We believe it's essential for the mobility planning to be incorporated into the plan prior to its adoption.

Provide appropriate protection and sustainment of our Urban Forest.

We're also very concerned about the protection of our green spaces, and particularly concerned that Rotary Park is not being recognized as park area with the new plan.

Fully develop Heritage Planning Tools prior to adoption of the plan.

Protecting the unique heritage of Crescent Heights has always been a priority for our community. The Heritage Planning Tools referenced in the plan must be developed and their application in inner-city communities understood before the North Hill Local Area Plan can be adopted.

We strongly encourage the committee to direct City administration to continue its work with affected communities to resolve these outstanding issues and present a more comprehensive and sensitive plan that not only plans for future growth, but that also recognizes the need to sustain the great communities that we have in the inner city.

Sincerely,

*Marie Semenick-Evans and Dan Evans
Residents of Crescent Heights*

February 29, 2020

The City of Calgary

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

RE: Proposed North Hill Communities Local Area Plan

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the proposed plan. As an advocate of making Calgary a great city, I participated in the engagement opportunities with The City regarding North Hill Communities local area plan with a specific interest in the Crescent Heights area. I am disheartened to see what has been agreed upon at the sessions changed that I participated in and my concerns have not been addressed by the plan. While believe that the plan is premature pending the resolution of the GreenLine, the focus of this letter is on the potential loss of character, lifestyle and sense of place in the historic areas of Crescent Heights.


More specifically, I respectfully request that consideration be given to two areas:

1. Protect the historical view corridor to Balmoral School clock tower.

This tower is a significant landmark and has functioned to help create sense of place and wayfinding for over a hundred years (built in 1913). In particular, the view along 1A Street NW should be protected. Highlights from the MDP that support the protection of important sightlines include:

- The whole of section 2.3.3 Heritage and Public Art, for example: (b) *“Ensure that the protection and enhancement of historic assets...and form part of the wider design and urban development agenda.”*
- The whole of Section 2.4 Urban design, for example: (a) *“locate and design significant sites and public buildings to promote their civic importance...”* Retaining the view to the school enhances its importance in the community; and (c) *“Identify, preserve and enhance scenic routes and principal views of important natural or constructed features”*

In addition, the Guidebook identifies under 2.29 that Local Area Plan content **should include identification of special view corridors in Chapter 1 and identify “existing or new landmark sites or gateway sites and key view corridors” 2.29(f)**. Further it states that Chapter 2 section 2.5(a)(ix) that **developments should respect view corridors in local area plans**. Recognition of this important view line within the Local Area Plan is needed.






View looking north on 1A Street to Balmoral School. The current plan does not acknowledge this view corridor and identifies it for buildings up to 12 stories on 16th Avenue and 6 stories on 15th Avenue. If built to this height, it would effectively block this historical view corridor; reduce the prominence of this civic building; hide its cultural and historical significance; and lose its function as a means to support wayfinding and creating sense of place.





To address this concern, I respectfully request amendments to the plan in Chapters 1 and 2 to protect the view corridor down 1A ST W to Balmoral School. In addition, City Council may wish to have additional view corridors to the tower recognized such as views from key intersections along 16th Avenue such as those from 8th Street and 4th Street.


In addition, I request an amendment to the Heritage map in Appendix C of the plan to help ensure that views to this historic landmark are considered in future planning decisions.

-  View Corridor
-  Balmoral School clock tower
-  Area proposed to be included as a Heritage Planning Area to protect historic view corridor.

Excerpt from:
MAP C:
Heritage
Planning Areas

Legend

-  Heritage Planning Areas
-  Plan Area Boundary



2. Maintain lower building height where required to encourage heritage preservation and respect building scale and privacy of adjacent properties.

There are a number of MDP policies that supports this. Examples include:

- Section 2.2.1 (b) (i) *“maintaining compatibility, avoiding dramatic contrast in height and scale with low density residential area through limits on allowable heights and bulk of new development”*; (ii) *“creating transition in development intensity...”* and (iv) *“massing new development in a way that responds to existing scale”*.
- Section 2.2.4 (b) (v) *“distinctive, attractive neighbourhoods that feature architectural and natural elements that contribute to local identity and strong sense of place”*
- Section 2.3.2 (a) *“Respect the existing character of low-density residential areas, while still allowing for innovative and creative designs that foster distinctiveness”* (b) *Ensure an appropriate transition of development intensity, uses and built form between low-density residential areas and more intensive multi-residential or commercial areas;* (c) *Ensure infill development complements the established character of the area and does not create dramatic contrasts in the physical development pattern.*

The Map 4 of the plan currently proposes an increased building scale along the west side of 1 Street NW between 14 and 15 Avenues and the both sides of 15th Avenue NW between 1st and 2nd Streets. There 3 main concerns with this proposal.

First there currently exists a number of character homes located in these areas and identifying these areas for higher building heights decreases the likelihood that these houses will be preserved. It is worthy to note that many of these houses are well maintained and will be present for the foreseeable future. In fact, a character home on 15th Avenue is currently being renovated.

Second, if redevelopment occurs adjacent to these buildings, they should **maintain a similar building scale to help promote the prominence of these historic assets.**

The third concern is that **these parcels back onto single family back and side yards. Without even a lane to help create separation, the overlooking from higher elevations will create sightlines into many private spaces and would materially interfere and affect the use and enjoyment of these properties.** In addition, the building massing of 6-storeys immediately adjacent to character homes such as the recently renovated c.1913 home shown in the picture to the left does not respect the existing neighbourhood character.



View looking northwest at the corner of on 1 Street and 14th Avenue NW. Two significant, well maintained century homes. The Plan currently proposes 6-storeys at this location. Having increased building height at this location will discourage the retention of these historic homes. This corner is particularly historically significant as the Wild Rose Church, which is also historically significant sits immediately across 14th Avenue (to left of picture).



1428 1A ST NW, renovated c.1913 2-story home, immediately adjacent to proposal for 6-storeys




Heritage tree located on 15th Ave. in front of two character homes. Increased building scale at this location will put development pressure on these community assets.

**MAP 3:
 Urban Form**

Legend

- Neighbourhood Housing Local
- Neighbourhood Housing Minor
- Neighbourhood Housing Major
- Neighbourhood Commercial Minor
- Neighbourhood Commercial Major




Increasing building heights along the north side of 15th Avenue should respect existing homes (many are single story post war homes) and the neighbourhood local urban form as shown in map 3 by having individual entrances to ground orientated units facing 15th Avenue.

The change to the plan that I respectfully request is to amend Map 4: Building Scale to change the areas shown in blue on the bottom of this page from Low (up to 6 Storeys) to Limited (up to 3 Storeys).

In sum, the changes I am proposing are to achieve 2 outcomes. The first is to protect the historical view corridor along 1A Street to help maintain community character, create a sense of place and promote pedestrian wayfinding. The second desired outcome is to promote the retention and prominence of historic homes and respect the existing urban form.

Sincerely,

Tim Holz



Proposed amendment to Map 4



Request blue section to be classified as Limited (up to 3 Storeys)

**MAP 4:
 Building Scale**

Legend

- No Scale Modifier
- Limited (up to 3 Storeys)
- Low (up to 6 Storeys)
- Mid (up to 12 Storeys)
- High (up to 26 Storeys)
- Parks and Open Space
- Plan Area Boundary

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 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