



Supplementary What We Heard Report

Guidebook for Great Communities

April 2021 Public Hearing Engagement





Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Table of Contents

- 1 Project overview3
- 2 Engagement overview3
- 3 What we asked.....4
- 4 What we heard6
- 5 Next steps6
- 6 Summary of Input.....7
 - 6.1 Clarity, Predictability and Certainty.....7
 - 6.2 Complete Communities9
 - 6.3 Heritage 11
 - 6.4 Neighbourhood Stability and Character 12
 - 6.5 Engagement..... 14
- 7 Session Workbooks 16



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

1 Project overview

The City of Calgary developed the Guidebook for Great Communities (Guidebook) as a key tool for citizens, stakeholders, and City planners to create Local Area Plans (LAPs). The Guidebook provides common policies and language for how and where growth and development could occur in a community. The goal of the Guidebook is to ensure Calgary remains a great place to live for citizens living here now and people who will move here in the future with, communities that are vibrant and inclusive, with more choices to live, move and gather.

2 Engagement overview

At the March 22 – 24, 2021, Combined meeting of Council, which included a public hearing regarding the Guidebook, Council provided Administration with the following direction:

“Direct Administration to report to the 2021 May 05 Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development committee meeting with a “What We Heard” report based on the Guidebook for Great Communities Public Hearing 2021 March 22-24 and proposed recommended amendments to the Guidebook for Council consideration, engaging with stakeholders as needed, with public participation at the committee meeting.”

The What We Heard report for the submissions and speakers from the public hearing was completed by an independent consultant and is included as Attachment 5. In addition, Administration also compiled the themes that were presented at the public hearing that helped guide our engagement.

To follow Council’s direction of “engaging with stakeholders as needed,” Administration hosted a series of workshops to better understand the feedback received at the public hearing from those who presented and submitted written comments. Administration hosted workshops at the following dates and times:

- Wednesday April 14, 2021, 6:00 – 9:00 PM: public hearing participants
- Thursday April 15, 2021, 11:00 AM – 1:30 PM: industry representatives
- Thursday April 15, 2021, 6:00 – 9:00 PM: public hearing participants
- Friday April 16, 2021, 11:00 AM – 2:00 PM: public hearing participants
- Monday April 19, 2021, 11:00 AM – 2:00 PM: Guidebook/local area plan (LAP) Multi-Stakeholder Working Group
- Tuesday April 20, 2021, 12:00 – 2:30 PM: community leaders
- Tuesday April 20, 2021, 6:00 – 9:00 PM: public hearing participants

Due to limitations related to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP Act), Administration was unable to directly contact public hearing participants using the information they submitted to City Clerks in support of presenting at the public hearing. As a result, Administration sent workshop invitations to as many participants as possible using publicly available contact information for



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

individuals and groups who presented or submitted letters, including community associations. Recipients were asked to forward the invitation to anyone who they knew presented at the public hearing but may not have received a workshop invitation. Members of the multi-stakeholder working group and industry were contacted directly, as they had previously consented to being contacted for further engagement related to the Guidebook.

The invitations included a link to a registration page for all public hearing workshops. Participation was limited to 32 stakeholders per workshop to allow for discussion group sizes that ensured all participants were able to speak. Prior to the workshops, stakeholders were sent a pre-reading package that included a preliminary overview of the themes and suggested changes or amendments presented during the public hearing, as well as a copy of the workbook used to guide the discussions during the workshops.

For all sessions, a presentation was given to all participants regarding the workshop scope, purpose and process, and then participants were divided into smaller discussion groups for the rest of the workshop.

The session with community leaders on April 20, 2021, was with a group of citizens who also participated in the public hearing participant workshops and wanted to provide additional feedback on specific aspects of the Guidebook that fell within the broader themes discussed at other workshops.

3 What we asked

The discussion during the workshops was divided into two key areas:

- **What you think:** using the preliminary set of What We Heard themes that Administration compiled during the public hearing, stakeholders were asked to verify our understanding of their thoughts and concerns, to provide clarification or further detail on those concerns, and identify any key issues that they would like added to our list of themes.
- **What you want to change:** higher-level themes of the proposed changes to the Guidebook raised by presenters during the public hearing (i.e. the goals or intended outcomes of those changes) were discussed to understand more clearly what exactly stakeholders want to change in the document.

Feedback was categorized into five key themes:

Key Theme	Public Hearing Comments	Potential Actions (amendments/changes suggested by participants)
1. Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook • Policies are unclear or vague • Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document? • Set foundation for predictable planning system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document • Replace “should” statements with “must” or “shall”



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Key Theme	Public Hearing Comments	Potential Actions (amendments/changes suggested by participants)
2. Complete Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities Representation in the process Infrastructure, services and amenities Mobility choice Metrics and growth targets Climate action and sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future sustainment work for climate change targets Include references to climate change throughout the entire document Set urban forestry targets Identify growth targets in local area plans Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres Add land acknowledgment to the Guidebook
3. Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect our heritage buildings Protect our heritage streetscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas) Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will', instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may') Make Development Permit applications for all identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating
4. Neighbourhood Stability and Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize importance of single-detached home areas Need certainty on housing forms Land Use Bylaw rules – height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc. Restrictive covenants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms Eliminate zones A and B 2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets and Activity Centres Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Key Theme	Public Hearing Comments	Potential Actions (amendments/changes suggested by participants)
5. Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around engagement process Local area plan engagement was successful Accessible engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations The Guidebook should be an election issue

During the discussion of public hearing comments, we asked:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentation and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments, or provide additional comments?

During the discussion of proposed actions, we asked:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

4 What we heard

For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.

To read the notes from the workshops, please see the [Session Workbooks](#) section.

5 Next steps

Feedback provided during these workshops was considered by Administration in order to create proposed amendments for the Guidebook, to be presented at the May 5, 2021, meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

6 Summary of Input

The tables in this section provide an overview of the key themes captured during the April 2021 workshops.

Acronyms used in the table:

- CTP: Calgary Transportation Plan
- DAG: Developed Areas Guidebook
- EAGCS: Established Areas Growth and Change Strategy
- MDP: Municipal Development Plan
- LAP: Local Area Plan
- LUB: Land Use Bylaw 1P2007
- R-C1: Residential – Contextual One Dwelling District
- R-C2: Residential – Contextual One/Two Dwelling District
- R-CG: Residential – Grade-Oriented Infill District
- TOD: Transit Oriented Development
- UFC: Urban Form Category

6.1 Clarity, Predictability and Certainty

Comments from the public hearing	
Theme	Description
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants found the language in the Guidebook to be unclear, and suggested defining terms, providing more examples and using better visual representations. Participants also noted that this unclear language exacerbated a lack of trust in the document and The City. • Participants felt there was either an unclear link or conflict of direction between the Guidebook and other City planning policy, including the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Developed Areas Guidebook (DAG), Land Use Bylaw (LUB), Calgary Transportation Plan (CTP) and the Established Areas Growth and Change Strategy (EAGCS). • Participants had questions about the link between the Guidebook and local area plans (LAPs), including which supersedes the other and how they relate, as well as general questions about the LAP process and how communities across the city had been grouped into LAP areas. Some participants felt that the policies of the Guidebook were not reflected in the pilot LAPs, and that the Guidebook and LAP process limited community input. • Participants questioned whether the Guidebook was necessary, especially regarding the need for density in communities and the financial justification for the policy shift. Some participants questioned the name of the Guidebook and felt that this was disingenuous as the document would act as more than a guide. • Participants had questions about how the Guidebook would be applied, including what changes it seeks to make, the lifespan of the document,



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

	<p>whether it will apply to newer communities, and whether it will result in blanket density across the city.</p>
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants wanted further clarity or definitions of certain aspects of the Guidebook including the neighbourhood connector urban form category (UFC), low density and neighbourhood stability. Participants felt that certain aspects of the Guidebook were too prescriptive and required the discretion to accommodate community needs, while other aspects of the Guidebook did not provide enough certainty. Some participants suggested separating the storytelling aspects of the Guidebook from the technical aspects of the document.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants had questions about the distinction between a statutory and non-statutory document, including how it would impact LAPs, the implications to the land use process and whether changing the document to be non-statutory would trigger an additional public hearing. Participants tended to be more in favour of the outcome that would allow for greater flexibility to a specific neighbourhood's character in the LAP process and give communities a better ability to oppose unwanted development in their community.
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants felt that LAPs did not provide a predictable foundation for community planning and were particularly concerned with the way communities were grouped together and the potential for the Guidebook and LAPs to allow for more redevelopment. Participants also felt that LAPs would not lead to additional stability if developers could continue to apply for 'spot rezoning.' Some participants indicated they were happy with their existing community plans and were worried that the positive aspects and community-level nuance of those plans would be lost in the move to multi-community LAPs. Participants felt these smaller plans helped to maintain variety between neighbourhoods. Some participants indicated support for LAPs and the LAP process.
Potential actions	
Potential Action	Description
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were generally more in favour of passing the document by Council resolution than passing the Guidebook as a statutory document.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants felt that "must" or "shall" policies could negatively limit flexibility in the Guidebook if applied across the document, and that each policy should be evaluated for its context before deciding whether policy should be written as 'shall' or 'should'. Some participants felt that words such as "should" should be defined in the Guidebook for added clarity.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

6.2 Complete Communities

Comments from the public hearing	
Theme	Description
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants indicated that not all communities are the same, and that not all types of development work in every community, or across every community. Some participants felt that increased density should first be prioritized for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas. Others felt that a distribution of density would lead to greater equity across communities. Some participants indicated that increasing density in communities would not necessarily mean increased affordability of housing. Participants wanted more clarity on the definition of “diversity,” both within communities and between communities. Some participants were also interested in defining “equity.” Some participants felt that having different housing types is important, and that excluding different housing types could be considered prejudicial.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants took issue with allegations at and surrounding the public hearing that opposition to the Guidebook was a form of racism. In addition, some participants felt that race should not be a part of discussions on planning topics. Some participants felt that feedback received at the public hearing carried too much weight, compared to the feedback provided during previous Guidebook engagement. Some participants felt that the public hearing process was not accessible. Some participants felt that developers were over-represented in the process.
Infrastructure, services and amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants indicated that better coordination with school boards was necessary, and that schools were a key part of neighbourhood planning. Some participants indicated that schools should not be a key component of local area planning. Participants reiterated the need to define the neighbourhood connector urban form category including specific metrics to be used. Some participants were interested in cost-effective solutions, both for capital and operating costs, for infrastructure and services. Some participants expressed concern regarding the ability of existing infrastructure to accommodate increased density and felt that doing so would be easier at nodes and along corridors.
Mobility choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants indicated that it was time to start prioritizing modes of transportation other than cars, including transit, walking and wheeling. Some participants indicated Calgary was still a car-focussed city. Some participants indicated there was a need for greater attention to accessibility, both in infrastructure and housing options.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted more information regarding the analysis undertaken to inform the Guidebook’s vision for growth. Participants were interested in how the Guidebook aligned with the targets set out in the MDP, why the



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

	<p>neighbourhood connector UFC was applied to specific corridors, and what density targets had been set in support of the Guidebook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants felt that density targets should be set on a community-by-community basis in order to give great flexibility and recognition of community character.
Climate action and sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were interested in protecting greenspace, both in the interest of maintaining urban canopy and limiting runoff. Some participants expressed concern that doing so could be costly. Some participants felt that the Guidebook was not the appropriate place for climate policy, either generally or in the interest of not creating duplication with other City policy.
Potential actions	
Potential Action	Description
Identify growth targets in LAPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders were generally in favour of identifying growth targets in LAPs, provided they were identified on a community-by-community basis and sensitive to the context of those communities. Some stakeholders wanted to see metrics to justify any increased density or growth targets.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders were interested in clearer targets for climate change, and incentives for reusing or improving the efficiency of older buildings.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on this topic is reflected under the theme “Climate action and sustainability” above.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants expressed support for protection of private and public trees, with some expressing a preference for focussing on public trees. Some participants wanted more detail on what these targets would be. Some participants were interested in maintaining or increasing greenspace as density increased, highlighting the impacts of increased massing on the loss of greenspace. Some participants did not agree with placing limitations or protections on private trees, with some favouring incentives instead.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders generally did not support this suggestion action. Those who did support it, cited accessibility and the advantage of vehicle-oriented uses during the COVID pandemic as reasons for their support.
Add land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants felt adding a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook made sense. Some participants felt a land acknowledgement and pre-colonial history did not belong in planning documents.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

6.3 Heritage

Comments from the public hearing	
Theme	Description
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were interested in increasing preservation of heritage homes and wanted to see tools such as public funded incentives to achieve this. Some participants indicated that prioritizing and promoting heritage preservation can expose others to greater change and could be used as a means of preventing neighbourhood change or supporting gentrification. Some participants felt that the Guidebook still lacked the tools to support preservation of heritage homes. Some participants wanted more clarity or to expand the definition of heritage, indicating that age isn't the only aspect that defines heritage. Participants provided the example of mid-century homes, which do not meet the current definition of heritage, but reflect a distinct heritage. Some participants wanted greater community input into identifying heritage properties. Some participants wanted more clarity around how heritage would be applied within LAPs.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants indicated that streetscapes are important in defining an area's heritage and character, and that not allowing drastic changes in massing was important in maintaining this. Participants were interested in defining broader heritage areas rather than identifying heritage parcel-by-parcel or by block face.
Potential actions	
Potential Action	Description
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants indicated that the items covered in this proposed action were very important to defining the character of a heritage areas and wanted ways to ensure new development was sensitive to the surrounding context, especially for properties adjacent to heritage homes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were generally in favour of this.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were generally in favour of this. Some stakeholders wanted this done through tools such as incentives as opposed to extending protections.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

<i>Evaluated Historical Resources</i>	
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will', instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may')	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants expressed support for reuse of heritage buildings. • Some participants wanted better supports for conservation and indicated that stronger language should be coupled with incentives for owners. • Some participants wanted clear outcomes and metrics defined regarding conservation and repurposing.
Make Development Permit applications for all identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were generally in favour of this, with some suggesting that these applications be circulated to the full community, not just the CA.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants expressed support for protection of trees as an important part of heritage and wanted tools and incentives to protect private and public trees during redevelopment. • Participants stressed the importance of canopy, not just the number of trees.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were generally in favour of this.

6.4 Neighbourhood Stability and Character

Comments from the public hearing	
Theme	Description
Recognize importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants indicated that there was a need for more granularity in the definition of low-density housing in the Guidebook. • Participants were in favour of protecting single-family homes, including across whole areas. • Participants indicated that people want to live in single-family homes, especially since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants indicated these homes were important to communities, and that communities of single-family homes were important to the city. • Some participants indicated that this protection should extend to RC-2 homes as well. • Some participants felt that allowing full communities of only single-family homes was not a fair or equitable approach to densification, and primarily favoured the wealthy.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted development to be sensitive to the surrounding context and wanted community-specific plans for placement of housing types. Participants wanted communities to identify where different types of development and density would be appropriate. Some participants thought density should go first to communities who express an interest or need. Participants were generally not in favour of zones A and B, indicating that they did not provide enough detail regarding the communities covered in the zones, and that density should be applied across the entire city.
Land Use Bylaw rules – height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were interested in more tools to ensure redevelopment respected the surrounding context, including height, setbacks, lot coverage and greenspace.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted restrictive covenants respected in both the Guidebook and LAPs, indicating that they did not currently trust either The City or developers to do so. Some participants felt that restrictive covenants had drawbacks, including that they are difficult to remove and can restrict redevelopment.
Potential actions	
Potential Action	Description
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted the ability to outline single-family and R-C2 home areas in LAPs. Some participants did not agree with this approach or questioned why it was necessary.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were generally in favour of this and wanted to process to be community-led. Participants wanted the ability to apply the neighbourhood connector UFC block by block in LAPs to ensure development is sensitive to the surrounding context.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders were generally in favour of this. Participants who wanted to keep zones A and B indicated that the boundaries should be revisited.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from participants was mixed for this action. Some felt it should be long (e.g. 5 to 10 years), while others were opposed or confused regarding the purpose of the moratorium.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were generally in favour of this.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

6.5 Engagement

Comments from the public hearing	
Theme	Description
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants indicated they needed more time for engagement on the Guidebook generally, and specifically more time to review the amendments to be proposed by Administration at the May 5, 2021, meeting of PUD. Participants indicated that more, and more diverse communications and education was required regarding the Guidebook in order to create better awareness and understanding. Participants felt that not enough people and not enough communities had been consulted regarding the Guidebook, and that many people were unaware of the document prior to the public hearing or continue to be unaware. Participants indicated this needed to extend beyond CAs to all members of communities. Participants felt that engagement on the Guidebook and LAPs put an undue burden on CA representatives, and that they were left trying to represent and answer questions for community members without enough information. Participants indicated that expectations of CA involvement in City engagement are too high given that CA board members are volunteers. Participants felt that engagement on the Guidebook was poorly done, and that the large public outcry against the Guidebook would not have happened if The City had done a better job of engagement. Some participants felt that engagement on the Guidebook was leading to pre-determined outcomes. Some participants felt that CAs were not representative of their broader community. Some participants suggested using existing tools such as property tax mailers to raise awareness of the Guidebook. Some stakeholders felt that City engagement processes favoured developers.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants took issue with Guidebook and local area plans, especially the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan, happening in parallel. Participants would have preferred Guidebook to be approved prior to starting LAP processes. Participants did not agree with or did not understand the grouping of neighbourhoods in LAPs, indicating that the groupings of disparate communities did not make sense, that the plan areas were too large, and that communities should have a say in the boundaries of LAP areas. Some participants felt that the LAP engagement process what not good, and that not enough people in their communities were informed or involved. Some felt that they or their communities more broadly were not heard in the process. With the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan, participants felt the name was ambiguous and led to less interest and smaller turnout for engagement. Participants indicated that broader engagement was required beyond just the LAP working groups.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants indicated that the LAP process should respect individual community character, with some expressing a preference for single community plans. Some participants were pleased with their experience of LAP engagement, and felt the process was empowering for communities. Some participants indicated that more, broader communications and education is required for LAPs in order to build awareness. Some participants took issue with stakeholders from outside their community having a say on where density is appropriate within their community. Some stakeholders wanted more discussion regarding the location of the neighbourhood connector UFC within communities. Some stakeholders had questions about the LAP working group selection process, indicating that it felt exclusive.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants raised issues with the public hearing process, including that it is inaccessible for shift workers or Calgarians with language barriers. In addition, some participants felt that letters submitted for the public hearing were not given equal weight, even though not everyone could sit through a three-day public hearing. Some participants indicated that The City should look at who is in the room during engagement and try to address the gaps by reaching out more broadly to communities and organizations who serve those communities. Some participants felt that clear language was an important part of accessible engagement.
Potential actions	
Potential Action	Description
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were generally in favour of this, indicating they wanted to see these plans based on sound principles of engagement.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were in favour of this action, indicating that it was necessary to improve the Guidebook and build trust with Calgarians. Participants wanted to see broader engagement, both in terms of reach and engagement opportunities provided. Participants felt that more education was required for Calgarians to fully understand the Guidebook and its implications.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant feedback was mixed on whether the Guidebook should be an election issue. Some liked the idea, especially given the number of councillors not seeking re-election. Others felt that making the Guidebook an election issue would risk the good work already put into the Guidebook, and that successful engagement on the Guidebook may take more time than is available prior to the election. In addition, some stakeholders felt that the discussion surrounding the Guidebook would suffer from the political polarization that comes with election issues.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

7 Session Workbooks

Wednesday, April 14, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 1

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

APRIL 14 - EVENING SESSION - GROUP 1

Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes. however some communities are happy with their plans. They are ok and do not feel old or aged. Hope that the LAP process take the best of those plans and retain them. There are so many good stuff in there, lots of hours spent, lots of ideas. Concern about the ideas that could get lost. Because it is outdated it doesn't mean it is not good.

