



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

AVPA Exemption Report Back: September 22, 2016
What We Heard, September 22, 2016

Project overview

City Council intends to request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs remove the residential development prohibition in the Airport Vicinity Protection Agreement (AVPA), which currently impacts those properties in the Inglewood community lying within the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 30 contour area.

City Council supported a Notice of Motion to amend the AVPA. Specifically, Council directed Administration to:

“engage with the public and affected stakeholders including the Calgary Airport Authority, regarding a proposed amendment to the Airport Vicinity Protection Area Regulation to exempt specific lands in the community of Inglewood lying within the N.E.F. 30 contour from the regulation prohibiting residential development and redevelopment in that area”

Removing the exemption on residential developments will allow existing residential properties to increase their development or redevelopment potentials in accordance with the provisions of the Calgary Land Use Bylaw.

Engagement overview

As part of the AVPA Exemption project, The City hosted two public open houses and an online questionnaire to gather feedback from area residents. This report reflects feedback received at the open house and online.

The first open house was held on Tuesday, June 21, 2016, as part of a larger Inglewood-Ramsay ARP open house. Twenty-eight comment forms were received.


The second open house was held at the Inglewood Community Association Hall on Tuesday, September 13, 2016. Thirty four people attended and 11 comment forms were received. Feedback collected through sticky notes posted on open house boards was transcribed.

The online questionnaire was available on The City's online engagement web page from August 13 to September 14, 2016. Two hundred and thirty-three unique visitors accessed the online questionnaire, with 41 visitors completing the questionnaire.

What we asked

To capture a balanced understanding of what stakeholders' opinions about having the AVPA exemption lifted were, the project team will ask people the following questions:

- Do you believe the amendment will affect you or your property in some way? Why/how?
- Describe why you think the proposed amendment will be positive, negative or neutral for you, your property or your community?



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- Why or why not do you support lifting the AVPA exemption?
- What other options could the City of Calgary consider concerning the APA regulation?

At the open house they provided feedback by:

- Filling out comment sheets;
- Leaving post-it notes with comments and concerns; and
- Writing comments and concerns on post-it notes and placing them on the display boards.

Those who accessed the online survey and mapping tool provided feedback by:


- Filling out questionnaire;
- Answering open ended questions; and
- Answering a project poll

What we heard

All of the feedback collected was organized into the following themes:

- Densification of neighbourhood (positive)
- Neighbourhood growth
- Will allow for property development
- Will allow for more people to live in neighbourhood
- Will allow for secondary suites
- Property values will increase and properties will see faster
- Less restrictive land use (positive)
- Limited changes to regulation are positive
- Aircraft noise is a concern
- AVPA should be consistent for all areas
- Community character will change
- Developers, not residents, will benefit
- Removal is detrimental to community
- Densification of neighbourhood (negative)
- Property values will decrease
- Traffic and parking issues will increase
- Increased consultation required

► For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

Summary of input

Below is a summary of the feedback received to concerning the AVPA exemption.

When asked whether participants thought that the proposed amendment to the AVPA will be a) positive, beneficial or advantageous for your property and/or Inglewood or b) negative, unsound or damaging to your property and/or Inglewood, a small majority felt that the proposed amendment would be positive. Additionally, in an online poll, all small majority of participants voted that they were in favour of the proposed amendment to the AVPA.

Positive comments from residents focused on the fact that amending the AVPA would allow for increased densification of Inglewood, allowing the neighbourhood to grow and allowing more people to live in the community. Many comments focused on the fact that it would allow them to develop their property and give them the option to consider a secondary suites. Comments also focused on the fact that this would ensure that property values in the area would rise and that it would be easier to sell properties without the regulation impacting them.


There were concerns raised about the fact that densification would be negative for the community overall. Participants highlighted the fact that increased density would permanently alter the character of one of Calgary's most prominent heritage neighbourhoods. Other concerns included the fact that aircraft noise is a major concern in the neighbourhood, amending or lifting the exemption would lower property values and increase noise, traffic and parking issues in the neighbourhood.

Participants have also indicated that other negative aspects of the amendment being implemented could include the impact of shadows from tall buildings, increased densification in a flood plain and the perception that the area's councillor is not in line with public opinion on this issue.

When asked about messaging for an education and awareness campaign in the community participants indicated that there is support for all three of the proposed messages to be used.