If planning has done a quantitative analysis to know how many units are required over the next number of years. This date would make it easier for people to understand the need for density.

The multicomunities LAP is a great move as small communities could feel density pressure. Multi-communities LAP give more opportunity for densification where it is best suited.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

GB would allow for more creativity if non statutory. LAP should be statutory.

Impress with knowledge from staff. Statutory vs non-statutory is confusing. Feels confused so i thin is better to just listen today. Feel like we were not consulted and feel like we did not have the opportunity to provide input in this document (GB). We should've had this conversations before. Thought GB was simple to understand, but it wasn't. Should not be law (or statutory).

LAP are the key documents, they should be statutory. GB could be statutory but more linked to the LAP. should depend more on the LAP for details (as determined through the LAP process in the GB.)

Non-statutory easier to amend and adapt overtime. For example Infill Guidelines. give more flexibility. easier to keep it up to date and gives more flexibility when reviewing DPs. Statutory is cast in stone./ must adhere. Non-statutory allows for the DP to adapt and look more at the content.

Need clarity of language in the GB. less acronyms

SHALL/MUST - SHOULD
what do they mean? shall/must more powerful
must be used selectively in the document to allow for flexibility.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

The most important amenities are parks and open spaces. This is very obvious now with Covid. Concern: density increase should not be at the expenses of loosing green space. when talking about access to services and amenities, it mainly relates to parks, pathways, and open space. Let's not loose the idea that parks are amenities.

Varsity is very diverse for example and diversity/intensity needs to be placed in a sensitive way.

Calgary is diverse and inclusive community. No need for all the areas to be the same. People choose to put their money in the type of homes they want and others to choose to spend their \$ in other things. People need assurance that their investment is protected. No need to have the same everywhere.

Agree. there is value in different type of housing. Understanding mixed housing meaning is important. does not work well if different housing are in the same area... if mixed in separate sections its ok.
difficult to understand the planning of the city from this perspective.

Inner City is expensive. Areas with more amenities are more expensive. how to re-write neighbourhoods? there are all sort of reason for people to live in an area, not just having choices, affordability is huge. Would like more explanation on what diversity mean.

Let's clarify: This is information directly from the public hearing (H).

There is a lot of comments from different communities. we need to understand that there are neighbourhoods that are more expensive than others. Perhaps step back from this ideas that all communities need to be the same. how to understand one GB for all communities that are different.

Making all neighbourhood affordable feels to be impossible. There are communitites that are expensive no matter what gets built.

Diverse - value of different type of housing close together. Varsity is an example of housing diversity and land uses mix (Residential, parks, schools, commercial, etc) Need to be careful where you put those mixed-uses, etc. The wording of the GB is important.

One designation should/may not apply to the whole road, for example. if the whole street is classified as a connector, the character of the area will be lost. Was not able to see the link between race/socio economics and how it would apply. Areas with certain type of housing need to be identified. for example 8 units in the midle of low density housing would be difficult to accept.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

No concerns on diversity/inclusive however it needs to be clearly state where its more appropriate.

Climate Change and Sustainability
not quiet sure what this policies entitle. what is the intention? the GB overlaps with climate change strategy - perhaps related more to land uses, transit, travel modes. We heard more should be done, how? I dont know. These climate considerations may be more appropriate via land use bylaw/guidelines/strategies. Guidebook helps but there are details that are out of scope.

The GB should not get into details related to climate change. we have federal laws and building code that address climate change.
hard to imagine a planning document affecting climate change other than vehicle movement and modes of transportation. need to see where those fit best for example: RCG talks about lot coverage which relates to climate change. The more hard landscaping the more stormwater run-offs. trees improve quality of life. if removed, it has negative impacts and it affects climate change. Protect Trees!

The GB mentions that ability to waived parking to encourage transit, yet there is a problem with parking. for example an appartment building and no parking, could be a problem.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

not sure how easy is to clarify what the climate targets are. perhaps be more general statements related to trees canopies, etc.

ensure single-detached area are protected. density need to be sensitive to the context and surrounded land uses.
Let's talk about the expansion of the urban forestry guidelines as they add quality of life to the communities. Now trees can be cut and them smaller trees are planted and sometimes they die.
RCG lot coverage reduces area for trees
Urban forestry need to be more detailed.

vehicle oriented, yes.

Attached garages are important however the issues it causes are understood. many people, especially those with mobility issues, are not able to use transit or bikes and vehicle is the one mode of travel so its important to recognize the importance of cars.

Do not agree with no-parking approach.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Old community flooded and many heritage homes went.

Heritage to us is more related to the protection of the tree canopy. these are issues that the communities should have a say and more control over, communities should get what they want. specially in areas vulnerable to flooding.

It is nice that the city help preserve heritage assessts in a community. The selection should be neighbourhood driven, not City driven.

We are only 03 speakers here vs more than 700 residents - from one community. feel like its not a good representation of all the community, nor we are representing anyone. We just happen to have the time to sit for 3 days during the public hearing. City should come to us to listen and talk to us. I am not a voice from my community.

Not enough time, not enough people.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

support heritage preservation



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Single Detached
Protect not only single detached but duplexes. Communities have concerns about preserving the character of the community. Think about both R-C1 and R-C2 neighbourhoods.

Is key that single family housing is kept as it is the predominant family housing, it is a Canadian thing. we like people but also love our own space. People like space that comes with single family homes. It is a key part of who we are. Should not erode that.

Single-detached homes or single-detached areas? most comments relate to areas no to individual units. We live near and are surrounded by high density areas. My understanding of the GB is that every community needs to accept densification, which is not a good idea. People should have a voice and be able to stay in single family areas not eroded by high density.

The GB approach to low scale is not broken down enough, and does not give certainty. for example, Connector Streets is a problem if a long road is entirely zoned. concerns about tall structures next to single family home. Wording in the GB could be changed to talk about portions or / areas. GB needs to identify areas of a community that is characterize by large lots, green area, open spaces which is where high density would be appropriate.

Fourplex if they are able to be built any where, people would leave the city.

There needs to be mechanism to protect low density areas and clearly identify where density is appropriate. The GB is silent about protecting communities. Higher density next to single family homes impact property taxes.

Again it is about areas not about individual houses that needs to be protected.

restricted covenants - the City needs to warn applicants and others about them. feels like they can't be policed. depending on the community it can be useless or unbreakable. sometimes development can be stopped using covenants.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Eliminating zones A and B. was not clear where in the GB is.

Unclear how many units would be needed in the next 50 years to meet MDP targets. Is there an analysis available? assuming they are split through out the four quadrant of the city. do we know where there is development pressure and areas that are suited for high density?

Comment by Heloisa: Targets were set by the MDP not the guidebook. Analysis to support where is the low hanging fruit. when a LAP is developed we have the TAC people from different backgrounds who work together with stakeholders. there is various analysis that take place.

Quantitated data could clarify the need for density. Is it about capacity? Is it about there is no enough room in certain areas? why adding density in single family neighbourhood?

The GB is silent on density targets. It seems that density is to increase equally across the city. if density is spread out, feels like density is taken away from main streets, LRT stations, activity centres, etc. density is better in targeted areas.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

The set up, the willingness to engage is great however more people should be involved. Frustrated for not being able to meet in person and discuss (but due to Covid is difficult), in-person is easier to managed and easier to get to more people. Did not find residents to be involve or inform on this. the City needs to go around communities and discuss the GB. It is very important to do that. however recognize that it is difficult to do with this limited timeline.

The problem has been mentioned overtime. City should notify all Calgarians. mostly the Calgarians that know this, is because they go to the City website on a regular bases. Feels like there is opportunities to improve the out reach to communities

is GB more important than the LAP? would all the LAP have to agree with ideas on the GB? neighbourhoods should be the first place to find information related to where density should go. Feels like process is backwards. Engagement feels that nothing I say would make a different. We need to go back a step, perhaps wait until I covid ends so we can meet in person.

it is difficult during covid. shoul've stoped during covid.

The name of Guidebook is confusing. Though it was a guide. Need to be more clear, perhaps the name is misleading. Q&A was too general and neglected the real impact for example the GB would allow for higher densities next to single family areas. Use clear, simple terms for everyone to understand. People dislike the process. We look for open and honest discussion. partial true does not do it. full discloasure is appreciated and valued.

Its hard but need to use easy language for anyone to understand and help with a clear idea about the impacts. Caution - we need to use clear language. Concern about the LAP process. my community (West Elbow) is to start soon. heard from NH that they were not listed to and their concerns were not addresssed. For example Renfrew and the connector street. GB should outline guidance for engagement proceses for LAPs because that is a really important piece. because it is in the LAP that details are discussed and LAPs are where people can share their local knowledge.

yes, this should be an election issue!

Mail outs, face-to-face, what else would be appropriate? please tell us. Use utility bills to get the information out. everyone reads it. a little update with a link would be ideal.

City should come to us - we need to sit down with a map and start the conversation. There has been a lot of efforts but lots of people did not know. We need more engagement. come, sit down and let's talk.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Need to be more micro when it comes to engagement. A more personal/community approach is needed.

LAP has to follow the GB. why would communities need to densify if we dont want to?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Random comments:

Quantitated analysis
has there been an analysis about cost of density? how much does it cost to demolish a unit, for example. Cost of lot is high, depending on the community. would be useful to know what this mean.

if there is no data, the planning exercise may hit a brick wall for economics. For example undergorund parking cost to build. need to look at this data as it will help to identify where affordable housing can be included. lands value varies between communities.

We need to understand what affordable means?, what is the reality for each LAP?. In the Heritage LAP there could b opportunities along MacLeod Trail. let's look where affordable housing can be placed base on economics of each community/area.

Mision road
we do not know what happened to great ideas that have been completed before? sometimes plans come and then disappear.

Industrial lands could be densified. Industrial areas could be areas where fantastic communities could be built. I will support this!



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- One session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
- Includes public participation
- Council session date & format TBD - June or July



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wednesday, April 14, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 2

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Wasn't clear that the GB is intended to go hand in hand with MDP. It is important that there is a duty to consult. There should not be a one-size fits all approach. Focus on what needs to be done. This will help manage resources better and prevent negative impacts to communities. Offering choice shouldn't take away choice from others. The relationship between the MDP and Guidebook should be clearer; people think of their ARP as the community plan. If the Guidebook becomes statutory it may make it difficult to implement community/context specific policies. A illustrated hierarchy would be helpful for explaining relationship between city documents. Further to the relationship between the Guidebook and LAP: the rules need to be able to be broken out into small enough pieces for the LAP truly to have choices, not just one neighborhood family typology. If the Guidebook was a collaborative educational planning book it may have resulted in more community involvement. Further clarification of use vs. form. The statutory nature of the document may make it difficult for community to influence and appeal developments. Development intensity should be focused to opportunity areas such as University District. People want more breathing space to understand and engage, what is the hurry?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Adopt the guidebook by resolution - agree.
Should, could, recommend or support because there are so many different situations. Must or shall removes flexibility.
Respect for existing agreements and covenants. It would provide certainty and comfort that existing interests will be respected.
Should v. shall depends entirely upon the contents of the point made.
Stronger language (shall) for heritage. If no, it provides an opportunity for developers to destroy heritage.
Make it very clear only when this local area plan is established.
I would go even further than allowing LAPs to choose which policies it wants to use from the Guidebook. Each community should be allowed to choose as well, or the special character of each community cannot be set out and the LAP will become homogeneous.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

I would go even further than allowing LAPs to choose which policies it wants to use from the eGuidebook. Each community should be allowed to choose as well, or the special character of each community cannot be set out and the LAP will become homogeneous.

Having a complete community isn't always practical for every community, you can't just force it on existing communities. It may not produce the desired results.

Existing established communities provide choice.

I would say that, if each community has access to some retail, residents would be able to purchase winter clothing to assist them with Calgary's winters - and less need for cars!

The Guidebook needs to be careful about encouraging evolutionary change. Change in most cities is evolutionary.

Yet to see how housing choice and diversity will result in improved affordability. Sustainable housing leads to affordability.

The ways to make housing more affordable is government intervention, not additional housing.

Translate the MDP target populations into numbers and apply them by quadrant or community. It would result in better discussions with communities and surgical implementation.

Calgary is one of the few cities in Canada that does not tend to have large ethnic pockets in specific communities; ethnicities tend to spread all across the city. We are not a place where if you give your address, everyone knows what your ethnic background is. As such, the market creates its own diversity.

I agree with Terry and Phil re affordable housing. Heritage buildings - ie buildings that are long bought and paid for, can and often do, provide affordable housing. The demolition of heritage homes and building erodes residential affordability, particularly in the inner city.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

One of the reasons that people might have been loathe to speak at the hearing is the shockingly bad behavior that has been allowed to go on vis a vis bullying by councillors. It gets really old and is perceived to hurt one's position if one is vilified when speaking. The Zone A and B areas in the guidebook stratify the City and lead to the insularity of landuse that appears to be most concerning to residents.

Lets not look at the infrastructure costs but can we afford the operating costs - that is the economics we should be looking at and it influences affordability.

Climate is important, but I'm cautious of the diminishing returns of spending too much on climate. There are other ways to address climate change.

Inglewood has always been cited as an area that "everyone" wants to move to - this is clearly not possible without building highrises everywhere, which in turn destroys quality of life. No one has a "right" to live anywhere we must not have an obligation to accommodate.

The guidebook seems quite idealistic in regards to main streets and commerical/retail. Retail is going though an unprecedented contraction, not just because of the pandemic but the shift to online purchasing. This is not reflected in the guidebook. One comment I heard was there are only so many coffee shops and spin studios one community can support.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

"the greenest building is the one already built" Recycle old buildings! (comment applies to climate section as well).
Pleased how heritage is represented in the Guidebook.
Concerns that the tools that the heritage planning team is working on will not be funded in the future; with the change to council.
It would be great if the tools and designations were actually effective.
Every heritage resource is threatened without greater protection.
Be more specific about the re-use of materials for all buildings.
I fail to see where pre-colonial history fits into this area of heritage - it muddies the waters and disparate goals.
Heritage density bonusing should mean the use of all data available including the Coriolis study of Inglewood which has been subverted.
Community heritage is just as important as a site.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

It is incredibly important to note that heritage is not just the building, but the massing how a building relates to the street and therefore setbacks and coverage are paramount. Heritage planning is difficult. To take steps to protect someones property it results in an economic loss. It requires the city or the province to put up money to protect heritage assets. Policies won't have an impact without money. It will be difficult to have the perfect answer in the guidebook. There has been a lot of push back by the city against protecting private trees. It has been achieved in many other cities: just do it. In our community, there tends to be a disregard for mature vegetation when properties are being redeveloped. In our comments back to planning, we always ask why these trees need to be removed. Part of sustainable development is to protect these assets. There are tools that have been effective in other parts of the world that are not a cash transfer such as tax deferral or density bonusing. We heard at council that keeping the single detached areas is important and that can contribute to heritage preservation. Community heritage needs to be acknowledged. How can we recognize heritage areas that are newer? Time always shifts, heritage is not always something that is old. Dates are not used in other cities. How do we recognize recent history/heritage? Statement of significance? It is also easy to undervalue "workers' cottages" which are culturally and historically important to many communities. Not only does that value exist but these smaller homes are valued by current owners - not everyone needs to live in 3000 sq. ft. homes. How do we maintain a community's look and feel even when it is not heritage? Heritage and context are synonymous.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Most of the Zone A communities are heritage heavy, so this offsets the need to over densify them. Nix the zones.
The stratification of the city into different zones creates uncertainty. It's not fair not knowing what someone can build next to me. You do know in suburban areas. It can destabilize the inner city neighbourhoods.
The cost of land alone doesn't facilitate affordable housing. It requires a push from governments. Relying on developers is idealistic. Guidebook alone cannot do that.
Duty to consult community associations and residents of each community before approval and implementation. The duty to consult shall carry the meaning defined by the Supreme Court of Canada. It would be a good idea to poach from the Infill Guidelines to capture some of the LUB rules - it has proven to be very clear and effective until now.
Respect and acknowledgement by the Guidebook and consequently by any Local Area Plan (LAP) of historical and legal agreements that exist in each community (i.e., such agreements as restrictive covenants). No one wants to drive wedges amongst community members and themselves, or with developers or even with the City administration.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

How can density contribute in a positive way while maintain the existing community character? This question is part of the process. Being proactive and thinking about how someone would want their community to improve.

Much of the push back is the concern of losing single family areas and these areas are a key housing option and people want to live in single detached homes in the inner city.

Why only a two year moratorium on rezoning? Is this to give time to get used to the Guidebook? An opportunity to revisit a moratorium should be as open as this is allowed to go. Otherwise, developers will just wait it out.

Should delineate where restrictive covenants can and cannot be used. The city should acknowledge the covenants and respect them. Restrictive covenants are existing agreements and when taking into consideration provide certainty in the process.