When asked about other options that Council should consider in regards to the proposed amendment, participants suggested the following (among others – detailed in the verbatim section):

- Leave the regulation as is
- Consider removing the regulation for certain properties
- Consult with other communities before making any changes to ensure regulations are equitable
- Amend regulation to allow for secondary suites
- Maintain regulations under flight paths only
- Exemptions should only be made under special circumstances with approval of the Inglewood Community Association's redevelopment committee



AVPA Exemption


Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

Next steps

- ▶ The feedback collected at the two open houses and through the online questionnaire will be provided to the AVPA exemption Project Manager for consideration as he develops his recommendation report for Council.
- ▶ The report will be presented to the Planning and Urban Development Committee for review in November 2016.
- ▶ The report will be presented to Council for review and decision in December 2016 or January 2017 (TBD).
- ▶ Depending on the option chosen, Council may petition the Minister of Municipal Affairs to request a change to the AVPA Regulation's provisions as they apply to residential development in the NEF 30 contour areas.



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments include all written input that was received at the open houses and online.

NB: The verbatim comments have not been edited for spelling, grammar or punctuation. Language deemed offensive or personally identifying information has been removed and replaced with either (offensive language removed) or (personal identifier removed).

Participants were asked to provide responses on the questions listed below. A majority of the questions asked online were the same questions that were asked at the open house.

Open House #1 – June 21, 2016

Initial thoughts and comments you want to share with the project team:

- I support keeping the AVPA!! It protects my property from nieghbours over developing their properties. Please keep it in place! NO reason to change it. NO! NO! NO!
- I wasn't familiar with the AVPA prior to this and it affects my property directly. I have heard during public engagement that there have been amendments proposed - our community in Inglewood was unaware of the proposed changes as we had not been consulted. It appears that there has been a lack of process for consultation - without an active community one questions whether an open house for dialogue would have taken place. Transparency is important for trust in processes to ensure community input. Going forward I hope to see more dialogue as this community sees numerous concurrent projects happening.
- Transport Canada and the airport are in favour of keeping the AVPA - that is good enough for me! It is a can of worms! Leave the lid on it - it is not an issue with the community or the residents of Calgary. Listen to your tax payers! I will be wrting Joe Ceci and the Minister of Transportation and Municipal Affairs - the people who are really making the decision.
- I guess I'm somewhat confused about when the community was supposed to provide input or when we are supposed to provide input. I was surprised the City was taking action with the Minister without any community input.
- Suggest a Townhall meeting (after one of these open houses) or a different evening to ensure everyone has a good understanding of what is planned and the impact to the community.
- The impression I now have is that the community consultation is virtually a pretense. City Council seems to have already made up its mind to rubber stamp this exemption request. The info delivered using these info sessions leaves me as a resident profoundly sceptical that any input is sincerely solicited.
- The ICA has put together a list of key questions and issues re: the AVPA. It is a very blunt instrument for preventing densification in the flight path. BUT if it is to be removed we would need clear, strict, limitations on the kind of densification that could occur in this zone. It has to be modest and appropriate. The whole issue should have been discussed first with the ICA before Council took two votes to back its removal. The cart went before the horse. We all need to take a step back and



AVPA Exemption


Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

just think this through carefully. You don't want - as some will - fiveplexes and fourplexes in a flight path and in an area zoned for C2 developments. We need meaningful, thorough, full, discussion of questions like this before they are voted on.

- Please consider lifting this and giving us some breathing room to increase our capacity.
- I am wholeheartedly in favour of removing the AVPA exemption.
- Please proceed with lifting the AVPA restrictions in this area. Further development should not be limited by the airport. There are many valid reasons to regulate development such as purposeful greenspace, maintaining an area's character, however the airport is not a valid reason to curb development. Thanks!
- While I would like there to be no development or loss of green space in the community, it makes no sense to have this in place because we are under a flight path. I would support other bylaws or zoning that preserved heritage or green space and parks, but this one does not make sense.
- I have been planning since 1992 to redevelop and live in my 1/2 duplex property. When the goal is in sight - this.
- I bought a house and lot in this area two years ago. I was very dismayed when I got the letter and learned of these AVPA restrictions, as I did not find information about this when purchasing the property - it would seem that the lawyer who helped me with this was not aware of the restrictions either. I am very much in support of lifting these restrictions! Please send me any information about this. I would also - very much - like to help with this process if I can (knocking on doors, calling people etc.)
- I bought my house in 1999 w/ intention of dividing and building. There are infills built on my street so why am I blocked. UNFAIR! I would never have bought this house if I had been told this in 1999.
- I have concerns that when I go to sell my home in 20 years, future buyers may want to develop a C(?) house on laneway on my property, but because of the AVPA they may not be able to do that. But, I also have concerns about too many side by side homes being built. Overall I think Inglewood will develop and become more affluent if the AVPA is removed.
- If restrictions are not lifted, property prices should and will diminish and property taxes should definitely be reduced to reflect this.
- Support to lift the exemption.
- Map on the website needs to be bigger.
- I would just like to say I am in favour of having a blanket removal of the AVPA. I feel that the single family homeowner is negatively impacted by this silly provincial bylaw. Having this in place prevents us from 1. having a basement suite 2. creating a mother in law suite for aging parents and/or 3. building a suite above our garage in order to rent to one person/renter - it isn't right that the airport has a say in our property. It needs to be removed so that young families can be able to afford to buy a home in Inglewood and supplement their mortgage by renting out to individuals. Thanks!
- What are next steps towards lifting exemption? I am not particularly bothered by very frequent plane traffic nor am I planning to increase density of my property, but I am concerned that this could affect the value of my property. The real estate agent that sold us the house certainly didn't know about this as he suggested we add a unit on our garage. Agents need education from the City? I think



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

basement suites, etc. would be positive for our part of the neighbourhood and maybe they wouldn't mind the planes - so I think missed opportunity.

- Extending infrastructure is a risk that needs to be mitigated. The best way to do this is providing cost effective density that relies on existing infrastructure rather than costly expansion and maintenance. The AVPA seems to be based on outdated objectives. Limiting one resident while the next door neighbour is not effected is wrong.
- Has the AVPA been revisited recently or ever? Planes are more efficient, quieter, safer, also runways have changed. Why is my property zoned RC2 if it isn't a true RC2 and yes I know it's a provincial regulation but at the end of the day the city enforces the provincial regulation. Get rid of it, please...all I want to do is add a legal secondary suite to put food on my table.

Open House #2 – September 13, 2016


Questionnaire

Do you live or own property in the area that will be affected by the proposed amendment to the AVPA regulation?

- Live but do not own property in the affected area – 0
- Live and own property in the affected area – 7
- Own property but do not live in the affected area – 2
- Do not live or own property in the affected area – 0

Do you believe the amendment will affect you or your property in some way? Why/how?

- yes it will allow me to densify my property. I am afraid of losing my speculative growth potential.
- Give us opportunities...I'd love the opportunity to develop my property.
- Yes. If the AVPA is removed or amended to allow increased density the potential for more development will outpace our infrastructure. Would we simultaneously have widened streets, a closer fire hall, an enlarged community pool, more park space? My street hasn't been repaved in 40-50 years. What happens with 25% more traffic? When the condo development behind me turns on their electric boiler my lights flicker + dim. Will we get new utilities?
- Yes, I think an amendment to remove the AVPA would be a good thing. I can't subdivide my lot and the other property we own is already built as a duplex so the land use is at its maximum potential (Both places are in the NEF 30 corridor). Permitting additional development will allow more people to live in our community which helps support the businesses and services I love being so close to home. If noise from the airport is an issue maintain the requirements to build to a higher level of sound proofing in the building code but don't block development.
- Yes.
- Yes, I cannot develop land as I would like. Require residential land use.
- Yes. It will allow development of a large parcel of land for multi unit dwellings. High density on my street is a positive move.



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- yes - (also it is calling for removal not amendment). Change of character of neighbourhood. And amendment to allow for development on large parcels of land eg. what happened on old Conforce site (Inglewood Village may be OK.) Increased density of buildings on residential streets NOT OK.

Do you think the proposed amendment to the AVPA will be:


- positive, beneficial or advantageous for your property and/or Inglewood – 5
- negative, unsound or damaging for your property and/or Inglewood – 3

Please explain your reason(s) or concern(s) related to your selection above.

- My neighbourhood will be aloud to grow.
- Why change now? Is it worth changing the community to allow a few projects to proceed? What is the net benefit to existing residents? The proposed change will primarily benefit developers from outside the community.
- See above. Note the AVPA is detrimental to the community because it blocks planning decisions at the local government level. This regulation is solely for the benefit of the airport and the noise from planes is well know an I knew about before we made the decision to move into the community. It is part of the ARP plan and we knew the noise exposure forecast before we came. So people may argue that it needs to be on title but not everything about any properties listed on title. Due diligence is key to living anywhere. The lack of stopping people from historically subdividing has set precedence for removal - it's not fair anymore to keep it.
- I don't believe either extreme is a realistic reconciliation of the numerous conflicting concerns. Noise is a concern and an impact on residential health. Airport is only one factor - letting that industry dictate all development is a form of oligopoly. More sensible would be area specific rules with development allowed with mitigation.
- It will allow for more residential density in the in inner city.
- It is important for the inner city to continue to develop.
- INCREASED DENSITY = MORE PARKING PROBLEMS & NOISY NEIGHBOURS
- Increased density eg. 4 plexes will negatively affect quality of oldest neighbourhood. Increased traffic, lack of parking will again affect quality of neighbourhood and house values. Why is our councillor proposing this??? NOT in favour.