Single detached areas near downtown provides choice and important for diversity.

Neighbourhood connector should be applied block by block. Careful to how we define these areas. Important to also consider the transition with properties behind neighbourhood connector areas. Limiting drive-throughs or other businesses are limiting. If it doesn't impinge on safety of pedestrian or communities it should be allowed. Better definition of industrial transitions between streets.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

As an Inglewood resident, I want to clearly state that some LAP consultation has been terrible. Communication has been opaque and dishonest and promises are broken with every "draft" LAP. We resigned for reasons that were articulated with each engagement and we are still not being listened to. The process must be revamped to respect the community and value our input instead of ignoring it.

If there could be more clarity around the process around who gets picked to be part of the local area plan. How are we ensuring we have a diversity of voices?

Engagement should occur early in the process and it should be clear how people can get involved. The City needs to develop a task to be more involved with community associations so that there is a relationship and people can be engaged early.

There are people who want individual community plans but this is messy and resource intensive. It would make it more difficult to achieve community plans for all communities. Not without additional resources.

Communities are rebelling against the new model and multi-community planning is a challenge.

The urban form categories are confusing.

If communities aren't informed it can create tension between community associations and community members.

We began the process of updating our ARP in 2002. The City told us we didn't need an update and we put thousands of hours into broad engagement that crossed all stakeholder groups. No resources were asked of the City yet our efforts were rejected. In the light of a broken process, we may end up writing our own LAP anyway. Really demoralizing.

R-2 areas have the same concerns as R-1.

Don't approve more R-CG in broad areas until R-CG fit motion is completed and comes back to Council.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Inglewood has some very good wording about RC-G that I recommend that was derived from a multi-stakeholder group. Thanks for the opportunity to contribute. Engagement shouldn't be a checked box exercise. Sequencing important.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- One session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
- Includes public participation
- Council session date & format TBD - June or July



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wednesday, April 14, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 3

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- No. Concern about elimination of some of the development policies that apply to specific communities when a plan applies to multiple communities.

- Desire to maintain the existing land use designations.

- Concerns that some parts of the discussion were not captured. Concern about the alignment between messaging and effect of policies. Example of redesignations under new policy. Loss of trust.

- Only partially. Why no weighting or distillation of the comments heard? Captures aspects but not main concerns.

- People don't understand how the guidebook will be applied. Heard that most people thought the document should be non-statutory.

- Seems to be a rationale for squishing everything together under the guidebook. May be more enabling of speculative development projects. What's out of date and what isn't working? Concerned about losing some of the specific nuances within plans.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Beyond the question of how it's adopted, there's a question about whether it should universally apply. Changing the language is not as simple as find and replace.

- As it exists, does not support it as a statutory document.

- Concerned about massing large areas of the City together in a LAP is a mistake.

- Confusion about stat versus non stat and the implications.

- Concerned about just strengthening language without consideration of where that happens. Should be considered case-by-case.

- Suggestion of planning community by community instead of aggregated. Not supportive of homogeneous planning.

- Should is less binary (more gray area) than must and shall.

- What is the difference between Should and Shall



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Felt that the A & B areas had been unfairly focused on. Seems to be emphasis in the guidebook that older housing stock is prime for redevelopment. Older homes can be well maintained.

- It seems like there is an emphasis on every community being a complete community. Look at things in the wider context when it comes to commercial and services.

- There seems to be a drive to reach density and population targets. Doesn't understand densification for the sake of densification.

- Why not start with the communities that want inner city growth?

- What about areas like Manchester? Along future LRT.

- Have there been discussion with school boards about intensification?

- Why are secondary suites not included in densification?

- Concerns about school capacity.

- Wants sensitive, contextual development and communities need to be consulted about where densification happens. Concern that the guidebook does not protect against spot upzoning in R-C1 neighbourhoods. Doesn't think that a thriving community is about population stats.

- Topic 2, bullet 2 and t3, b3 are questionable.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Reject the idea that districts need to meet growth targets.
 - The criteria in the guidebook where you might be able to have single-detached neighbourhoods... for a category below...
 - The City prides itself on looking after public trees, but the guidebook doesn't look at private trees when lot coverage is increased. Redevelopment has meant the loss of private trees and their replacement with smaller ones.
 - Increased density should be coupled with increased greenspace.
 - Densification has a knock on effect on rivers through runoff.
 - Surprised that there's no section on urban forest in the guidebook.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Concern that anyone can buy a property in a heritage street, tear it down and build something different. That could change the landscape and that's not protecting heritage.

- Heritage preservation is critical to the preservation of a lot of older neighbourhood. Heritage is not just about individual buildings but also about community character. Think about allowable urban forms in these areas. Special consideration for heritage near commercial streets. Don't erode heritage neighbourhoods near commercial.

- Define different road and street types in the document. Collectors and connectors? Use one terminology across documents. They should be defined/identified through public engagement.

- Looking at streets needs to consider the character of each side and be sensitive to place.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Communities should be consulted with respect to identifying heritage buildings. There should be an extra process for any changes to those buildings.

- Conversation about rights versus protections.

- Calgary needs to spend more time thinking about how to protect heritage areas. How do we favour preservation and restoration over demolition. Also, all setbacks are important.

- Buildings that don't qualify as heritage also contribute to the character of neighbourhoods and should be considered.

- Concern about designating individual buildings without the owner's consent.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- With the current criteria of the guidebook, Elbow Park will not qualify for being a single detached area. Will the lot coverage be revised in heritage areas? What about saving trees and greenspace? The distinction between zones A & B and the different levels of willingness to develop.

- Concern that there are no protections for stable single detached neighbourhoods. The nature of those areas will be disrupted by new development. Ability for change to happen on a spot by spot basis. The importance of single detached neighbourhoods should be recognized. Communities should be different and that should be embraced. Wants a single detached category.

- Echo above. Having everything homogeneous will not result in a great city. Zones A & B should go. There are a lot of areas outside of those where sensitive intensification could occur. The downtown core is not the draw it used to be. Those zones as focus points don't make sense.

- Zones A & B should be dropped and the guidebook should apply across the city.

- Those type of zone distinctions should be a part of a LAP process and not in the guidebook.

- One value is that it would strengthen the argument that single detached areas have value. May gain support from greenfield developers.

- One of the issues is how the guidebook has an urban form approach instead of a land use planning approach. The categories are too broad. This does not allow for the contextually sensitive approach that communities want. Single detached should be a starting point, not an exemption. There should not be a blanket reset to higher density. Qualitative values of low density. People do not like R-CG lumped in with R-C1 and R-C2.

- The guidebook was supposed to create certainty, but spot zoning does not accomplish that.

- There continues to be an undercurrent of facilitating developers. Spot redesignation is not desired.

- Not mentioning restrictive covenants is an omission. Where conflicts occur, the city shouldn't interfere with those contractual obligations.

- The city shouldn't take actions that go against any covenants. Deprives residents of certainty.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Support delineation and protection of single detached areas. Don't see any need to tie it to growth targets or other criteria.
 - The action should be to have an urban form category for single detached.
 - The guidebook should defer to the LAP process for density quantity and locations. The guidebook should not provide criteria.
 - 4-600 metre limits around features targets too much inner city areas. The community is much beyond an individual district. Density should be allocated contextually.
 - Communities already have what they need.
 - Who is writing the LAP? Will the community have a say? Maybe a topic for below...
 - Would the onus be on those contesting development or those who are the proponents? Seems like the guidebook's assumption is higher density. R-CG is a higher density form.
 - Rowhousing in a single detached neighbourhood also allows for secondary suites and that allows for a lot of extra units. This impacts services, parking utilities, greenspace, ...



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- The engagement should have extended into 2022 and involved more communities. This is too brief an amount of time (to May 5). This is not creating the conditions for a successful collaboration. Concern that these sessions are only a start and that important amendment work needs to happen. The city should work with citizens to determine what meaningful engagement means. The planning document is complex and there needs to be common understanding and alignment. Need to get the doc right so that the LAPs work well. Principles of consultation should be in the guidebook and in the LAPs.

- Echo above. More emphasis on the LAPs.

- Echo above. Concerned about these sessions. They are not full. Concerned about who was invited relative to who spoke at the hearing. Concerned about who will be involved in the LAP processes.

- Echo above. 'Shoe-horning sessions in before PUD' is not a way to talk about these sessions respectfully. Engagement post-approval of the guidebook should be better. Developers should not be considered stakeholders because of their profit motive. Quality control needs to be improved in new builds.

- Outreach on the guidebook was inadequate. Many outreach efforts were tangential. Felt like the guidebook was geared towards a pre-determined outcome and that consultation was rushed. This generates cynicism. The lack of consensus as to what goes into the guidebook is likely to result in more conflict later. People objecting at the public hearing is an indicator of inadequate opportunities to provide comments earlier. Enmax, tax notices, etc would be a great way to notify because they piggyback on something many people see.

-



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Agree with everything on the page.

- " "

- What about community associations that are not the voice of the people? It's concerning.

- Principles of meaningful engagement need to be in both the guidebook and in the LAPs. Agree it should be an election issue.

- Encourage the city to speak to the communities about how to do effective engagement.

- This has been a good engagement session because of active listening. Previous engagement has been more about 'selling' the guidebook.

- Agree w above.

- Concerned about the Councillors behaviour towards the people speaking. Did not feel that they were there to listen.

- The quick timeline on these sessions prior to PUD and the challenge of commenting before that contributes to the feeling that this is a foregone conclusion.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- One session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
- Includes public participation
- Council session date & format TBD - June or July



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wednesday, April 14, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 4

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Agree with the list. Overarching theme is the lack of clarity.
 - Themes were categorized reasonably.
 - The guidebook is a highly technical document but seems vague at times. It is difficult to interpret the wording to those that are not familiar with planning jargon.
 - Can the Guidebook be more specific than trying to be two different types of documents.
 - It is drafted vaguely as a list. Heritage is factored in the guidebook but still lacks clarity.
 - does a good job of looking at various different topics but lacks in the interplay between the topics and is not clear. Possible contradictions that could happen between the topics.
 - How is the guidebook going to provide answers. Just raises questions.
 - the document talks about heritage homes and historic assets, preserving green space. Page 11 of the Guidebook says heritage should be excluded near main streets. Needs to have specificity to give direction. The ambiguity gives developers more freedom and could capitalize with the ambiguity.
 - Trying to figure out applicability. section on scale modifiers and trying to connect it to urban forms. Couldn't find correlation with each other. what does it mean to the urban forms. Does connector streets mean mid scaled buildings (six-storey) buildings.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- potential action to have better document that is straight forward with all the rules. avoid the propaganda. One document for Marie and David and one document that speaks to the rules and the technicality of the rules.

- the impact and weight of a non-stat document. Struggling to understand the relationship if it is not a statutory document.

- i am supportive of the document as being a non-statutory plan.

- the limitation of the statutory plan should be emphasized.

- supportive of being cost effective.

- city can save some time and work by referencing other documents. Incorporate by reference.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Satisfied with the comments captured.

-



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- love identify growth targets in local area plans. would like the city to elaborate on what it means. many versions of what that means to people. Look at the measures in numbers and metrics. It should show a combination of different types of buildings and backed by quantifiable data.

- in Vancouver there are different ideas of gentle density behind the scenes that preserves heritage assets and how do we achieve those targets without it being overly disruptive.

- set urban forestry targets. nice to go for a walk and enjoy the paths and streets which is beneficial for the community and the city.

- look at the city strategically on where high density and low density areas are.

- use current infrastructure to bring more people in is more environmentally friendly than new buildings.

- gentle density needs to be sensitive to the community. Traffic becomes a concern with increased density. Need to pay attention to parking and its impact on neighbourhoods.

- metrics required to support climate change and density targets.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- happy to see what was discussed in the hearings have been captured.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- strength and language. not in favour of changing from should's to must's. Believe that Planners should have discretion.
- some of the actions could conflict with each other but it is the City capturing the comments.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Good with the comments captured.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- strongly in support of delineating a single-detached area. Should be an urban form for single family housing.
 - like the concept of eliminating zones A and B. themes and policies should be implemented holistically across the city. As a guideline it should apply equally to all communities.
 - Zones such as Zone A scare people that live there.
 - to make our inner cities more equitable, needs to be more specific of low income housing need to be provided for. Agree with the first bullet - Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- The guidebook affects does affect people in the future. Sympathize with those through the confusion put forth leading up to the public hearing. From an engagement perspective it felt like a hear it is and not a give and take.

- There were comments on the number of people that were engaged in the process. the statistics were generated from placards in the public area or videos. debate on whether some of the engagement was meaningful.

- the city sent emails about the hearing but it is hard to accept the city would not use the same emails that there are follow up engagement sessions. feels disingenuous.

- letter was submitted through the online portal. Option to give consent for todays session but was not contacted.

- why is the consent so narrow. it is all part of the same process. is there a way to give consent for the entire Guidebook engagement process.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- a broader neighbourhood association message should go out again. Support the potential actions
- support the Guidebook to be an election issue.

General comments at the end of the session

A lot of good work here. better present it in a couple of different forms not all in one document would really help.

- Cost of city services. We need to be more cost effective in how we can deliver services. one of the ways to do that is through higher density. a better approach is to show the impacts of infrastructure and would appeal to some groups. Did not see it much in the Guidebook. How do you manage municipal spending better.

- Like the breakout format. Do more of this earlier in the process. People feel like they are not being listened to and this format would help and hope to see it in the next step when producing community plans.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- One session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
- Includes public participation
- Council session date & format TBD - June or July



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Thursday, April 15, 11:00am - 1:30pm
Industry Developers and Consultants

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic	Time	
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	11:20am - 11:55am
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15am
Break	5 mins	12:15am - 12:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	12:20pm - 12:35pm
Heritage	20 mins	12:35pm - 12:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

11:20am - 11:55am **1**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

11:20am - 11:55am 1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- A lot of the anxiety around topic may be lack of understanding on how the GB gets applied

- zone A & B may have missed the mark in that it was confusing - no problem in eliminating those zones

- Q: where are we at in terms of the potential actions presented here? A: we do know we'll have to address single-detached in some way. we need to know where your line is

- zone A & B was trying to balance stakeholder needs with market investment. ability to delineate areas of single-detached may be more symbolic than effective.

- It would be good to know where the strongest shift in Admin's recommendation will be - quite critical.

- Q: 2 year moratorium on land use redesignations? A: trying to get at the intent behind that, things like certainty behind local area plans. While we might not do a moratorium, we might propose other ways to get at those intents

- Glad to hear that you're not considering the 2-year moratorium. That is the line in the sand - isn't reasonable to stop these processes.

- Communities feel really side-swipped by this. First two points are probably the right approach. Communities have their amendments that they'll bring forward. They realize that there is density coming, and they're not opposed to it; some are very well informed and they want some ability to 'control' R-1. We're happy to give them some R-1 control and in return they have to compromise that they have to play the game as well. What don't want to see is that in those R-1 areas, they get defined as Heritage -- not appropriate. We have to be very careful about that Heritage designation.

- Density targets for communities -- caution about dictating outcomes rather than creating opportunities.

- But how do we have that trade-off conversation without having those targets?

- We'd have to have density targets that the City anticipates in the next 10, 20 years is we were using those metrics.

- It's been pretty easy so far because of declining populations in inner-city communities, but what about after that? What argument do you have for density after you've brought up those populations to 1950's populations? Might be helpful to have those numbers that we're working towards.

- We're not giving the communities the understanding they need in terms of this.

- The GB wouldn't help with that - metrics & targets conversation would happen at LAP stage

- GB is a very useful tool for local area planning and would hate to throw that out because of a lack of low, low-density piece.

- Could be put in now, and considered for pulling out later.

- MDP have targets, and LAP are a way to work towards those targets. That's thin implementation piece. And GB is a tool to help inform that LAP piece, so metrics & targets piece isn't appropriate in the GB.

- If the movement is to allow communities to delineate s-d areas, there needs to be a very considered set of expectations in policy around what that available tool is.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

11:20am - 11:55am 1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

- If the movement is to allow communities to delineate s-d areas, there needs to be a very considered set of expectations in policy around what that available tool is. Working group & engagement process in LAPs has been successful and good so far, but we have to be careful in qualifying "communities" as one single entity -- CA's aren't always representative. Will need to be a more sophisticated tool than just saying that the existing s-d, R-1 areas can stay that way. Would like to see what the detail is on that tool asap.

- Eliminating Zones A & B comment clarification - just not sure if they achieved what the intent it was trying to get at (ie giving communities a bit more comfort with expectations) - not necessarily advocating for their elimination, but questioning whether they achieved their original intent.

- Q: are we not trying to make these communities more complete, walkable and have more opportunity than currently, and in order to get there, you do need the density. Not quite sure why communities are so upset other than not having all the facts and using fear. Is this what you're sensing going to these meetings?

- In that LAP process, going through that "lego block" exercise is helpful, but not sure how that's played out now. Q: going back to those metrics, are we using these to get at the outcomes?

- A: one of the reason we haven't come out with these density targets is because we want to stay away from putting it all in a single place to "solve" the problem. Trade-off was to look at a lot of areas for potential, and that way we don't have to continuously change LAPs.

- A: communities have not recognized population declines in their communities. Conversation about growth will be critical. Education piece that goes with local area plans is very important. If we go forward with this model, we have to have that educational component.

- Opportunity to "test" the policy in LAPs (perhaps like Heritage)? - might give communities that are more resistant to see as an example.

- Possible to have both the Zones and the optional tool to delineate?

- Caution in telling people that their population is "down". Maybe use historic populations as part of the story - where was the population, where it is today, and where it's going.

- Population growth analysis needed? to show what population would be if all areas in the inner city were built out?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:55am - 12:15pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:55am - 12:15pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Many of these comments were fairly limited in terms of how much they were reflected over the entire public hearing. I don't see a number of these issues having to be addressed as part of amendments. They could be flagged as items to follow for the sustainment committee going forward. Not sure that any of these would 'hang up' the Guidebook for now.

- don't think these are issues that we need to address at this point in time. Important that we give a nod to some of these issues, but if our goal is to identify 90% of issues, 90% of time, we can't address all the issues all the time.

- #2 and #3 -- these cost people money. if we are hoping to create affordable housing, these things might tag on 50K/door in terms of cost. Caution as to how far we go down this path of recognizing a small number of people - not saying we need to dismiss, but just look at both sides for some of these issues. Especially in terms of affordable housing

- #4 -- would push back aggressively against people dictating me what I can do with the trees on my yard.

- Q: amendments proposed by Cllr Farrell last night?

- Protection of trees on private lots: you might have conflicts with solar panels when you start doing that - I wouldn't be supportive either.

- Struggle around the 50K/door building (there's a lot of missing context around that). Concern is not only the cost (although it's a legit consideration), but it's more the expectation setting at the community level. Only province can mandate building code, so caution about managing expectations. Does the City actually have the ability to mandate/require? Need to be thoughtful about goal setting vs action to meet those.

- The City is writing climate related policy separately - we should be cautious that we are not duplicating, repeating or even conflicting with other policy.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

12:20pm - 12:35pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

12:20pm - 12:35pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Thought the City did a reasonable job in "should" vs "shall" statements - thought the balance was good so no recommendations for changes and would stick with what you have.

- On the fence about the stat vs non-stat question. if it is used as it is intended, as boilerplate material for LAP then it needs to be statutory, otherwise what is the purpose of it? how does it work? Thought it was clear for it to be stat if it's used for its intended purpose.

- "should", "shall" statements - important in these early LAPs to tread on a lighter hand over a heavier one. opportunity to work with the sustainment committee if there needs to be any adjustments in the future

- stat versus non-stat: if it's non-stat and you need to embed it into the LAP, and you need to change anything does that mean you have to go back and change every single LAP where it's embedded? - Pertinent for that "should" versus "shall" language - when we need to adjust, it makes it harder to do that sustainment.

- stat vs non-stat - biggest challenge is the sustainment piece. On track on how you might divide it up. Other piece of this is building up knowledge on the whole planning process.

- hopefully outcome is that the GB policy gets applied on all LAPs, and any further changes to the GB is reflected in all LAPs. If we're not cautious about that now, we'll wind up with LAPs that don't have consistent policy across them.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

12:35pm - 12:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

12:35pm - 12:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- noted a dramatic difference between PUD in march 2020 and the 2021 public hearing. dramatic decrease in comments in terms of heritage. Comments were more open to work with the existing Heritage policy & tools.

- there is no real usable defensible definition of "heritage streetscapes". Causes a huge amount of uncertainty. Need a real definition, otherwise every community will just go with "our street should be heritage too, its just not recognized yet". Extending protections to everything on the list "awaiting evaluation" is a non-starter for me. If city isn't willing to take the step of making a true municipal heritage resource protected by bylaw, then it simply isn't and should not even be "quasi-protected". Otherwise there is zero clarity.

- to say that trees are part of our heritage and we have to maintain them is dictating outcomes instead of allowing opportunities. Concern about going down a path where we are restricting the ability for people to develop what is demanded by the market. Balancing act.

- "Strengthening language for conservation and re-purposing" with must, required, will is likely as City noted, illegal, and unsupportable. But we need to be careful to no pretend through quasi-protection to attempt to do same thing without following MGA and HRA.

- Needs to be definition about where is the true heritage? Otherwise everyone will think it applies to their area. We're going so far down a rabbit hole that it feels like it's including everything pre-2000. Shouldn't be about protecting everything that's quasi-heritage. need to be careful about having some clear-cut handling around heritage. If language is too vague, everyone will jump on that bandwagon.

- If city can turn Victoria Park into a stampede parking lot, then we can't be protecting 70's bungalows in specific areas that no one sees. Very subjective wording right now, parameters are key.

- Language in the GB around Heritage isn't consistent with Heritage tools - important to be clear.

- Not sure the community understands how Heritage designations & protection tools work. Don't think the big majority of people know this work on the Heritage tools (windshield survey) is happening. Concern about Heritage designation. Did City council really understand ramifications around voting for 25% versus a 50% threshold?

- Keep this into perspective, and maybe there's an opportunity to test the new policy that's being developed. May be the delay in implementation that's causing these concerns & potential actions coming forward



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Are we putting too much emphasis on CAs and not the broader community?
 - Thought the City had done a lot of engagement over the course of years - deliberate process, a lot of discussion. People only became engaged when it became a political sword to become an election issue. This is a big challenge for the City, and for developers. very difficult to touch everyone in engaging. Feel that this is an unfair positioning and that the City did do a lot of engagement.
 - Agreed a tremendous amount of engagement was done. To the point where some people may have felt 'over-engaged' That said, the 'politicizing' and media around the GB has resulted in an opportunity to raise awareness and set the table for much more robust LAP engagement with a number of communities in the future - when the policy will have direct impacts on them. We can create the opportunity, but not force people to participate. A lot of folks would've had the opportunity for engaging, but it was only through the media and politicizing that people came out of the woodwork. There wasn't a lack of opportunity - there was a lack of realizing the opportunities that were there. How do we reach people?
 - Agreement that it was politicized. Hope that we can get to a moving away from a process of needing engagement because the rules will be laid out clearly for everyone to understand. From community perspective, process today looks like a conflicting lobbying exercise - planners/City are being paid by developers and community is on the outside. All of us want certainty, and if the GB can help us get there, that would be ideal.
 - System that we have right now - with no GB and no LAP gives all sorts of opportunities for negative feedback. Hope that the next system will work better.

Any other topics?

- Risk : risks of the GB not getting approved. What is the risk and how do Councillors, Admin, communities; do we all understand the risks if it doesn't get approved? There's a potential for the whole "Next Gen planning system" not to move forward.
 - Risk of a loss of investment in the City of Calgary - holding back investment and projects not moving forward as result of uncertainty in the established areas.
 - Risk with pushing the GB approval past the election.
 - Risk with piecing the GB policy into LAPs (instead of a holistic Guidebook) - this could result in a step backward to disparate and individual plans.
 - Sustainment approach might need to be emphasized more.
 - Sustainment committee might present more opportunity - give communities some comfort with this process going forward.
 - stat vs non-stat: communities are very confused as to what the difference is. One-pager with differences, implications and pros/cons of both might be a win is Admin can approach that issue proactively.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- One session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
- Includes public participation
- Council session date & format TBD - June or July



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Thursday, April 15, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 1

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Difference between a statutory document and a policy document. is there something in the Guidebook, were there are long term ramifications that I may not see which allows a builder, developer or planner to do something that would go against the grain of our community. For example - Group A and Group B community, living in Elbow Park my street is narrow enough that it would be difficult to accommodate the parking that would come in with rowhouses and infills.

- There is a lot of work for a community to do when there are planning changes in the community. The Guidebook is one more tool for the developer to use against the community.

- Could the Guidebook simply state that the current designations would not change through the Guidebook. There is a concern the R-1 district would go away without having the application go through to City Council for decision.

- concern over statutory and non statutory. Lots of confusion on what would be better. Appreciate the concept that the Guidebook was trying to address in having certainty. It is stressful and exhausting when you don't know what can happen. The concept of certainty is something we really need to nail down so that CA's are not constantly receiving applications with relaxations. A big time sink for volunteers to comment on applications

- We want flexibility but also rules. it is a hard decision to be in. The guidebook serves more of as a guideline. Lot of anxiety comes from the communication piece. lots of Planning jargon to google. Needs better wording and communication.

- Do we really need a guidebook when we are working on local area plans. Lots of subdivision applications for infills. Fear is that the guidebook and the LAP will cause exponential development.

- we are scared of the unknown. we need to recognize the city is growing and there needs to be an update. We need change and go to the right direction.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- What if a community didn't want or ask for a local area plan? The question was not answered during the public hearing. Who initiates a local area plan?

- I appreciate the shoulds and the musts but they lack clarity and can be open to different interpretations.

- What is the point of the Guidebook if it is not statutory? If it is approved by resolution then what happens?

- stat or non-stat plans have different weights but both have weights. The flexibility as long as there is weight to what the community and residents require opposed to what a developer wants.

- how were the communities put together in the local area plans?

- suggest note in regards to restrictive covenants.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Transit infrastructure was mentioned but is a huge infrastructure piece that needs emphasis in the Guidebook. Is there a complete transit system for people who cannot drive including newcomers to the City. Was there a life cycle assessment that was done? Did we look at the cost of sprawling out versus densification.

- What other types of housing are considered mixed housing?

- socio economic diversity - In inner city communities compared to Lake Bonavista for example, the inner city has diversity and is something that we like about our community. Overbuilding of lots is inappropriate development. Trying to keep the diversity of some older homes and feel that the goals of the Guidebook is not clear. It does not make sense to knockdown older homes for more expensive housing. We have properties that are vacant. If density and housing is the concern then we need to have a conversation on how long is it reasonable to have vacant properties.

- Spec houses sit empty and no one wants them. It would be beneficial if the neighbourhood has more of a say to ensure development is thoughtful and sensitive.

- After being a long term resident of Elbow Park there is a lot of diversity in my community.

- The word Winter shows up once in the plan. Go back and implement policy in relation to Calgary. We are a car friendly City and should not be an car unfriendly City. The tone pushes public transit over vehicles.

- Do we build a city more towards vehicles than for pedestrians. Calgary has the potential to be more accessible for everyone.

- 2 full days of public hearing is not accessible for those that have minimum wage and are working or have language barriers. It is hard for these segments to participate in the process. It would be good to see more engagement and how can we communicate to those that are not at the table.

- Schools are being closed due to the lack of kids.

- Something needs to be done to improve transit.

- What do we mean by diversity? Clarification of diversity.

- Is the theory of the Guidebook, that anyone in Calgary has a right to move in any community they choose.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- If there are communities that would benefit from densification and growth targets then why don't we start there instead of communities that are already thriving. The perception of the guidebook is that the blanket policy, the intent feels like a broad based approach without thought. Does not feel the local area plans address it either. Different communities have different things to offer. Hate to lose the individuality of communities that are offered right now.

- Great to see the inclusion of climate change. more engagement for youth is required. Different demographic and voices and to involve young people who are the future of Calgary.

- in regards to growth targets. Is there a set growth target? People move to certain neighborhoods because of what they offer.

- There is a fear the way it is written here regarding identifying growth targets.

- The people that are directly impacted by decisions need to be the strongest voice at the table. It is easy to make goals when you are not impacted so we should strive to achieve a balance.

- There are youth from different walks of life that are impacted and there are people that are not being engaged in the process.

- We should look for innovative ideas and the world is about change and we are constantly changing so we should hear the ideas.

- since there are no specific community growth targets, the first point may be misleading. Is there a need to intensify? single detached should stay in place.

- amplify the importance of protection for trees on both public and private land. Loss of mature trees is a huge concern with alot of the new development.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Support all the discussion points and the protection of heritage needs a lot of attention. Calgary being a relatively young city we do not have many heritage buildings left and we should preserve them.

- Is there a chance of the heritage process being combined within the guidebook to ensure those homes are protected.

- Would like to see the re purposing of older heritage buildings. For example see Perth and Sydney.

- amplify the importance of protection for trees on both public and private land. Loss of mature trees is a huge concern with alot of the new development.

- illustrate the value of boulevard trees. People come to the area to enjoy them and it transcends to more than the people that live in the community.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Is the Guidebook, the place that gives weight to discretion? Needs to be addressed somewhere.
- Last point for heritage communities or all communities?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- agree with all the points.
 - single family detached homes are very important to the neighbourhood. In regards to a big home next to small homes, have wonderful neighbours but would be nice to see protections such as shadowing, amenity space and overall massing and building design.
 - What is the city plan in preserving and maintaining homes? Include resources and incentives for energy efficiency in upgrading existing homes.
 - Concept of offering a variety of choices in and between neighbourhoods.
 - We are trying to discourage 3 storey homes beside bungalows. Appreciate that we are trying to discourage it but is a massive issue in Elbow Park. Opposition to the Guidebook is a result of issues that are not a result of the Guidebook but are raised in this process. There is a setback where people are required to observe but there are ways they curtail around it through cantilevers, HVAC etc. Is there a way to address these concerns? The higher the house the more setback it should require.
 - When a contextual application is put in, changes happen midstream and then communities do not have a say later in the process.
 - Is there still lot coverage? Garage suites cover the entire lot and there is no backyard. Are there still requirements?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Concern is if a certain housing type is allowed it could set a precedence for more of that type of housing to happen.

- What gives a certain group of us to advise which homes are to increase in density.

- Is the 600m transit buffer still in place? affordability of existing homes within the buffer are priced high.

- if the community is already zoned for single detached housing then why is there a need to delineate areas for single detached housing.

- Common theme noticed here is a lack of trust in the whole process. Why isnt there trust? it is where the anxiety and questions come from.

- The guidebook is asking for a leap of faith which requires trust.

- Most of the neighbourhood didn't fit in the bottom two categories in Elbow Park. It feels like we are being set up. Felt like the community didn't fit into any of the categories. Have the communities create the criteria rather than impose the criteria on the communities.

- Why a 2 year moratorium?

- Many of these items go to public hearing and it is out of the hands of Administration.

- concerned about how corridors are identified. feel that communities should be more involved. disagreement on the designation on what streets are corridors. more engagement and better understanding of the criteria in identifying corridors.

- page 47 of the guidebook delineates zone A and zone B. without the zones it does not feel realistic. is an important part of the guidebook. Zone A mentions it is the most appropriate area for infills. it reads as zone A communities to be more dense with moderate and low density. feels like word salad which makes it confusing for people that leads to a trust issue. Do not know where a developer could take that map. Is the primary objective to have a range of infills? Do not want the builder or developer to have a stronger case against those that live in the neighbourhood currently.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- This type of face to face conversation is a great step in the right direction to build relationships. Greater community engagement right from the beginning. Element of co-design, bringing communities along and help communities understand what needs to change. Calgary has a spirit of working together and solving problems, there would be a buy in if people understood and brought into the conversation.

- Would like to see a City Planner assigned to a community. Would like to deal with someone who understands the issues in the community and build relationships.

- Public engagement can be messy and time consuming but in the end you have better buy in to avoid the situation we are going through now.

- Appreciate the time taken to listen and appreciate the difficult position the City is in. We should do better engagement. Land use planning is a niche topic and is not exciting. It is hard to engage with people who don't care even though they may be impacted. It would be great to chat with community associations directly although there are still people that may not be engaged. Engage with communities that are not on the radar such as the immigration society. Accessibility is a key issue and how can we engage people that are everyday Calgarians.

- Previously planners was designated to set areas. We have NPC's that are assigned to communities, can they be involved as a conduit. Maybe an insert in your tax bills, etc. Councillors office can also play a part in providing information.

- We feel like we live in great communities today. City hall telling us that we need a guidebook to make our communities great leaves us skeptical an suspicious. Communities have evolved without the guidebook and how do we build trust and words matter. There is a separation between those that have written it versus the residents of the area.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Lets be conscious of language and tone of the Guidebook.
 - The story lines in the plan seemed condescending in a way. Built more suspicion.
 - Page 8 - The journey felt comical.
 - For a lot of new people that come to Calgary the story could be relevant and it is one persons journey but not everyones story.
 - Do not understand why are we trying to rush the Guidebook through. If this is a long term vision for Calgary, it would be great to spend more time and thought into it where many different perspectives are included to come to an outcome we are proud of.
 - Lets take the time to do it right.
 - Long term foundation documents need time to get it right.
 - Some of us learnt of the Guidebook recently.
 - Fear of it being rushed but also with a new group at Council, worried about having to do it all over again.
 - I like the idea of it being an election issue but not sure how the mechanics would work.
 - There are already several issues on the ballot this election. With how complex the Guidebook is, people may not be well versed. With only 30% people voting it may not represent everyone.
 - Would not like it to be an election issue but would like the time to do it right. Lots of progress made and would hate to lose some of it through the election process.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Thursday, April 15, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 2

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

June 15 - Evening Group 2

Relationship between GB and NH LAP
Working in the NH LAP-lots of things in the GB are not reflected in the NH. certain things/steps should've been done, and we feel were not followed. Why does the GB exist if not driving what the LAP are to look like? How can a LAP be developed parallel to the GB? how they relate to one another?

Why do we need change/density?
It is not clear what the case for change is. attended various meetings, the talk is about Calgary Growth over x number of years. Are the MDP numbers out of date? no clear numbers in the GB? do not consider growth/decline due to Covid. Not clear how much density/where/ and why? quantitative data?
Inconsistent messaging - city planner mentioned that currently zoning allowed for enough growth, that #s shown are not realistic. hence unclear why more density is required.
Current economic situation and downtown situation to retrofit office space reflect that growth has areas where it can happen. wonder if there is a true justification for densification? other than political agenda?
Need for density is not there? is not understood. Feels like there is no demand for density. feels like we do not need to do this. Why forcing density into communities when no demand exists?
Secondary Suites do not count towards density, they should. Brentwood added SS that are not accounted for. SS involve more people, cars, need for green space, etc.

Data needs to support/make the case for change!
density targets for particular community need to be clear. It would help if the LAP provides that information - what is the contribution to density for each community?
CA members feel too much pressure to be part of the LAP without a broader engagement. We feel scared to talk about 6 storeys buildings to residents, once we understood what the HN was and what the GB mean. Informal conversations have happened and neighbours were discussing if they need to move or sell. They felt like the future was determine by others that think densification is good. is that necessary?

Why mix of housing everywhere?
diverse community - housing types.
To us housing mixed means that there are different areas in the communities that hold a certain type of housing. Unclear why is there a need to mix them all together. feels it does not work. what is the need for density?
in Brentwood – the current policy show areas of stability (limited change) areas for change (areas where change happen), and that works well for all of us.
Do not mixed all housing types together. do it per areas, in certain places.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

MDP/GB relationship? Not all communities are the same!
Read the MDP and GB - feel like they align but not align. MDP talks about development being sensitive to communities/context. GB does not reflect that. GB talks about equitable communities. Yet communities are different.

Why do we need the GB?
not clear what the GB is for? to justify densification.

LAP vs GB - concern: why parallel processes
the LAP is already being pushed through while the GB is still under discussion. how is it possible that the foundation for the LAP is still being discussed/change when the LAP is already moving forward?
predictable planning is important.
we don't have broad/consistent public participation through these processes, we see ad hoc process that run parallel for public engagement.
if NH plan is a pilot, should've start after the GB is implemented. no need for guinea pigs.
negative impact of two processes GB/LAP running together. Less predictability and clarity. creates confusion.
If GB goes first without a proper consultation and if we have concerns during the LAP process, is it game over? if GB is approved as Statutory document, heard that things could happen through the LAP process. also feel like there will be no opportunity to change things.
It feels that everything is already decided. Citizens feel like voicing concerns would not make a different, as it is all set.
Felt not heard during the LAP meetings/discussions.