Are there any other options that Council should consider in regards to the proposed amendment?

- No
- 1 CONCERN: CURRENTLY MANY VOICES CLAIM NOISE FROM AIRCRAFT IS LOWER SITING NEW QUIETER: NOT MY EXPERIENCE. LOWER MORE FREQUENT LANDINGS STRAIGHT DOWN 17 ST. MEANS "INGLEWOOD PAUSE" IS NOT HUMOROUS & EVERY 17 MINUTES SOME 'PRIME' LANDING TIMES IS EXTREMELY ANNOYING! WHAT ARE LANDING ALTITUDES & AT WHAT HEIGHT OFF RIVER??



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- THE AVPA REGULATION SHOULD BE CONSISTENT FOR ALL AREAS/AIRCRAFT APPROACHES. NOT JUST A CHANGE FOR INGLEWOOD.
- Remove AVPA - consider keeping build restrictions on sound proofing requirements in place. Similar to the way extra extra requirements exist for houses on the flood fringe and development managed at the city level. Working with the city for planning and development is more practical than lobbying the provincial government to allow me to do more with my home or rental property if I wanted to.
- See above. A full fair & equitable discussion of factors, impacts & mitigation.
- Exempt IE land uses in Inglewood, Alyth, Bonnybrook as they may become multi family residential in the future.
- An amendment to perhaps allow secondary suites may be ok. Increasing building density. NOT OK. Why at this time is this being brought to council by our councillor and why only a portion of Inglewood. Many areas fall under AVPA. Why councillor Carra?

Poster boards – sticky notes and dotmocracy

Do you believe the amendment will affect you or your property in some way? Why/how?

- Removing the AVPA could really affect my neighbourhood if the ARP does not control density appropriately & does not get end run, but is upheld.
- I feel this will affect the character of the neighbourhood. Why is our councillor proposing removal now?
- issues are being confused. AVPA affects only a narrow wedge of the communities - the ARP & neighbourhood density restrictions are separate issues
- Can our City sue the province for trampling our rights to develop our property like our neighbours
- Our neighbourhood is full of character & heritage, some may be lost without a control on development. AVPA needs to work with ARP & overall bylaws. Noise is an issue and people need knowledge around this.
- I LIKE THE OASIS OF REDUCED DENSITY PRESERVED BY THE AVPA
- In order to keep a fair process for input - you need to consult people who don't want to sub-divide or build a secondary suite. Thanks.
- CURRENTLY WHAT ARE LANDING HEIGHT RANGES??

Do you think the proposed amendment to the AVPA will be:

- Positive, beneficial or advantageous for your property and/or Inglewood – 6
- Negative, unsound or damaging for your property and/or Inglewood – 4

Dotmocracy poll:

- I am in favour of the proposed amendment to the AVPA – 6
- I am opposed to the proposed amendment to the AVPA – 9
- I am neutral towards the proposed amendment to the AVPA – 0



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

Are there any other options that Council should consider in regards to the proposed amendment?

- THIS IS NOT A "PROPOSED AMENDMENT" to the AVPA. It abolishes it. Amending the AVPA is another matter.
- We either have to protect the community through the AVPA (modified) or through the new ARP.
- We have to ensure that density in this area is controlled, & that land use is clearly set out.
- Amendment maybe for large blocks of "waste land" eg. Inglewood Village on old Conforce site. Not Removed! Why?
- Heritage homes & character needs to be preserved. Development can't be allowed to bulldoze through. AVPA with ARP could work very well with some change.
- It is NOT just a noise issue: it is about density & character.
- NEF 30 is on the title of houses in the area - but the AVPA needs to be on title as well.
- The AVPA can be removed and the city can maintain the sound proofing requirements. AVPA unnecessarily takes planning out of the hands of the city & community.
- A lot of people against the removal of the AVPA are using the AVPA as a means to unfairly block subdivision and suites. This is unfair to home owners who think more people in our community is a good thing.
- Consistency & transparent in all development needs to happen. AVPA is the only way to have knowledge on land titles. Education on noise & effects must be shared with homeowners. Amendments need to allow secondary suites.


Online Feedback Questionnaire

Do you live or own property in the area that will be affected by the proposed amendment to the AVPA regulation?

- Live but do not own property in the affected area – 0
- Live and own property in the affected area – 19
- Own property but do not live in the affected area – 3
- Do not live or own property in the affected area – 19

Do you believe the amendment will affect you or your property in some way? How/why?

- It is important to have an indication on title that warns owners about noise and land use restrictions. It has to be put in place and not be removed. The Open House was cryptic in asking what public reaction was to "amendment" - the amendment is removal and this may not have been clear to participants.
- I don't want taller buildings in my neighborhood.
- It will increase my property value and also allow old homes to be replaced with modern structures. We need that.
- Absolutely! I am a Realtor and I can assure you that properties in the AVPA are and will be affected if the city decides to apply the AVPA on re-developments and sub-divisions. They have disregarded



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

the AVPA for these purposes until Rey recently but now properties within the area that would have sold quickly are languishing even with reduced pricing.

- Yes, I live in Mayland Heights and think this change shouldn't be specific to Inglewood. Mayland Heights (Crossroads community) is in the AVPA too. Change shouldn't be piecemeal, to the most organized community,, it should be applicable to all within this zone
- It will enhance the value of my property and result in greater density for the City of Calgary where service and a walk or bicycling commute are possible. It is very environmentally friendly, which makes me very happy for myself and my children, allowing greater density to occur in the core rather than encouraging creeping into arable land surrounding Calgary or wildlife areas.
- I live in the AVPA, apparently, so it affects me. There was no warning when I bought the property. I have lived in Inglewood for >10 yrs and I pay attention to what happens in our neighborhood, but I still had no idea this restriction existed. As have others I spoke to.
- No, we have no plans for redevelopment.
- Our house is just a few doors outside the boundary of the AVPA in Inglewood. Aircraft noise, though at lower decibels than a generation ago, is still substantial, especially in warmer months when windows are open. My greater concern, however, is the highly questionable reason that this process was begun in the first place. The ward councilor is highly suspect when he claims he is only an arm's length home-buyer in a project within the boundary: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/carracouncillor-ethics-ward-1.3650158>. If not for questions from community members earlier this year, he would not have been forced away from the issue. If the original request to change the regulation came from a conflict of interest, then the process should be stopped and a proper investigation by the city's ethics commissioner should be launched.
- Will increase value, as will make it more desirable to purchase. Will also make it more affordable by enabling income property.
- The amendment will enhance my property values and spur Inglewood commercial development.
- Our understanding is that with the sudden enforcement of AVPA, secondary suites are no longer being approved in the impacted area. While we have no intention of putting in a secondary suite, it impacts the property value of our home if a future owner wishes to put in a suite.
- Will encourage applications for inappropriate high-density construction projects within Inglewood
- I do not think it appropriate to add more residential in a area highly used by flights overhead and subject them to noise pollution and subsequent health issues unless you have a requirement that all flights take off to the North as they used to before NAV Canada got involved so that now most of Calgary get flights overhead and council is doing nothing to help out affected areas. I am in Britannia and many days it is like living at the end of the runway. It is not appreciated nor wanted so why would you purposely build in an area where you know that there is kind of noise disturbance? I think council should work with the airport to stop flights over the city and stick up for the people on the ground as it is not fun and will only get worse as time goes by. NAV Canada states that flight must take off into the wind but upon further questioning they admit that this is not always true, so get them to use north flight takeoff paths as a priority in as many cases as possible which would be most of the time according to a pilot friend that flies jets.




AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- It will increase the value of my property, (and also tax revenues for the City of Calgary), because it will allow the possibility to double the number of residences along "with parking spaces on my lot" without the need to extend roads, sewers, utilities or add to City of Calgary snow-clearing expense etc.
- There could now be high density development that will have a negative impact on parking and increase traffic congestion.
- I believe it will affect all properties with proximity to AVPA restricted areas as it will hopefully allow for revisions to their policies and make them more consistent with changing technologies for noise pollution, health and safety concerns, as well as evolved decision making capabilities of informed purchasers. many of these restrictions are old or outdated.
- Yes. It limits resale value and prohibits us from making our own decisions about our property. We are also adjacent to areas that could be developed for residential uses which may be preferable to industrial/commercial restrictions.
- Ability to add a secondary suite
- Currently my property is one house on two lots. If I cannot develop the property going forward by building two residences and splitting the lots; my property value decreases.
- I am an architect and have a residential project that will benefit from the amendment being adopted
- No, I do not believe it will affect my property. But perhaps me in the fact that I believe in the redevelopment of the area to support city policy and plans for the future that would be impacted by this. There are key site for redevelopment that are impacted by the AVPA.
- The amendment will put pressure on future governments asking for the relocation of the Calgary International Airport. This will cost billions of dollars to relocate the airport and add to the carbon footprint by having longer commutes for travellers and people the work at the airport. This far outweighs any advantage of increased density by the additional time and energy usage to both build and operate a new airport.
- Removing restrictions will ultimately result in an increased amount of noise complaints from aircraft. The airport is a major infrastructure that is essential to all Calgarians and other travellers. The additional complaints would result in an increased cost to taxpayers to investigate and additional costs associated with frivolous studies to mitigate the issue. We can mitigate the issue now by not allowing increased density in a known flood zone and area of flight paths.
- Yes. It encourages high density in a historical area. The "original" Calgary. Parking in the residential streets is already a problem. The streets have character. They are narrow as are the back alleys. There are already appropriate areas of Inglewood with high density. This amendment will open the gate for inappropriate building in a character neighborhood. There should be no changes to the current AVPA. We have lived here since 1972 and do not want to see the character of our historical community changed.
- "Enough development and increased density already going on in this area becoming just too much!"
- Why do we have to change the existing rules, for Councillor Carra?"
- No