Trying to push for GB to move forward and get approve without proper consultation does not provide confident for us.
For the NH LAP it seems weird to run parallel to the GB.
Pushing the NH LAP through the approval process feels irresponsible specially because changes to the GB are still happening.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Clarification by SR - Actions reflect feedback from the PH.

Predictability
GB offers predictability maybe to stringer to developers no citizens
In the NH plan it feels like there are winners and losers. for example, Renfrew is packed with density. did calculation on where density was paced and 14% in main street - 86% in the community (6+ storey buildings). Feels like if a community does not have a strong voice, they are the ones that get more density.

GB brings density everywhere.
The MDP brings density to Main Streets and Activity Centres. The GB puts density everywhere. creates problems. too much density in the community. Hence is would be easier/cheaper for developers to buy and develop in the community and leave the Main Streets. Main streets will not develop as quickly as the community area. the whole MDP purpose would be lost.

Lots of good staff in existing ASPs/ARPs forgotten
Once a LAP is approved, the work in the ASPs/ARPs (existing ones), would be lost/ gone. existing plans already provide comfort to residents and they include good staff for individual community.
The new multi-community approach for the LAPs feels like it does not (NH example) have the level of details required for each community. too much discretion is given to the City. Time and efforts invested in the existing ASPs/ARPs feel lost.
ASP offered more details for a community.

Not honest information
A poster posted in the library says that the GB offers more housing choices, shops, etc. But the reality is different. the GB brings density everywhere not just in Main Streets or Activity Centers.
Residents are confused when reading the GB. did not know where to find the inform about connectors-for example. Need to be more open with the info that public see.
Use graphics in posters for people to understand. Need transparency so people really understand the impact of density. Give an example of high density next to single family house and you will see how shocking it would be. Graphics are preferred.
Page 78 graphic should be used. You need to show 6 storey graphic so people know and understand.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Discussion on LAP/Guidebook at PH
Seemed like Council listed to the concerns. was eye opening when other people talked about their neighbourhoods. It felt that they want their communities to remain the same with just small incremental, it felt like they were attacked for expressing their concerns. Felt like a non-open approach because when people say things that they did like or did not align with their ideas, things were not received well.
Renfrew is a family friendly community, but now everyone worries about what is to come HN/ walked through the neighbourhood and collected signature. 38 out of 40 people were not aware of this HN LAP or the GB. AWARENESS.

Diverse, inclusive and Equitable
How does housing mixed work? what is the plan to make this equitable? Renfrew is being hit with more density in comparison with other communities in the NH LAP. density is not evenly shared among all communities - no equitability.

Density everywhere is a problem
In addition, infrastructure services and amenities, what do they mean to connector streets? example of connector streets in Renfrew. unclear how these streets are now connector streets? not clear about the plan to reflect growth focused on Main Street first? when other streets are getting density-land cheaper/easier to sell/incentive for developers is to go to other streets and not to main streets.

Public Schools
Feel like GB did not consider the implications of densification in relation to the schools. CBE just re-draw boundaries for schools. feel like no coordination took place with CBE. Specially when there are no other school sites available and no money to buy and build. Unclear what the impact of density would be for these schools.
Schools are not full. that is not the issue, issue is that the waiting list to get into the schools is long and it would become longer if more density around schools. The idea that things will collapse if there is no density is wrong.

Existing communities are inclusive
Many comments at PH related to this. Height of building does not relate to racism. Opposition to 6 storey building does not mean opposition to actual people. It's about # of storeys. Renfrew has affordable single-family units to own or to rent, it is an inclusive community.
Higher density would mean small units and it is not realistic to think that everyone wants to live in smaller units. feel like there is no willness to have open discussion on the real issue, especially at Council.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Racism was felt like an excuse during the PH. comments came from council and public.

Connector Street/classification – 6 storey buildings
Need to define storeys in the GB to know what it means. what is a 6 storey? a 3 storey?

Connector is a UFC. The main issue is that it's not well defined. Unclear if there is a scale modifier. People are confused specially when a connector street is shown next to a main street.

Collector Street is transportation classification. in Scarboro collector streets are generally occupied by single-family homes, and in the LAP, they are identified as high density. Unclear if the idea to have 6 storey buildings everywhere. most of us were shocked when looking at the proposed LAP. Perhaps not came out at PH but it's a concern.

We asked people who had not seen the GB or the LAP to try and understand that and was confusing. feels like the city needs to clearly show/discuss a map that reflect people's comments and clearly explain what it means. It needs to be clear where the 6+ storeys are located so people know. it is important to be transparent. People need to understand what this is all about; they need time to understand what things are and where.

Let single-family homes be and see where density is more appropriate. Some neighbourhoods meet the "criteria" to move to moderate density but feels like density has been taken too far. context should matter. why high density near single-family? worry about large buildings next to single-family homes. Sad to see access to sunlight gone for the neighbour next door. Specially the case for connector streets in NH. The GB does not define the Neighbourhood connector in reference to housing type. more definition is required to address differences between communities.

in the NH LAP map people try to figure out which is what? who defines what they are? uncertain about who makes the decision? in Renfrew there are lots of streets labeled as neighbourhood connectors. Wonder how did this happen? confusion where did this come from? why density makes sense there? need to have more clarity what Neighbourhood Connectors are? logics?

GB-a tool for builders and developers
It feels like GB/LAP are meant to "help" builders to go ahead and introduce density along connector streets instead of in Main Streets. Basically, where density was not allowed before. The GB's front page should say the intent is to help builders and developers built higher densities along connectors. The map is most needed for people to understand that. feels like if the GB is approved, it would be too late to discuss changes.
The GB would not have a map (SR)

GB Approval - meaning
We recognize that there is a lot of great stuff in there. great work!



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

If the GB is approved as is, concern is that specific things affect the neighbourhoods, and neighbourhoods have not had the chance to be part of it.
If the GB is approved, the feeling is that LAP has to follow the GB, hence it feels it's too late to make any changes. for example: town houses will be everywhere and would be too late to make a change on that. for example. if there are good intentions in the LAP, it feels like there will be no way to "prevent" things from happening. Communities change, yes, however recognize that there is more from R-C1 neighbourhoods. Trying to introduce density everywhere feels like going from 0 to 100 instead of introducing gradual change. Who are the decision makers in the LAP process is also a concern? larger engagement is not in place. So, decision fall onto few people. And that is not a good community representation.

Confusion
Unclear what does low density mean, main street, mid density – Use graphics to show us. if GB is approved things are set. density should happen considering the context. R-C1 next to R-C2 or RCG may be ok. Just be honest and clear.

AWARENESS is key - residents.
Silent voices - felt that the people's comments at the PH , over the silent voices who did not show up – was not taken seriously. Felt that support and more attention was given to those who had been already engaged, and those who were in favor. Felt discounted even if effort to be there was made.
Silent people are silent because they do not know the meaning of the GB.
The LAP process feels stressful and not open, that seems to be the general feeling for the engagement in the LAP process. engagement should allow for participation and input from individual communities. We all need to have a say.

GB prescribes an outcome.
frustration is that there is lack of tools to help the LAP process. very little in most relevant issues the single-family homes and heritage tools. lack strong tools to protect heritage or be sensitive to the community. Tools need to be included so the LAP process can follow.

GB Naming
In 2019 there was suggestion to change the name "bringing 6 storeys building to your neighbourhood" did not go anywhere. Name could be more honest as this is not just a guide.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Heritage/R-C1 protection leaves other areas un-protected
Concerns because it means some streets/communities are protected vs others. If people want to protect R-C1 to me is the same as trying to protect heritage - need consistency.
when you protect something, other things get affected. put density here instead of there to "protect" does not feel fair or equitable. each one values their own place, their own area. things should be dealt with equally.
how does heritage designation is decided? in Renfrew there are no heritage building, but we have bungalows, which are not considered heritage but define the character of the community. in other community with heritage buildings would be worth protecting for example Inglewood.

GB lacks tools
I support heritage protection - concern is that the GB do not have tools to help protect heritage buildings. Perhaps, in communities like Scarboro, districts that reflect the character of the community should be protected, for us that feels like heritage.
Heritage guidelines should be stronger to allow for a heritage district

Trees as Heritage assets
Trees are part of the heritage landscape.
In Brentwood, for example, we have large trees because of lot size. Concern that more dense houses will not allow for the trees to remain. trees need to be protected. we value them.
what is pre-colonial history? what does it mean? before European settlement (SR).



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Community character point is that each community has its own character. Each community has its beauty. we do not want to make all communities the same. we want to keep the character of each community. concern is that in the multi-communities LAP process there are different communities with different ideas and different concerns which can be challenging when trying to protect the unique character of an area or a community.

People want to protect the character they like. People already think they have great communities. no matter the economics. it's about liking what each neighbourhood is and has.

GB lost that, and that creates stress, makes people uncomfortable and creates uncertainty. It does not show how it would allow our community to grow in context. We each think our communities are great, each one is unique. we need to reflect that. Include more details for each community.

Seaton example-separate housing types by zones undeveloped areas- incentivize development in the right locations. for example, mobile homes could grow. piecemeal does not allow for development in key areas.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Neighbourhood stability is key and it's a sensitive topic among neighbours. what to do? stay here? leave?

Equity in density
the real case for change is missing. do not believe that density is required in all communities. focus density in main streets and other key area without the need to go into residential areas.
Who ever decided in Zones A and B missed equality and equity concepts. Zones A and B is inequitable. Should be equal for all communities. was concern that our community was in zone A when we know the community is under flood plain. feel like there is a lot going on specially in community with flood mitigation, Covid ... concern to know we are set for intensification when we do not know if flood mitigations would allow for it.

Evolutionary Approach
Height differential as a max height
Also, LUB could solve the issue. For example, having a height differential between developments - 2 storey over your neighbour - evolutionary approach. Height differential may work and may take away fear.
height differential concept - basically for each block and it's the differential to the smaller house on the block. then the new building can be 3 storey.

Restrictive covenants
They are part of many neighbourhoods.
GB ignores these historical documents. If we want success, covenants should be dealt with and taken into consideration.
We all want the GB to be successful, worries that is missing things like the covenant.
move from single-family to 6 storey may not be possible due to covenants. City should be more proactive.
restricted covenant - is a touchy point. they should be acknowledged. Allow them to be included onto the plan. The GB says that the landowners are to get rid of them? How? When?
There should be clear acknowledgement in the GB/LAP.
If the GB is well done, Covenant may not be required anymore. they could be unfriendly between neighbours.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

What was shared at the hearing?
New development in Seton, developer knows where to put high density and where to put single-family homes. that is a good way to do it, no problem with row houses, for example, as they are together in an area. Duplexes are in certain street and single-family homes on its own area. mixing them together is destroys the character/feel of a community. Melanie's comments at PH.

NEXT STEPS
Very concern that it will be said: thank you, we heard you, thank you... and no matter what, the GB/LAP get approve.

Feels like we are rushing to get this approved. for some politicians it is their goal to push this through. please do not push and avoid make this a personal legacy. Be fair.

These sessions are meant to address amendments to the guidebook (SR) and we will talk about next steps and what dates we are looking at. timeline is very tight. Clarity on who makes the decision (SR) - is there a piece that could be added to the GB to help with this concern. or is a separate piece? (SR) - BROADER ENGAGEMENT and AWARENESS.

The LAP should put the neighbourhood connectors in an equal way in all communities - spread them out in all communities regardless the socio-economic. Renfrew was hit hard and feels that there is no logical reason for that.
Feels like all communities will be the same, will be treated the same.

Neighbourhood stability and character-2 years moratorium on DPs
The 16-avenue corridor is not nice. undeveloped lots, lack of strong process/tools to favor development in that main streets. The NH does not support/incentivized development in Main Streets. We need to be better than 2 years, developers would wait.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

AWARENESS issue. wonder why not a lot of people are aware of the GB or the NH.

The city brags that 3,000+ people have an understanding on the GB from the engagement throughout the city, to us that seems too little.

Engagement
Comments that say: Residents feel inform - is concerning as it seems to be opposite to the reality. Some residents did door-to-door polling and results show little people knew.

Miss-information concern
Miss information grows when engagement fails, hence the miss-information is a direct result of the City not doing a good job engaging the broader community. The City is responsible.

Feel like tonight I am heard, however, frustration with people who have shared comments before, people felt they were listened however at the end felt they were ignored, please do not do that again!

Listening and weighing concerns
If more people are against or in favor and one or two have different ideas, listen according to the amount of people talking. No to who is the random person who has a different opinion, especially if they align with the City objectives. If more people are concern, it just means that there is a problem and an opportunity to do things right.

Representation
Need for broader engagement-AWARENESS
Board of Renfrew CA, representation in the process is minimal, only CA and the working group, there was no consensus on the board. CA board are not elected but volunteers and they are given too much power to comment on key decisions that would affect everyone in the community. Engagement should be broader, the CA are 8 people out of 6600, this is not a good representation, it may work if they are given resources to conduct polls, studies, engagement sessions.
CA's have too much weight/responsibility, as a CA we don't want the responsibility to inform residents on the results of the LAPs. Needs to be a broader engagement-direct input from residents, too much responsibility.

Representation - feel like the comments expressed at PH were not represented in the document, door knocking took place and only 10% knew about the GB. Presentation to Council was not reflected of the comments from the people working on the LAP.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Closing Remarks

UNFAIR to run parallel processes for the GB and the LAP. Deal with one first, to have more clarity and more certainty and then do the other one.

LACK OF AWARENESS - Take the time to do a broader engagement for the GB and then start the LAP engagement

GB needs to be completed and approved first

All attention was for the GB. The NH did not get the attention it deserved. specially if it will affect people's lives. Media paid attention to GB only.

FRUSTRATION on the process. feels unfair. decisions feel like they were set since day one.

BE HONEST by showing exactly what the impacts are. Going back to the poster. Use graphic on what 6 storesys look like next to a single-family home.

IMPROVE, not a good job engaging / informing everyone.

Let's do it right! we understand that changes are required.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Thursday, April 15, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 3

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- It would be useful to have a 1:1 matching between themes and discussion points in these documents.
 - One of the biggest challenges was clarity and understanding how it works. Policies needed more layers. Additional scale modifiers are an example of something that would help. Finer grain on building height.
 - It would be useful to have the process shown through a flowchart.
 - There needed to be more examples of how things would be implemented at a community level. That wasn't clear to people.
 - Foundation for a predictable planning system. It wasn't clear as to when ARPs would be developed or redone.
 - Clarify how this would change existing processes.
 - The document seemed more like a marketing document than a planning document. Nothing spoke to exactly how each area would be impacted.
 - Feel like the policies could be more defined. In North Hill they seemed to be applied differently in different areas. Why were similar communities treated differently?
 - Found the guidebook challenging as a statutory doc because it only applies to some areas. Seems to be targeting the inner city.
 - Suggest that it be non-stat first... more below...
 - Are there priorities that the guidebook team is looking at for work on the document by May 5? A: work starting next week...
 - Are these notes going to be made public? A: Yes, these notes and the overall summary.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- If this is a stat doc it should be much more clear.
 - What this appears to say is "we hope you like it, we'll strengthen the language". That's not the point. Clarity is key. The doc appears to be leading down a path, just be clear about that.
 - Don't like partial application of policies. There needs to be a clear link between policy and its application in the LAPs.
 - There needs to be a fair application of policies. It's not fair to have single detached only neighbourhoods and some that are allocated lots of density. Density (50/50 growth goal) should be allocated fairly in the established areas.
 - It's going to be difficult for people to follow changes to the guidebook as they happen. There should be a track changes version of the document. Version tracking. A: That information will be in the report to Council.
 - The document should apply to the whole city and not just zones A & B.
 - Commiserate with Elbow Park. There is a lack of predictability on how things will be applied.
 - Consternation about the plans for 14th Street in Mount Royal, especially how it relates to century homes. Plans for densification without certainty are cause for unease.
 - Some of the statements in the document seem disingenuous.
 - Some of the wealthier neighbourhoods are used as a sort of park because of their character and atmosphere. The potential impacts of the guidebook on these areas is disconcerting.
 - Having participated in a process, it seems like the LAP process was empowering as to where growth goes.
 - Elbow Park reacted to being grouped in with the Beltline. The doc didn't provide predictability and clarity about how they would be impacted.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- On the theme of complete communities, the hearing lost the thread. People spoke about what's important to them. We need to recognize that these topics were discussed but that the guidebook is not the right place. The doc may try to appease a lot of considerations (like climate change) that aren't central to city planning. Those discussions should be picked up elsewhere.

- Schools are a secondary consideration. It's not a topic for the guidebook, but rather for implementation.

- Maybe some of the topics that are outside of planning came up because of the storytelling in the guidebook. Did not find that helpful. It opened up a Pandora's Box of all the other issues residents face. The vision is a place for storytelling but there needs to be a split between that and detailed policy. There's also room for that detailed content in the LAPs.

- Echo the idea of splitting out the storytelling from the policy. Want a section on how things will be applied at the local level.

- Comments in the summary seem to reflect the comments at the public hearing. Concerned that the hearing will get a lot of weight whereas the comments from other engagement will be devalued.

- Echo the point about the stories. Didn't find them realistic or relate able.

- Regarding the silent voices: very few people know about the document. There wasn't an awareness about the process so there was a majority that was silent.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Have no idea what a local area plan (LAP) looks like, how it's started, what goes in it. There needs to be reference to related documents. Functional relations between documents.

- Understanding what your LAP may include would help. Map out what LAPs are and how they differ from communities.

- Discussion of what LAPs are. See North Hill Communities, Heritage Communities, on calgary.ca

- How do communities get grouped together in the LAP processes?

- There were three zones. Maybe have more or re-label the ones that were put in the guidebook.

- Increase the toolkit. There should be rules about when an ARP is initiated (when, where, why). Mount Royal and the Beltline appear to be included in the guidebook and both treated as high density growth areas.

- Guidebook appeared to be centric based, as opposed to TOD.

- Parkhill is in zone B but is already quite dense.

- Seems to be confusion about what zone A & B mean.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Summary covers the comments at the hearing well. How to designate your property as heritage was discussed and should be advertised.
 - Inglewood is an example of a heritage area and there should be preservation strategies for overall areas.
 - A greater degree of granularity would help as opposed to just zone A & B.
 - Age of the neighbourhood was not a good way to split between A & B - that doesn't say much about redevelopment.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- There was some interesting conversation on greenspace. Comments weren't well articulated. Four storey is breaking the tree canopy. The relation between greenspace and planning wasn't there in the guidebook.