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016


- I believe the amendment will help me maintain my property values and any redevelopment plans for the future.
- I believe the amendment will have a negative affect on our property and our day-to-day lives - added density, increased allowed building height, higher demand for parking, increased traffic
- I believe the amendment will allow non-resident (and some greedy resident) developers to benefit from building oversized and over-dense projects that will negatively affect our quality of life in Inglewood. Three storey buildings have no place on our quiet Inglewood streets.
- Yes. Air travel times and routes are already negatively-impacted by numerous ongoing noise complaints by people who have moved into houses under flight paths. More people will bring more complaints.
- The AVPA currently restricts densification on our property. Removing this regulation will potentially allow the building of multi-family dwellings such as condos and four-plexes.
- Yes. Live in Sunnyside and this would influence inner city development ideas.
- no
- It will give me the ability to develop my property more easily. I am very much in favor of this change.

Do you think the proposed amendment to the AVPA will be:

- Positive, beneficial or advantageous for your property and/or Inglewood – 22
- Negative, unsound or damaging for your property and/or Inglewood – 18

Please explain your reason(s) or concern(s) related to your selection above.

- The removal, which was clearly motivated by personal interests, is inappropriate. The desired result is unbridled density with no consideration of the implications of noise on health.
- "The airport is only getting busier with more air traffic and therefore noise.
- Tall buildings cause detrimental shadowing and infringements on privacy."
- It will be a huge benefit. Otherwise, Inglewood will stagnate.
- It will not restrict subdivision other than current general citywide subdivision guidelines and rules.
- It is very possible that, now or in the future, land values and the environment will make new increased-density residential options nearby or in downtown areas popular or even mandated by government to reduce carbon emissions, (e.g. more people living closer to their workplaces lowering the number of vehicle commuters), and opening options for my property to the benefit of myself, people wishing to live in this area and near downtown, environmentalists and wildlife.
- "From what I understand the interpretation of the rules by the City is messed up. At the very least it needs to be clarified.
- Also, Inglewood is perfect for more development so this AVPA policy seems so... strange.
- Also there is no mechanism in place to warn property purchasers of these restrictions. I should know, I purchased in the zone and had no idea until now (for the record my property is not one that can be subdivided or secondary suited so I have no vested interest in seeing the restrictions removed).




AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- Also how exactly did Pearce Gardens and Inglewood Grove get built? Is new development and is within the AVPA. Confusing.
- Also, impression is that the Airport is being overly protectionist so that they can increase the noise again at a future time."
- I don't want to encourage people redeveloping, ripping out older homes, and building ever larger "McMansions". This is already happening in the neighbourhood -- no need to increase it. However, that being said, I am in favour of allowing secondary suites in the neighbourhood, even in the AVPA area, provided that the homeowner lives in the home.
- It would be highly negative because it was launched under circumstances that city officials and taxpayers would rationally agree is a breach of public trust.
- The people who lived within the AVPA contour in NE Calgary complained that the new runway affected them, in spite of the fact that they KNEW they purchased a home within the NEF contour. You're asking for more noise complaints from these future residents if you move forward with this politically expedient yet poorly thought out plan.
- as per above
- The removal of the restriction will enhance the potential for my property and therefore my financial situation. A growing body of survey research suggests millennials intend to gravitate toward and prefer a higher-density, more walkable residential area than the cul-de-sac communities of their parents. Inglewood is extremely walkable, not only to live in but to walk to work downtown. I can put 2 new homes with parking on my lot and obtain far more financial benefit from a market of everyone who wishes to live in a walkable downtown community. Inglewood itself would benefit from an influx of young people ...likely high-income earners working downtown, spurring local consumer spending at the nearby walking distance shops and, therefore, improved local shop prosperity. Many depressed North American inner cities have slowly deteriorated and been partially abandoned due to a lack of interest to live in their core areas, let's help get ahead of the problem and encourage development by removing the AVPA barrier. By so doing you will facilitate the replacement of land-hungry, unsalvageable bungalows with an increased quantity of affordable, smaller, inner-city density-increasing homes. We should learn from the mistakes of cities who are, today, now fighting to attract people back to their inner locales
- There has been a great deal of intensification in Inglewood despite the AVPA being in place. It seems ridiculous (and even unethical) to start enforcing it now. Given Inglewood's proximity to downtown, it is appropriate for Inglewood to increase its density.
- Inglewood is an historical residential community. Any further high-density buildings will have a negative impact on the integrity of the community.
- noise pollution affecting peoples health and opening it up to more flights over this area and the airports using this area to turn through and over the SW. for out going planes.
- Yes, positive indeed. Inglewood would be able to evolve and grow in a manner benefiting Calgary. Removing all restrictions from Inglewood not only gives Inglewood owners the same rights as other



AVPA Exemption


Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

city property owners, it is environmentally and financially responsible. It is financially responsible because it allows increased population without increased infrastructure. It is environmentally responsible because it would reduce commuting burden/congestion from city roads and vehicular-pollution because many Inglewood residents can walk to work and to other needs, (my spouse and I rarely use our cars); also, inner city development helps mitigate urban sprawl.

- Negative - There could now be high density development that will significantly and irreversibly change the current heritage character of the neighbourhood.
- very positive for maintaining our inner city development opportunities and thus the sustainability of the our city centre.
- I think that the biggest issue here is the community as a whole. The current restrictions limit the ability of the community to have well-integrated mixed uses that cater to a broad demographic spectrum. It limits the ability of the City to increase inner-city density. Without this change, it means that the only developments that could occur are single-family infills which offer very little in terms of a diverse community with affordable housing options. The fact that this is currently hindering the YWCA to move their facilities here is ridiculous...the YWCA would be a wonderful addition to the community and i think the central, yet family-friendly location is ideal for the YWCA. I find it completely baffling that sound barriers for roads are only required to limit sound to less that 65dB, yet the City is limiting residential developments due to occasional 30dB air traffic.
- Inglewood is a vibrant inner city community and development limitations over and above the land-use bylaw seem like an unnecessary hindrance to the ongoing improvement, redevelopment and densification of the community. As a resident living in the NEF 30-35 corridor, I don't feel that plane noise is disruptive. I think it should be the choice of the residents to live/buy/develop property in the flight path rather than an imposed limitation.
- I believe that the community benefits from increasing the density, however there should be caution regarding the balance of density in relationship to the existing community.
- "This is like High River allows MORE residential developments in the flood area.
- You are creating future problems."
- Inglewood and Alyth - Bonnybrook will benefit from increased density and urbanization
- I believe it would allow redevelopment in alignment with city's strategic goals.
- The Inglewood community has been flooded numerous times in the past by both the Bow river and the Elbow river. As we saw in2013 there is little man can do to impede floodwaters. Global climate change will likely result in more frequent and more severe events in the future. Increased density should be focused in areas that are less likely to result in infrastructure loss and emergency management risks.
- Changing the restrictions will result in additional complaints of Chemtrails from doofus artists that will seek out living in an area of sweater shops.
- It opens the gate for one of the most historical areas in Calgary to have it's character changed for ever. It will bring about many problems regarding parking and change the character of the neighborhood.
- See above



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- Increased density is a good thing. Might get a major chain grocery store one day.
- See above comment.
- Overcrowding is a real issue. Not all of Inglewood is affected by the AVPA - let the developers do their business in areas outside the restricted area. Higher density does not make a neighbourhood better in any way.
- "The proposed amendment will definitely have a negative affect. The alderman pushing for the amendment has his own financial interests in mind, and those of his development buddies.
- The AVPA was not put in place on a whim and should not be changed so that they can reap a financial benefit while we get stuck with overcrowding."
- Cramming more people under flight paths will not make anything better.
- If it allows for the preservation of historic homes by allowing secondary suites to be developed, this would be a huge win.
- While most home-owners will probably welcome this proposed change to the regulation because they see \$\$ signs, I believe it could change the current streetscape of single family homes and encourage the tearing down of older houses which would otherwise be renovated and serve to preserve the historic character of the Inglewood neighbourhood. Parking and increased traffic through our neighbourhood also becomes an issue with densification.
- Less restriction on land use is positive.

Are there any other options that Council should consider in regards to the proposed amendment?