- Comments at the public hearing indicated that zoning would be preserved. Are new owners prevented from building something further than that?
A: The new owner would have to apply for a rezoning (aka. land use amendment & redesignation). Staff evaluate based on local area plans and Council ultimately decides.

- What protection does any neighbourhood have from Council and planning? Skeptical about the degree of protection from redevelopment. A: Same as above. Plus, there is a development permit process that allows some avenues for appeal.

- Comment that the LAP process was an empowering exercise where residents are able to plan in a cohesive way and strengthens the ability to discourage applications that don't fit.

- LAPs should be advertised better. Residents can be caught unaware of what plans are saying about their areas. Communication issue.

- Change word heritage to community context. Calgary's heritage is young. It's difficult to make heritage preservation decisions in the absence of context certainty.

- CAs without a strong base can make discussions between planning and citizens difficult because of the absence of leadership and communication channels.

- CAs need to be very active in LAP processes. They should be recognized as a significant body in those processes. Tools need to be given to the CAs to represent the voices of their communities well.

- LAPs have had a number of voices from communities and businesses.

- There has to be a way to mitigate the influence of people who don't understand local context in LAP processes.

- In an LAP process, reps have not tried to influence beyond their area.

- Do community reps have to be on a neighbourhood collector? Do the people participating get affected?

- It's important for the LAP process to have a lessons learned document. They should be transparent to future processes.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- There needed to be a lot more certainty about what can and can't happen on neighbourhood connectors. How many lanes does the street need? Transit? A lot was subjective and the policy needed more clarity.

- The right solution for a place should be taken in context with what exists and should exist. Context will increase neighbourhood stability and character. Don't just try to connect planning typologies.

- Some comments on the zones A & B above should be copied over here.

- Adding to LUB section - even on neighbourhood connectors, maybe the height differential should be limited to 2 storeys. Contextual height limits.

- Is there a way to have a person come to an LAP process as a heritage expert? A: The City has heritage experts that can be involved.

- Heritage expertise would be a valuable part of a planing process.

- Like shop houses - Mission Road. Mixed use developments should not be haphazard. Just because something is a busier road doesn't mean it's a good location for retail. Not sure that there's enough criteria for limiting retail in areas where it doesn't belong.

- Concerns about what retail businesses would be allowed on neighbourhood connectors. Nuisance of adjacent businesses could affect nearby residents. Criteria to prevent this.

- Create an environment for businesses to succeed. How wide are the corridors and how far can they cut into communities? How those features transition into communities is important. Be careful about what goes on connectors.

- Why does the (description of proposed amendments to the) guidebook say that single detached policy areas should not be identified for certain areas? A: Proposed amendments will capture these discussions as well.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Comments earlier in the session apply here.
 - Context versus building blocks needs to be explored. What makes a neighbourhood stable? What factors does planning put into making a neighbourhood stable? Define how specific decisions relate to this.
 - If we're going to continue down the path of a toolkit then the toolkit needs to be elaborated.
 - How do we do better actions related to scalability?
 - Concerned that allowing areas to be designated as single detached will push density to other places. Will we need more six storey buildings along connectors because some areas won't accept duplexes.
 - The moratorium should be 5-10 years to provide an incentive for these areas to receive development
 - Point about maintaining current lot coverage/heights, etc. and that was supported.
 - When redevelopment goes in, it should be comprehensive enough that businesses don't get stranded. The places become dead spaces
 - Remove policy about being able to consider applications above the scale put in a plan.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Views engagement as a precursor to any refinement of the guidebook. Understating it and its purpose. How things apply on a community by community basis. It really needs to have people on board and understanding. Right now there's still quite a bit of misunderstanding.

- Community newsletters and other messages were absent. Maybe there's an opportunity to change the way we communicate and how messages are pushed out to people. Part of the solution would be CA messaging.

- Sympathy regarding outreach because channels are not available. Social media as a outreach tool? How do we raise awareness effectively? No easy answer.

- The LAP engagement was not successful. Stumbled upon the process by accident. The messaging on signs or postcards may have been ambiguous. Didn't suggest that there would be impacts. A better naming system. Unless people know surveys exist, they can't engage.

- The guidebook is a massive undertaking. When the city does a large change like this, a fear reaction should be anticipated; to mitigate this, there needed to be education and not just communication. There may have been deliberate misinformation put out there. Reaching individual households is a challenge, sympathy, but it needed to happen and didn't.

- Putting a notification in a tax assessment would have helped. We still need that level of engagement. This should be an election issue. Not even 20% of the city knows what this is about. People feel overwhelmed by the size and complexity of the document. People may not realize how impactful this is.

- If this is a citywide doc, why did the only people who showed up come from the areas on the map?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Regarding citywide engagement; last year the city promised a citywide engagement process; covid hit and the city was sent back to do more engagement; they didn't do more; and this raises the question of whether the city does what it says. It's odd to say that communication took place. Doesn't think that the citywide engagement actually took place. Engagement was directed to the three areas where a LAP was underway. May have caused the negative reaction.

- Wants to see the priorities, dates and purpose of the engagement plan that will get rolled out on the guidebook. There needs to be buy-in and understanding about what the document is. Doing this initially may have changed the level of acceptance.

- This as an engagement setup is good. Guidebook 101 sessions only had a chat and didn't allow for a more 1:1 level of discussion and understanding.

- Appreciate this session. Explanations helpful.

- Would hate to see this become a political issue in the election. Thinks the doc is close. It would be wasteful to throw out the work done by making things overly political. How to avoid?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Friday, April 16, 11:00am - 1:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 1

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

What is the difference between a statutory policy, policy or a guide/guidebook?
Sense that a statutory document is more rigid, whereas a guidebook may be more flexible in terms of what is included in an LAP. Is this the case?
Would like to see it initially as non-statutory at the start that could become statutory as we've had the opportunity to work with it/ determine how it's working.
Concern about non-stat: that LAPs change over time and risk becoming more inconsistent. More pressure on project team and Council in approving each LAP.
Intent of the Guidebook-one intent is to be nimble. Updates to the Guidebook would cascade through all LAPs instead of individual LAPs. This ability to apply in all LAPs makes it more important to get the document right up front, given its importance to each LAP.
Given that each community planning process will be independent and consider the unique context of the community(ies) involved the output of an LAP must supercede (take precedence) the Guidebook to empower that the specific outcome in that LAP.
Concern that the Guidebook that is statutory may erode decisions made in LAP policy--the Guidebook may be used to undercut LAP policy where they conflict.
Clarity of what the policy expectation is regarding the relationship of LAP and the Guidebook.
Concern that changes to the Guidebook after the adoption of an LAP would change what was originally intended in the LAP.
The translation of policy to land use bylaw/district rules are not easily translated. Specifications are unclear.
Clarity of goals: not always a clarity of intent. This should be better spelled out for the public, transparency



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Some terms are not defined, like "near", in the Guidebook. Will this potentially lead to different interpretations over time. Would promote the use of metrics to better define some of the terms that are not precise.

Maybe the way "shall" is defined would be better if it is defined as "should" is currently. "Should" sounds wishy-washy.

The perception is that the Guidebook is a top down document/relationship for LAP planning. The tools define how and where change/density would occur in a community. Do these tools/building blocks limit the ability of community member to define the specific application of policy in their communities?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Community welcome new residents, the barrier to entry is often affordability. If people can purchase a home then they are welcomed.
The intensity of feeling with regard to each of the topics is not expressed here.
Likely to be a shift in how people view amenities, work, etc post pandemic. Calgary advantages - we need to understand these more precisely. Inner-city community attractiveness brings people to the city. Therefore we need to be careful about what we do with our neighbourhoods because it may result eroding what is attractive to people in/coming to the city.
Difficult to weight the comments/input because they are often at odds with one another.
We don't know what the future holds, there are different potential population outcomes. If the building blocks work well, are broad enough, that they can work today and be adjusted as trends change. We can't predict what Calgary will look like, so we shouldn't be too rigid in how we plan. It needs to be malleable/flexible, not overly prescriptive.
The need for the public to understand the intent and how it links to the decisions made. Explicit as to how planning responds to issues as they arise, or that we can see on the horizon (eg pandemic)
Some communities have limited ability to be involved in the public hearing process. It appears that more change have occurred in the past little while than the last 2 years, where is the input from the earlier process?
Some communities have schools/amenities that are closed/closing, meanwhile density/population may be growing. Maybe the link between growth and the requirements/investment in amenities/institutions could be more explicit.
Climate action and sustainability. Need for clearer targets, not in there yet, incompatibility with LUB/LOC process that references these outcomes, but there is no tie in on these metrics.
Agree that it is difficult to predict the future, so things need to be flexible. Some predictions see a move from urban communities to suburban or small town communities. We should ensure that we don't lose communities in Calgary that offer this lifestyle, since you can't get it back once it's changed.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

A land acknowledgement should be added, is not controversial. It is meaningful to some people and should be included. Zone A, intent is that these areas are likely to have additional density. However, there needs to be a way for the communities to collaborate with The City to determine together how/where this density/change happens. Community targets may be a good way to establish a foundation for this collaboration. Secondary suites/backyard suites should be counted as additional density. Why do people choose the inner-city vs. newer communities. It's because they are looking for authentic communities. More community specific policies in Guidebook, not just for pre-1940's communities, but in other communities too. Green space is important, maintaining a lower lot coverage while adding density is key. Streetscapes, maintaining lot coverage limits would retain harmonious streetscapes. Guidebook: if it has a door to the street it is a single family home. If we're going to maintain infrastructure in this city, if we layer in restrictions then it will be difficult to accommodate density. Targets for each community would ensure some equity in this distribution. Otherwise it can result in an unfair/uneven distribution of growth or density. Yes to avoid nimbysm the option should be given to each community how they density and should be community specific. Older communities like Elbow Park should not have density. Can each community be discussed individually in the MDP? Perception that the Guidebook is going to result in a broad brush that's going to be across the whole city. It needs to be written that each community should be evaluated based on needs, vintage, and what people in the community desire. Risk of larger LAP areas is that they lump different communities together that have different capacities/willingness to accommodate growth. Different things in different communities should be captured. It's good to have different options in different locations. Wish to see the City and developers as a partner. Different communities perform different functions.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Not enough in GB with respect to tools to protect heritage stock. Grant program and property tax incentive works well, valuable to a home owner. These tools are not sufficient on commercial or multi properties, they don't offset the profit/revenue potential on these higher density sites. The ability to sell unused density (like downtown) would be good for Mission/Inglewood/Ramsay. The process that starts earlier when there's consideration of removing a heritage building the community should be involved earlier to see if there's a better option to demolition. The value of the heritage assets should not be left up to the developers is not effective. Developers should not be allowed to knock down a building until they consult with the community, the city and heritage Calgary. Metrics for heritage retention policies, what are the goals? Clear as to what the policies are intended to achieve. Heritage value is not just reflected in one site, rather the area is as important, if not more important, than the individual site. Advocate for additional tool to be added to create a boundary for a heritage district for a greater area than the blockface. Retain property value, can be used for commercial too. Concern heritage designation and tools is another way to prevent change in some communities that lead to prioritizing other goals, climate action, diversity, etc. Heritage tools don't necessarily prevent evolution rejuvenation of neighbourhoods.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Could development permit consideration for identified assets be circulated to the whole community instead of just the community association?
Value to having applications for heritage assets circulated to communities as whole so that residents have an opportunity to be involved in development proposal design.
Heritage Guidelines not available yet, so not clear what these will be. Protections, not only adjacent but near (this is an unclear term). Front setbacks are an important part of these guidelines. Discretionary guidelines added to collector streets.
Heritage means architectural features and form (massing, scale, patterns of development), not what is inside the building (density).
Heritage district tools, also accounts for heritage assets and heritage sites in inventory in the area.
Restrictive Covenants that define local patterns of development, it makes sense to have LAPs reflect these building schemes.
Process for heritage preservation can be approved: developer/owner has right to demolish an inventory asset, once a sale takes place the developer has decided outcome. The conversation should happen earlier that could kick-start the preservation process (maybe at "optioning" phase) before decision are changed.
Heritage districts need to be noted somewhere so that there is previous knowledge for the prospective buyer. Possibly at the pre-app process. Or in due diligence documents (like a caveat), so there's an understanding about the additional requirements for the application.
Could we establish a heritage fund that supported someone with a heritage asset to maintain the heritage property? Additionally provide information about value of heritage asset.
Sometimes the experience of the process of preserving heritage can be lengthy/cumbersome. There needs to be something of a common sense test to these limitations/regulations.
Transition between heritage/non-heritage areas, would this differ from transition from higher to lower density areas? Are we prioritizing heritage over other MDP goals. The transition of density occurs over a shorter distance than is required for heritage, this seems uneven/unequal.
Need for some standards/definitions for what constitutes heritage. We make it too easy for developers to ignore the value of heritage assets, it should be harder. It should be easier for people who own heritage to maintain preserve these assets.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Guidebook does not apply until LAP is in place. Is there a potential need for a moratorium on land use amendments/development until an LAP is adopted? Legal challenges to this approach. Intent? Where are the protections for the individual, local community. Multi-community scale of plans. Individual voices may be limited, which may result in the individual desires of a community being limited/silenced. Lack of guardrails in GB to protect the individual nature/character of a community.

Are there guidelines for how LAP is defined? For example Altadore should not be lumped with Elbow Park. Communities should be linked together because they are like communities.

GB should result in greater incentive/requirement for a developer to consult with the community.

Lack of transition language within the current LUB. The change may be too abrupt. Need for more contextual language. The change from low to limited needs more transition.

How can the City respect the restrictive covenant, understanding the limitations? Is there a way for the City to get to the outcome of the restrictive covenant? Response to the form/pattern the restrictive covenant has established. Can we not just leave them and inform people about them? How do we make sure that we get the appropriate mix/representation of people in the LAP engagement process? This is important to realize. Some decisions, setbacks, height, coverage, may be very important in some communities and not in others. So many decisions need to be made at the local level. Having the building blocks establish a foundation that is used in a process involving community residents who are aware of the specific needs/attributes of the community.

Strong local area plan process can help with the certainty for both market and residents. This could also help balance out growth across neighbourhoods instead of being too focused.

An LAP can better reflect local design contexts. Specificity would direct development.

LAP guiding where density goes, communities being able to place R-CG. Different options for adding density allowing communities to choose.

No need for Zone A and Zone B. These will change over time, work with discretion with LAP community involvement.

Same lot coverage for R-CG as for other R districts.

LUB tool of FAR not equivalent to height definitions for scale in GB.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Neighbourhood Stability & Character**

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Include engagement strategy for LAP in GB is a good idea. How does the LAP process deal with lack of consensus among stakeholders? Need to ensure that the views and voices of the local community are properly heard. Guidelines to ensure that views of local communities are heard and weighed in decisions. Need to define what engagement will look like up front. No tool for people in the broader community to be involved in the guidebook tools, a city-wide engagement process. Selection for working groups is selected through community representations. Resources for community associations and volunteers to support the representative work, as well as expectations around communication. One experience was very geared to inform rather than consult/engage. Developers appear to be over-represented in LAP engagement. Ideally the Guidebook should not be an election issue. There is significant disagreement over just a few issues. If we wait we risk losing the benefits. Need for assurance that MDP goals will be met. Before the engagement process starts there need to be clear expectations around growth/change metrics translate into each LAP or community. Difficulty in seeing the voice of our community in the what we heard report. No closure on conversation, when things were raised it wasn't clear why decisions were made. If we really want change we need to mobilize for the public hearing. No, this should not be an election issue. City-wide engagement on the Guidebook needs to be done. Explain the principles and goals city-wide. This outreach needs to address planning more generally, how the Guidebook fits with the MDP. Some section in the LAP that recognizes some minority opinions in the report. Should this be an election issue? Depends on the outcome of the next session, if people are satisfied then no, otherwise it will be. Bridge the evolution from the MDP to the Guidebook, things like TOD, Main Streets, that were adopted in between. How did we get here? Can every community have community specific policies, not just for heritage tools? Yes. Then this should be reflected/specified in the GB. Language to help asking these questions may be good (eg. setbacks).



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Friday, April 16, 11:00am - 1:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 2

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Better explain how 3 heritage layers fit in with neighbourhood local UFC

How limited scale modifiers will work - heritage areas fitting in with the use

Interpretation of MDP is to place density along corridors and activity centres - guidebook appears to increase density in other areas not necessarily in alignment with MDP.

Connections to CTP and how that works with collectors etc.

Established areas growth and change policies should be brought into the guidebook and clarify what will happen to infill guidelines

Guidebook to sit in the middle of MDP along with land use bylaw if these are statutory, must be followed by the guidebook and LAP process

Confusion around statutory and non statutory and what the intention is and whether or not this is good for communities

If the guidebook becomes non statutory how will that impact the LAP?

Feeling of minimal trust around how communities were treated in the process. Communities were not included in sessions (mistrust of the process itself)

Were told guidebook would inform updates to the land use bylaw angry around accusations of misinformation

Broken trust needs to be repaired

Risk management comments in Oct. 2019 noted engagement as a risk and it has been a large concern.

Have not seen a financial rationale for undergoing the guidebook process

Seen largely as a push to increase density

Redevelopment can negatively affect affordability (ie. tearing down a \$500k single family home and build two \$800k semi detached homes

Financial incentive to the city of densification - city needs to be transparent on purpose

Feel like community is being attacked



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Have density projections been presented?

The existing DAG is non statutory. Correct? LAPs developed under the existing DAG are statutory - so why any different?
If non statutory, will approval and future amendments be subject to a public hearing of council?
No demographics, targets or projections included in the North Hill LAP
Zone A and B - lower density communities are in the outer donut. Seems to be unfair based on the intent of the guidebook.

I would add comment that, not only density projections, but what data was used to get to the density projections.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

If non statutory will approval and future amendments be subject to a public hearing of Council?

Non statutory (at least for now) would likely be helpful.

May be opportunity to change to statutory once more LAPs are completed

Why did mayor at the public hearing note that this was a guidebook and non statutory?

The issue above speaks to the confusion in communities and adds to that.