- There are ways of making any restrictions equitable for owners without changing the character of the neighborhood. There cannot be any fulsome consultation when only Inglewood, not any of the other affected communities are involved, which simply serves to emphasize the underlying motives of this silly NoM.
- Leave it as it is. It's been just fine for over 100 years.
- As the sound from overhead airplanes have drastically decreased as buildings have become vastly improved when it comes to sound insulation, the AVPA restrictions, other than highrise construction, should be entirely removed.
- This appears to be the last place for me to make a comment even though it isn't the question above. The new building standards for this area requires added sound insulation and triple pane sound deadening windows. Airplanes are becoming quieter every year and older aircraft are continually being retired. The sound is becoming less and less an issue. Perhaps you should place a comment on the titles for properties in the current AVPA so people are aware there has been an issue; however, I live smack dab in the middle of the AVPA and the airplane sound is insignificant and not a bother whatsoever. I will give my own cell phone number for the complaints about aircraft noise and handle the call if it is a bother for whomever is receiving those complaints these days. Please remove the residential development prohibition in the AVPA.
- "Allow all secondary suites and duplex applications. Allow higher developments, and support increased density.




AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

- Its good for businesses, it costs the city less than developing new suburbs, we need more revitalization in and near the core so that more than just restaurants and pubs are open after 5pm. The city core still pretty much closes at 5pm!"
- Parking on-site should be the requirement for any downtown development.
- Perhaps some kind of required notation on land titles or wherever appropriate indicating the property is within the flight path so "buyer beware".
- OK for densification of services along 9th Ave but there are currently sufficient high density housing.
- Don't change anything until you have stopped flights over this area and other areas of the city which the current council tends to not want to approach which could indicate we need a new council that is willing to fight for the people on the ground. I am referring to out going traffic
- No restrictions. Restrictions should be removed completely making the Inglewood property owners' situation equal to other Calgary owners and simplifying municipal administration.
- Ask the Province to make one small adjustment to the AVPA. Allow existing residences to have a secondary suite.
- Certainly they need to consider the input of people who live in these areas and what their 'real life' living experiences have been. It should be used as a barometer for the scientific data that is used when placing or evaluating the restrictions.
- I see no reason why any residential use should be excluded. It has been stated by the very people who implemented the restriction that the intent was not to limit secondary suites. the City's continued effort to limit this and other types of affordable housing is, frankly, disgusting. Allowing councillors to act on the misinformation, ignorance and prejudice that is rampant in community consultation is, at the very least, unprofessional and irresponsible. Let people decided for themselves where they want to live and what they want to do with their own properties. I own a home in the NEF30 zone and recently applied for and built an approved secondary suite. The suite helps us to afford the outrageous cost of inner city housing, helps our younger family members live independently and affordably, keeps the community vibrant and ensures future option for safe and affordable housing. Preventing suites like ours in the future would be damaging to the community.
- The AVPA restrictions should AT LEAST be relaxed for secondary suites. The noise impact on secondary units is no more than the existing primary unit, and in most cases much less as the suites are often in basements.
- At the base of this regulation is the noise level from the planes, which can at times be bad. Increasing or limiting the density will not stop the noise only the number of people affected by it. If you choose to live in the flight path of noise that is your choice. This is a fantastic location to live and the sacrifice is the noise.
- Change the aircraft traffic path.
- Include IE lands in the amendment as they may one day have Land Use changed to allow for residential - as is the case with our project
- limited changes would be good but it is actually the bigger stuff that is more important to align with strategic goals. Perhaps identify key sites to include such as truck stop and storage site along 9th



AVPA Exemption

Report Back: What We Heard

September 22, 2016

AVPA Exemption Report Back: What We Heard, September 22, 2016

and the brewery. What about areas included as part of Main Streets. Instead of complete exemption for the area - identify key areas for redevelopment to include.

- The AVPA area in Inglewood has been mostly a light to heavy industrial area not residential zoning. Areas under aircraft flight paths should not be developed as residential zones due to noise and possible risks associated with airplanes accidents in areas that are close to the ends of the runways. These areas should be parks, roads or light industrial areas. The AVPA should be amended to be more restrictive on residential development.
- Change Inglewood back to an industrial area much like it has always been with Gulf oil refinery, Calgary brewery, Canada Packers, Alyth yards Calgary stock yards etc. The area is slum always has been and always will be.
- We already are zoned for secondary suites. We want to avoid high density building. We are on a flight path therefore the restrictions should be maintained.
- Secondary suites should be strongly considered, but not as stand alone two storey structures such as those presently being constructed in Bridgeland. I feel secondary structures should be considered constructed as mother in law suites or as the multitude of already existing non-conforming suites, such as basement units with their own access.
- No. The restrictions were put in place for legitimate reasons - which have not changed nor gone away.
- Basement secondary suites could be allowed.
- Go in the opposite direction and promote a depopulation of areas under flight paths, especially as this area is also in a flood plain.
- Exemptions should only be made in special circumstances with the approval of the Inglewood Community Association's Redevelopment committee, who work hard to ensure that proposed new developments fit into the ARP guidelines which were written by the community for the community.

Online poll:

- I am in favour of the proposed amendment to the AVPA – 14
- I am opposed to the proposed amendment to the AVPA – 18