Would the guidebook being statutory impact the land use amendment process and the ability to provide feedback or to have decisions made through a public hearing

Has guidebook been created in part because of new powers granted through new city charter

Will there still be the ability to make comments on development applications? Yes if its a land use change, not a permitted contextual infill.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

During the process there were some councillors who used the racism card and this is offensive
Different versions of what a complete community means

Infrastructure, Services and Amenities - one size fits all does not apply. Opportunities throughout the city that can address a lot of the densification pressures (i.e. larger development sites - Oakridge Coop)
Downtown has opportunity to accommodate more growth through building conversions

Guidebook forces densification a lot of areas where the life cycle pressures aren't there

Pandemic not acknowledged and it should be and there is major impact

Targets and growth projections need to be revisited

Need to pay more attention to climate change.
Retaining green space and trees. too much concrete will create issues (ex. of Houston and flooding issues).

Leap in judgment on school enrollment and densification - other factors influence school size (ex. charter schools)

Above speaks to one size fits all concerns as well.

Metrics and growth should be dealt with at LAP. Guidebook should truly be a guide, with LAP drilling down on the details including density and population



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Should be direction on opportunities for repurposing buildings (not necessarily heritage) to meet community needs
identify those sites that help define sense of place and really matter to communities

Specific Metrics are needed in each LAP for heritage retention, green space per 1000 pop, urban tree canopy, climate action (eg reduction of demolition waste going to landfill)

Agree with desired outcomes

On development sites there needs to be tree protection/replacement on private sites - many difficulties when it comes to setbacks and lot coverage

How does the guidebook address 'unseen' infrastructure?

Feeling like Identifying growth targets in local area plans was one of the most contentious parts of the hearing. Need to also look at density that has been accepted

Need clarification of what the criteria is on accepting density and where it is appropriate.

Forcing density in middle of community needs to be addressed

Infrastructure is a concern and capacity needs to be addressed

Review on infrastructure appears to be broken on development applications.

Are the same considerations on infrastructure made along City projects (i.e. Green Line)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Acknowledge new heritage tools and incentives are the most progressive policies calgary has seen to date

Not clear how they will work with the urban form categories only apply to pre 1945 residential properties

Missing non-residential component and protection of those outside the 1 off approach to protecting heritage in the city

Hoping to see this more integrated in the LAP process

Multi-community approach is positive for heritage considerations in LAPs

Need to see how effective the tools may be

Many not aware or have understanding on what policies are coming in

Fine tuning of what's included in the guidebook rather than an overhaul

Re-purposing of buildings should be required - language 'required' may be too strong in LAPs unless heritage resource is owned and managed by city or province.

Heritage streetscapes involved more than trees - more character elements on setbacks, architectural elements

Will infill guidelines be removed if guidebook is adopted?

What will be protecting these heritage properties if this is the case blanket upzoning de-incentivizes retention of heritage properties

One person's heritage is another's old dilapidated building; it is in the eye of the beholder. Calgary's 'heritage' is a bald prairie, not one with large trees. I have a concern that Communities will use it as a way to avoid taking on densification.

Support of future heritage and mid-century communities - may be value in moving dates of what's considered heritage



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

The post war/oil boom (50's 60's) was Calgary's 2nd big development era (after pre WWI)

Wording vague re: 'near' or 'on' heritage main streets

Consideration of connection of commercial and residential heritage development under similar theme, area, architecture etc.

Need clarification of where they may be overlap areas of residential and commercial heritage areas. Need to be protected on at least an interim basis while that work is being completed.

Protecting the most heritage assets may not be the right outcome. Want to encourage designation of properties that are brought into the inventory.

Extension of protection to a property that could be added to inventory (under contract) - applications on adjacent properties would be subject to additional building rules



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Appears to be blanket approach of sprinkling things throughout communities

Connector areas can appear out of thin air

Sensitivity and contextual nature of where single detached homes and higher intensity development (i.e. 6 storeys) are located

Community voices have to be heard on where density occur

Zone a and b - lack of understanding around intent. May need to be revisited or removed

Current LUB rules generally work well

Should be made clear that restrictive covenants overrides all city planning, if you want to contravene the RC a developer would have to remove it through the courts.

City needs to be clear with developer where restrictive covenants exist

Guidebook and LAP needs to acknowledge these exist and the City is not party to the agreements

Single family issue framed as a racist issue was disappointing - should be made clear in the guidebook that the issues aren't about race or social inclusion/exclusion

Acknowledge importance of single family homes as part of the fabric of this city (part of the heritage of the city)

Well planned areas of densification make much more sense than zones a and b.

Not just RC's - some communities also have existing DCs. These existing instruments should be acknowledged in the specifics of the LAPS - eg setbacks etc.

Support for removing zone a and b (x2)

Some good in proposals from Cllrs. Gondek and Farkas

Tools for momansions that are proposed adjacent to smaller homes

Single family areas attract people to the city. what does a new resident look for in moving to a new neighbourhood?

Zones a and b not aligned with MDP.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

If 600 metres from transit stations is applied this could apply to entire communities (i.e. University Heights minus 2 lots are within 600m of transit)

Cllr. Gondek amendment does not provide the tools to guide increased density as per comment above.

Using a distance from transit does not apply to many communities



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Identifying actual streets that will be considered high density

Have to look at actual traffic counts of collectors - looking at threshold based on amount of traffic the collector takes. If low, may be appropriate to keep existing housing form if that's what the community wants.

Cllr. Farkas' amendment looked street by street and low/medium intensity. Could be pieced to include in proposed amendments.

Some communities don't fit well with guidebook policies - puts communities in a tough position when it comes to the LAP process.

Have several streets that were not built to take an increase in density or an increase in traffic because of what's included in the guidebook.

Communities may need special consideration if they don't fit the mold.

No definition of what a collector is. creates confusion with guidebook and LAPs (Renfrew example).

Criteria to "maintain" - maybe respect is a better word - status quo not necessarily a desired outcome but going from 20-30% average lot coverage in some older communities to 45% allowed now to 60% potential is a huge leap

Those with single family homes would potentially make a lot of money by selling of higher density development. Not an issue of money in wanting to retain single family homes - it is quality of life

Totally agree on the quality of life issue. That is far more important to me than the value of my house.

Desired outcome of Neighbourhood Stability Actions: is community harmony - not pitting neighbours against each other. Respecting RCs and patterns of streetscapes that were "bought into", Gaining trust and acceptance of where redevelopment should go.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Public engagement will always be hard. people will always complain whether consulted or not

Too many processes and committees - overlap between content and discussion which is a suck on time and energy

Streamline engagement - get confused as to what the true intentions of the City are.

Keep it down to 1 process

Agree with comments above

Biggest issue was dealing with North Hill ARP at the same time as the guidebook

Would like a focus on the guidebook and then focus on the North Hill LAP

Didn't make sense that North Hill was going at the same time. Guidebook should have been done first.

Process was rushed - all LAPs should follow guidebook

Issue of technology and access is very important

Language barriers in engagement need to be considered and those views captured.

Too many projects overlapping has been overwhelming - creates burn out

The initial engagements were invite-only and ergo were in-camera.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Some CAs are not in good contact with their community members flatten the process to include all community members with secondary suites all R-1 owners received a letter from the City on the change.

Selection of LAP Committee and criteria for that. Need consistent training for that group. FCC could provide the training to members that touch on heritage, climate change, diversity etc. Have to bring members along a bit

Reasonable changes to the guidebook to allow decision by Council would be better than having a new Council decide.

We (our CA) put City updates on the Guidebook in our newsletter and Dale Calkins, Ward 7 attended one board meeting. As far as I know, we were not contacted by the City re the Guidebook. We urged people to get engaged but not may chose to do so.

FCC was a lifeline to us as far as knowing what was going on and offering workshops.

LAPs are too large and engagement is hindered because of this



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Friday, April 16, 11:00am - 1:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 3

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- These points reflects the confusion that we heard at the public hearing.

- Want to stress a ton of confusion being one of the communities (Renfrew) that were working in tandem with a local area plan. The local area plan is not in alignment with the guidebook. The local area plan impacts the community directly and didn't realize there was a larger guidebook that was being worked on at the same time.

- in comparing the Guidebook with the local area plan found a lot of things that were not adhering to the Guidebook.

- For example a street that was indicated to be neighbourhood local is shown to have a 6 storey building. Building scale does not align and does not have a gradual decrease in transition.

- in terms of lack of clarity, the Municipal Development Plan specifically identifies what a Guidebook and local area plan should have in it.

- if you are worried of space there is a few things that can be taken out of the guidebook. If the planner has to keep going back to the MDP it will cause confusion.

- example of the LAP not adhering to the guidebook. section 2.1a. 86% of the development is within the residential area.

- statutory documents require to be consulted with the school board. This is a very important point. Concerned if it is a guidebook or is it law.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- do not understand fully the implications of being non stat vs statutory. What would it be if it was non-statutory?
 - Why call it the Guidebook when it was intended to be statutory?
 - Who gets to vote on the adoption of a local area plan?
 - should and shall statements in terms of climate change and stability. One comment came up in some cases they consider it being too restrictive for their area. Maybe some places where you can step back from should statements and make it more discretionary.
 - Would like clarification if the guidebook becomes non statutory how would it affect the north hill local area plan. How would this be handled in the short time frame.
 - Is it possible for the north hill plan to be approved before the guidebook?
 - if the local area plan chooses not to implement a policy, for example scale transition. If it is ignored, does it matter if its regulatory or not.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- does generally reflect what people said.
 - found this document excellent when reviewing it. Once concern is the link between single family homes and racism. Strongly encourage administration to carefully consider and ask them to take the racism discussion and the link to single family homes out of the discussion. Have not seen evidence of this. This is a dangerous statement to put out to the city.
 - its a deflection making this about racism. it is about height of buildings and density for my community.
 - to the first point, also take issue with it. We desire inclusion and diversity in our communities. What is actually proposed and developed for our community does not address this goal. increases gentrification and actually pushes out people in the community. This is not creating diversity, inclusion and affordability for people. there is a disconnect with what the guidebook set out and what is actually being created.
 - research shows we are not achieving inclusion and diversity. Are you trying to create gentrification, or trying to encourage inclusivity that people are looking for.
 - statistic that was in realesate.ca. 87% of rosedale is single family detached dwelling and 31% of Renfrew has this. However the local area plan, has slotted no increase in density in Rosedale while much more density in Renfrew. Renfrew has scored lesser in walkability compared to Rosedale yet Rosedale is not receiving that density. Rosedale is across the street from SAIT. Why shouldn't it also be affected.
 - There is declining population and schools are closing but there are other communities where schools are full. The MGA does require the Guidebook if statutory for the City to consult the school boards. CBE has confirmed they were not considered in the density increase discussions.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- need better coordination between what the school needs and what the City needs.

- key issue is the activity centers and the main streets. direction #3 of the MDP says that the city should direct density and activity to the main streets.

- curious whether in the planning process we looked at American cities in terms of Calgary's economy and where head offices are located. Have we done analysis to cities similar to us.

- Can the City release the quantitative data on the demand of inner city units? What targets are we needing in our inner city communities.

- Is the Guidebook headed in the right direction given the expansion of new communities. Development in the suburbs has hurt the existing communities as more funding has gone out to the fringes. We have an oversupply of housing in multi-family and not single family. CMHC has not identified which housing type the oversupply.

- the pandemic has highlighted an increase in the need for amenities. there is a need for large living spaces and private green spaces. shows the population wants to go towards single family housing. after the pandemic is over there will still be a bias to less dense housing options based on the hybrid work environments.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- heritage section provides contradiction as protection for existing buildings in comparison to the goals of the Guidebook to provide diversity and inclusion. This piece increases gentrification and protects certain communities.
- find it unfair where it does not protect shadowing and green spaces. It will end up protecting communities such as Rosedale



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- We are conflicted on this issue. recognize the value of preservation but we don't know how far to go through with this but have not had the time. From our view climate change is equally important.

- Maximum scale. an important topic for Renfrew receiving the highest amount of increased scale. The Local area plan was not communicated clearly. There were very few people that knew about it and what they knew of it. Did not understand that this allows up to 6 storey scaling. Low support for this type of densification. It was about shading, not having privacy left in your backyard or home. We feel that this is way to drastic going from bungalows to 6 storeys. we propose the idea of having a 2 storey differential. For example if the lowest building block is a bungalow it, future development would be restricted to 2 storeys.

- shading and daylight is the most significant issue for most homeowners. There needs to be some sort of solar access provisions in the Guidebook and local area plans. There needs to be some type of mechanism, maybe compensation or consent.

- The last point. this affects real people and sometimes what gets lost in the planning stage. You cannot forget the human aspect in the discussion including the financial impact.

- There should be some sharing in the increased in land value more than just for developers. The city needs to get something back in terms of financial benefits.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- The push towards density has not done an adequate job in the decrease of green spaces. Massing and setbacks are also an issue because ultimately its better for a persons mental well being when they have access to green space and nature.

- had a lot of problems with Zone A and Zone B. need something were ordinary citizens can understand. If you put a fence around a community there needs to be some ability to assess whether there are financial impacts to the rest of the area or other parts of the city. There is some value in preserving these neighbourhoods but need to look at the impacts downstream. question of balance and fairness to these conservation and protected zones.

- inner city property values pay for the existing infrastructure. would like to see a strategy designed with a lens on equity.

- the discussion is framed as inner city has a higher income. Renfrew does not fit in this narrative. The community has a high rental rate in the community and find it insulting that an idea is put out there that lower income families are only supposed to live in high density housing types. there are lower income households in low density housing that is being forgotten. it will lead to a polarization between lower income high density housing versus higher income low density housing.

- The city disclaiming against restrictive covenants is not ideal. the City should put the onus on developers rather than the residents. This gives the advantage to developers. It should be up to the developer to consult the neighbours on the restrictive covenant.

- disappointed with the citys response on restrictive covenants. the covenants should be respected if applicable.

- Crescent Heights too is very high in renters as well. Perhaps that is why we are targeted for redevelopment. A real shame as like Renfrew we have a vibrant mixed community. Crescent Heights and Renfrew have been targetted for more density due to some current statistics.

- the City of Calgary does not have discriminatory restrictive covenants and this is been brought in from outside the City.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- 2 year moratorium is needed when going into a local area planner. The other recommendation is to freeze rezoning until the plan is finished.

- Totally agree with that, especially since we as residents who are drastically affected haven't been informed or consulted about what is being proposed. The detail of what was planned for each street was done quietly.

- the moratorium does not go far enough. 16th avenue is a prime example of how there has been no development. There is no safeguard in the community, that the main streets be developed first. developers will come into the neighbourhood to buy the cheaper parcels rather than developing current main streets. There needs to be more than a 2 year moratorium to ensure the main streets are built up before our residential roads.

- developers will clearly choose to buy up cheaper land on the residential streets over building out the main streets first.

- activity centres and main streets have been ignored by the City. The MDP states that development should be directed to these corridors. If we are going to have Transit and service, we are going to need these main streets to be developed.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- did not feel heard at all. Was told to raise this with the councillor. If I knew the effect of this document, I would be involved and have spoken to my neighbours. This should be changed as the right people were not involved. Only place information was received from the community association letter.

- The city has alot of tools. I would have included a notice with the property taxes and given a year lead time or leverage the media. Administration mentioned a lot of misinformation put out by certain community associations. the citys myths and facts statement was vague and felt the city was trying to manipulate the message. I am glad to be part of this conversation today to voice our concerns. Creates a mistrust in the process.

- The name north hill commuities local are plan was very ambiguous. People didnt know the location due to the name North Hill. Didnt know the plan was developed at the same time as the Guidebook. The city is responsible for the misinformation. The way it was presented. if it was labeled 6 storey buildings were coming to your neighbourhood there would be a different response. the way it was posed was disingenuous. More visual images of their streetscape after implementation, a lot more people would have gotten engaged. feels like there were a select number of people included.

- I do not feel the city should be putting the responsibility on community associations. no consensus in community associations and a few people on the Renfrew board gave their support which does not represent the community equitably.

- Re the name - yes I saw big signs on 10th Street and I thought it had to do with area around North Hill Mall.

- hard to get everyone involved. Any amendments to local area plans needs to require community engagement.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- There is a possibility that if it were to become an election issue, people tend to pay more attention. Sounds like one of the better options at this point.

- do not think it is anywhere close to being ready, all of these issues need to be addressed before council votes on it. Do not think the timeline will align. I like the notion of it being an election issue but I am afraid of the politics of it. Polarizing and mean in social media. People will just pick a side rather than understanding it. It will pit communities against each other which will be the opposite result of great communities.

- goes back to the previous comment of looping racism in it.

- two different engagement strategies between the guidebook and the local area plan. Much happier to see the guidebook approved first before the local area plan.

- as a resident of the north hill local area plan, prefer to not be the guinea pigs. Approve the guidebook first and fix the amendments before rushing the local area plan.

- What are we going to do with the feedback received today and what will happen in the May PUD meeting?

- Concerned with the amount of time to incorporate all the feedback.

- postpone the PUD meeting to allow for time to distribute amendments to the Guidebook to the participants. A short timeline would lead to an ingenious result.

- How is feedback in the local area plan going to be distributed and what type of impact will it have on the local area plan? Forward this document to the North Hill Local Area Plan team.

- the number one amendment is to push the PUD date which allows the citizens to provide feedback.

- Please don't ask us to waste our time. We have to take an incredible amount of time out of our lives and this feels like we are trying to defend our communities and not creating great communities.

- Strongly opposed the May 5th PUD date. It is an unreasonable amount of time to provide feedback.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Friday, April 16, 11:00am - 1:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 4

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Doesn't fully reflect submissions, but is a good summary that captures many. Doesn't capture level of engagement. Doesn't really capture clearly what the guidebook (GB) will do. Does it replace the DAG (developed areas guidebook)?

(AC) -- Only applies with a local area plan based on the Guidebook This is difficult to understand. The gb is not in place yet. North Hill (NH) LAP is a pilot project.

There is no reference to the GBGC in the MDP which is adding to the confusion. It looks like we are going to be living with the DAG and GBGC for several years

Doesn't capture the level of engagement, no comments about COVID. COVID challenged engagement because of technology limitations, i.e. not being able to access the bridge for public hearing (PH) because it was full. The PH was long and that made it less accessible.

Clarity -- concerns about the principles in the Guidebook are not reflected in the NH LAP. Connection from GB to NH LAP are not clear.

How does the GB fit into the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the term LAP is used interchangeably with ASP/ARP. MDP hierarchy -- rename the DAG part 3A, GB added as part 3B, need to clarify which applies to which. GB failed to explain where it falls in the planning hierarchy and what its legal standing is. (See this page on the City's website. Scroll down to Guidebook for GC heading Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Volume 2: Community Guidebooks (calgary.ca)) Doesn't explain its relationship to the DAG. DAG has different concepts, in conflict, with the GB.

****CLARITY****

Worry that the DAG will be replaced quietly by the GB in the future. Should statements, all the documents have a definition for should but it isn't well known. Should be replaced by must and shall in some places.

Guide/Statutory (stat) -- public discussion concern about this becoming a stat document, people are leaning towards it being not a statutory document. Making this a stat document is going to be problematic as it meshes with the MDP. Significantly eroding community distinctions. Fear about a statutory route.

There is not enough time to review the report before PUD.

Timelines feel rushed, Council is changing in the fall.

Concerned about ambiguities. Wondering about restrictive covenants. How is a community chosen to be part of a LAP? Need more information about this to understand.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Benefit of GB being statutory is that it can't be changed except via Council + public hearing. If non-stat, easily and quietly amended and need not be consistent with MDP.

Concern with it NOT being a statutory document because growth is happening with or without a guidebook, and with the current system, there's actually a bigger danger of the growth being more random and not forward thinking because of the ability for developers/owners to just apply for land redesignation of individual lots, in any location.

Guidebook was made statutory so that LAPs didn't have to repeat what was in the GB. Originally the NHCLAP had all the policies in the GB and it was confusing.

LAPs need metrics to measure success and make changes.

Renfrew does not feel as if their voice has been listened to. Does not feel that community assets have been protected.

(from chat):

- Benefit of GB being statutory is that it can't be changed except via Council + public hearing. If non-stat, easily and quietly amended and need not be consistent with MDP.
- Concern with it NOT being a statutory document because growth is happening with or without a guidebook, and with the current system, there's actually a bigger danger of the growth being more random and not forward thinking because of the ability for developers/owners to just apply for land redesignation of individual lots, in any location.
- Guidebook was made statutory so that LAPs didn't have to repeat what was in the GB. Originally the NHCLAP had all the policies in the GB and it was confusing.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

How are the communities decided for inclusion in each LAP group? Our LAP group includes areas completely functionally disconnected with the rest of the neighbourhoods.
Doesn't reflect what was said at the public hearing.
Concern about must/shall. MDP means essentially "must". Definition of "should" is not understood.
Must/shall doesn't allow flexibility and there are times you need flexibility according to City definition. Planning dept tends to look at should as optional and that is concerning. More education is needed.
Developers are favoured by planning processes, that is a concern.
Crescent Height Community Association has voted to withdraw from the NHCLAP. However they are working with Druh Farrell to make changes.
pg. 117 should policy should be 90% certain, with a small scope of discretion, extremely limited. not "reasonable practical feasible" but rather "physically unachievable" Exceptions should be minor. Do not want policy by exception where the exception becomes the rule.
Any "should" decision should be discretionary, not contextual and the City need to consult with the community and immediate neighbours.
Comments about development occurring over time linked to the use of the work "should" under the MDP and Guidebook (meaning must unless the City in its discretion determines otherwise) drives developers to build insensitive developments cheaply to make a buck. Developers should not be stakeholders in this discussion unless they are building appropriate developments that are quality and fit into the community.

(from chat):
- Any "should" decision should be discretionary, not contextual and the City need to consult with the community and immediate neighbours.
- Comments about development occurring over time linked to the use of the work "should" under the MDP and Guidebook (meaning must unless the City in its discretion determines otherwise) drives developers to build insensitive developments cheaply to make a buck. Developers should not be stakeholders in this discussion unless they are building appropriate developments that are quality and fit into the community.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Diverse... communities – minority of speakers at the PH that expressed that there is value in having different housing types mixed together, but the overwhelming majority of the speakers did not consider that it was necessary to have diversity, equity and inclusion in every community. Majority opinions not represented. In proximity to other communities, accessible services and amenities can be shared. Every community doesn't need their own. There's value in having communities where it is just RC1. That has a specific value. Mixed neighbourhoods also have value. Everything available to everyone in every community is unnecessary. Calgary has plenty of choice. Appreciate historic neighbourhoods, even close to downtown there are plenty of options. Unsure why anyone would want to be near our downtown right now. Climate change - this needs to include biodiversity and limiting impervious surfaces through lot coverage. People access services in nearby communities. We already have great communities, including wonderful historic neighbourhoods. Don't want insensitive development for the sake of density. Long term loss of places people want to live. But, GB considers each neighbourhood to be a community. Diversity, inclusion and equity is a topical thing in the media. We should allow communities to evolve naturally. We shouldn't have a planning tool that seeks to add Diversity, inclusion and equity in everyone neighbourhood. Neighbourhood is evolving to be more inclusive of different ethnicities naturally. Housing types should occur naturally. By removing existing housing forms you're creating less choice. Key words "what the community wants" Fear that letting things change naturally may end up being more unpredictable. As it stands people can apply for redesignations anywhere/anytime and these are usually approved. PH speakers were being dismissed as misinformed, last minute objectors, also feel that their opinions weren't valued. There isn't any need in a land use planning document to have a reference to an anti-racist planning lens. This doesn't have a place in a planning document. Opposed to including a land acknowledgement. These are vacuous, virtue signaling statements. Rely on federal government management of rights. Pre-colonial history doesn't need to be in a planning document. Not to be dismissive of the constitutional rights of indigenous people. Want to avoid empty, useless statements built into document.

(from chat):
- Climate change - this needs to include biodiversity and limiting impervious surfaces through lot coverage.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Timeline for priority densification. i.e. doing Main Streets first (NH LAP shows density within the community and on Main Streets) would like targets/timelines showing that densification will happen on Main Streets first and support the need for any density that happens within the communities
Who is setting the growth targets, where do they come from? How is the burden shared between communities/LAP areas? Not enough protection from single detached areas.
Eliminate Zone A and B. Unfairly targets zone A.
Disagree with growth targets. Pandemic has set off a worldwide exodus from dense communities.
A reference to climate change has no place in an urban planning document. Climate change is a trendy issue.
Set urban forestry targets. Shouldn't be any guidance for what people do with their own private property. Don't want planners to dictate what trees can be planted or removed.
Do not support having a land acknowledgement in the guidebook.
Climate change is very important, especially with large bldgs on small lots with more impervious surface and not enough space for planting/trees. New homes have small yards.
Mobility – we need drop off points for people with mobility challenges, for access vehicles. That gets forgotten.
I am in 100% agreement with on his comments on anti-racism & pre-colonial history. I was told that a number of the councilors were actively soliciting sympathetic parties to come and speak at the public hearing which back end loaded speakers who were sympathetic to the Guidebook - this is obvious listening to the transcript of the public hearing.
Your fear of densification sharing/offloading is valid. In the NorthHill local area plan Renfrew has 7 designated 6-storey building streets being added (5 of them which are currently single detached homes) vs the other neighbourhoods in the plan only having 1-2 being added (main streets only)
Guidebook needs to apply to the whole city.
Large groupings (16 communities) in a LAP will drive people to the lowest common denominators. Pits community against community. Serves to reduce the unique character by moving towards growth/density targets. Developers shouldn't be able to upzone property by property under the auspices of the guidebook.
Want to confirm that community against community is happening. i.e. Renfrew being shown as taking on a lot of density and other communities not have as much.
No understanding of the cost of infrastructure and the cost of upgrading. Increased density may be cost prohibitive and we haven't looked at or heard anything about those kinds of areas.
Don't feel that there was a real push for Calgary to be a walking town, didn't hear people wanting to get rid of their cars, given climate, sports people engage in. If you don't have a car in Calgary you wish you had one when it's -30.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

The fundamental flaw with GB is that it starts with the assumption that there must be greater density, and that it must occur first within the Developed Areas. The technical parts of the GB - common language on urban forms, etc. -- is fine, but the application of those concepts to achieve density is a flawed fundamental assumption. Yes. This is the common theme that the guidebook lays out vague "good intentions" but they are not being reflected practically in this first pilot local area plan (northhill) so the question is, what is missing in the guidebook that allowed for this disparity so that we can improve the pilot LAP and all future LAPs

(from chat):

- The potential action is "identify GROWTH TARGETS...: There should not be any such targets. This is the problem, there is this fundamental assumption that there must be increased density and growth in established communities.
- One thing I don't see anywhere is the need for more residential building choices. A woman from Bridgeland compared the choices in the Guidebook as "vanilla" and what we need is more choices.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

-It's really important to preserve our heritage communities, i.e. Crescent Heights (CH), Scarboro, Elbow Park, etc. The houses are very well maintained.
 CH -- demolished for apt. buildings, managed to stop that in 1979. See the LAP taking the community back to the 1970s and people will not invest in buying houses here.
 29% single-detached. 3 heritage areas, but the land use bylaw (LUB) does not protect heritage. Heritage gets ignored. I know work is going on but it is not going to be done in time to protect our areas. GB needs to have a clear position on restrictive covenants and caveats. These protect heritage neighbourhoods.
 Important not to just talk about individual homes or buildings, nature of a community (heritage community) is important. Protecting 3/4 homes become outliers in the middle of a heritage district. Thinking about full streets, neighbourhoods. Protect heritage neighbourhoods broadly.
 heritage tools -- Level 2 would apply to the whole neighbourhood, Level 3 applies to an entire street/block face.
 Were these historic areas designated? Participant clarifies historic areas were identified last July and passed by Council.
 Guidebook tools/NH LAP are not approved yet and they are a start. Needs of different parts of older communities are different.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Heritage work needs to be completed. GB actually sets out good rules regarding heritage but the NH LAP doesn't meet them at all. Having problems with that, if this passes now we have 4-6 months where we have no protection (due to city timelines on this work). Like introducing "enhancing" existing communities instead of creating. Limit the size of new infills. Two bylaws (360 and 438) they can add a meter for height. Bylaw s.360 overrides s.438 if there is an slope on the property. R-C1, R-C2



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Concerns about loss of trees and greenspace, GB needs to address protecting greenspaces and playgrounds.
Connector roads recommend 6 storey building near community amendments. Trying to make it a connector/busy/mixed residential street right along the assets of their community. (i.e. Renfrew 8th Ave).
The page does a great job of capturing the public hearing. The topics here are an order of magnitude more important than everything else. One small comment - restrictive covenants (RCs): agree they should be adhered to by the City, don't recall that they don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since initial development.
RCs -- city themselves used RCs, problem with the MDP and guidebooks is they completely ignore the fact that RCs exist. i.e. an RC that limits things to single detached dwellings, seems perverse that the City would enact a planning document in opposition to that.
RCs should be acknowledged by the City, planning should be consistent with existing and future RCs. RCs are authorized under the land titles act, they are legitimate and enforceable. Planning documents should not ignore them, this doesn't acknowledge reality and is bad planning. Pits neighbourhoods against developers and the City. City approves development that is against the RCs. Costs citizens money to fight this. City should recognize they are legitimate and should follow them.
Climate of distrust comes from people running over RCs, the developer always wins. Creates a culture of distrust between residents and the City.
RCs are an important tool.
Need certainty on housing forms -- residents and community association (CA) development committees want input.
If the guidebook goes ahead it will neuter CA development committees power.
People bought their properties because of RCs, it does reflect the investment.
I think the last point on restrictive covenants was bought forward by someone in Banff Trail.
Completely agree that community input MUST include in each case the relevant community association(s).

(from chat):
- The fundamental flaw with GB is that it starts with the assumption that there must be greater density, and that it must occur first within the Developed Areas. The technical parts of the GB - common language on urban forms, etc. -- is fine, but the application of those concepts to achieve density is a flawed fundamental assumption.
- Yes. This is the common theme that the guidebook lays out vague "good intentions" but they are not being reflected practically in this first pilot local area plan (northhill) so the question is, what is missing in the guidebook that allowed for this disparity so that we can improve the pilot LAP and all future LAPs
- The building forms were too complicated in one of the previous drafts so they were simplified. They were simplified too much and there isn't clear direction as to how to add height modifiers.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on rezoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

People want to focus on Main Streets first. Two year moratorium on development in the community is not long enough. Did not hear 2 years. This redevelopment of Main Streets first would take 5-10 years at least.
Suggestion of setting a storey differential, i.e. 2 storey to what's currently there, that would help provide some growth over time without too much change all at times.
Provide specific criteria about what can be deemed a neighbourhood connector street/area. (some are alongside playground areas and we don't want busy roads)
I think 8 Ave NE east of Edmonton Trail has been a connector road for many years. Visuals/pictures in the gb there is a bit of conflict there and that loosely applied you could see a huge influx of higher density and commercial development in a placid residential area.
If the guidebook were to come into law, there should be a moratorium to prohibit rezoning in residential areas until a LAP has been approved for a community in question.
Guidebook can provide more certainty but LAPs need to better reflect community needs. Communities without a LAP may be more vulnerable to ad hoc change. Leaving connector urban form category more vague in the guidebook might be okay, criteria in the guidebook doesn't take into account neighbourhood specifics. i.e. 8th ave across for CA/school not appropriate, create shadows on green spaces adjacent, not taking into account a huge asset is a flaw. Isn't being thoughtfully processed at LAP phase. Connector must be looked at carefully with other features of a neighbourhood.
LAP could define neighbourhood connect based on local community characteristics. What does a community consider to be a street or a number of streets that could serve a broader purposed and could have a different treatment.
Please get into the comments my request that Potential Actions include reference to City acknowledging restrictive covenants and that GB must be consistent/supportive of them.
I think that stories are the wrong measure - it needs to be height to truly be respectful of the neighbors.
One thing I don't see anywhere is the need for more residential building choices. A woman from Bridgeland compared the choices in the Guidebook as "vanilla" and what we need is more choices.
Not one size fits all, but every community needs the engagement about everything that can be in these locations.
The building forms were too complicated in one of the previous drafts so they were simplified. They were simplified too much and there isn't clear direction as to how to add height modifiers.

(from chat):
- Potential Actions include reference to City acknowledging restrictive covenants and that GB must be consistent/supportive of them.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Did not hear that LAP engagement was successful. Divide that into two points -- engagement sessions that were held were effective for those that attended. LAP did not sufficiently reach enough people and was not successful in engaging those that were most impacted.

Councillors were soliciting feedback from people who were in favour of the guidebook. The mayor says these sessions are being shoehorned in to make people feel better. In favour of pushing these decisions out. Vast majority of people who spoke were not invited to this. FOIP issue was not an issue.

I agree with the first key topic and discussion points on Engagement. No comment on other two as to whether the public sessions caught this.

RESIDENTS did not feel informed.

Engagement was not effective and still isn't.

If people can't speak at PUD and if council doesn't get effective engagement from people across the City it can cause costly problems like lawsuits and litigation.

CH CA board -- one person was on the guidebook/north hill working group.

Purpose of the guidebook is unclear. North Hill plan replacing ARP was a surprise. Communication has been extremely poor. CA has short notice to communicate to the community. Green Line (GL) committee is doing a far better job. Gives the City 0 for engagement on this.

Engagement was really poor. When communities did engage they were chastised. How do we go forward if engagement is not good if you participate or if you don't? Disappointing.

Engagement was very poorly done.

People participating in large numbers at public hearing shows they are interested. Strong opposition to the process and the content shows that engagement was poor.

Accessible engagement was a bullet point that came from the late speakers that councillors rounded up and that wasn't heard from the vast majority of speakers.

A comment made by a councillor after the hearing was it didn't go the way they thought it would. This says to me that they are really out of touch. Many of the comments expressed at the hearing were also expressed at PUD on Feb 3 and ignored.

I support that community associations need to be involved, but it also needs to go beyond that to the residents directly. Not only because they may not share the communities view, but also that they are volunteer run and can't accomplish everything

There is a ARP that is also called "North Hill" - very confusing! themselves.

CAs are not notified about contextual development permits until they are approved - no signs or notifications for those. There is no community input at all.

(from chat):

- Completely agree that community input MUST include in each case the relevant community association(s).



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Future engagement -- use Enmax bill to let people know more widely. Find broad communication channels.

Engagement needs to go further than the CAs. They do not represent or amplify the voices of their residents. CAs have their own agendas (i.e. Renfrew CA) to get funding for amenities and services. Distrust of CAs. Renfrew engagement was very poor, worried this is because CAs have their own agenda.

Focus attention on all residents and not the community associations, especially residents most impacted.

If CAs don't represent residents they need to elect a new board.

CAs need to be engaged early, often and fully. There should also be engagement directly with citizens. Both are required.

Engagement materials (i.e. Enmax bill idea) should focus on the things that get people's attention/those that have a high impact on people. For example, don't focus on "great communities" but on the actual impacts, such as increased density in communities.

Pushing this to PUD for May 5, June/July Council with a Council that is leaving (including the mayor) is immoral. If it has to be pushed out longer to get proper engagement and to educate new councillors isn't that going to get us a better result? This has to be an election issue. People were not aware of the guidebook before the end of January.

I agree that it is completely improper for this Council to ram this through at this time. The right thing is to defer this, get proper and full engagement.

Ramming it through now will just create a festering ongoing war between City and its residents.

Need to know where new Council stands on this.

The sheer volume of residents speaking at the hearing directly proves that not enough of the community were informed. And the amount of misinformation that council claims is out there also proves that people aren't being educated on this matter well enough. Using specific community name is critical i.e. "North Hill LAP" includes Renfrew, Crescent Heights. Needs to be included in advertising: this applies to you.

Could use property tax assessment, City's website helps with garbage bins, sign up for City planning alerts for things affecting the neighbourhood, like development permits. Haphazard engagement leads to people feeling that city planning doesn't want to engage because it's an impediment to developers.

Communicate in a timely way in a variety of forms. Communities want to support, oppose, and provide helpful feedback on planning matters.

Sheer volume and fury of the citizenry shows engagement didn't work, hope for better ways to do it in the future.

Calgarians have lost trust in planning and council, and trust has to be built first. Because we are in a pandemic we need to allow more time for engagement than before, people have very serious things taking up their energy/time right now.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

What are the models for great cities that you are looking at? Who are the experts guiding this structure and create a great communities? City staff replied we are all planners, we are experts, and we've talked to people at the U of C. We need to look at cities that have succeeded, like Vancouver and Portland. Let's get engagement from the entire citizenry and educate ourselves about what's out there not just looking at what's in our own backyard.

In the lead up to the March 22nd PH, in trying to rally neighbourhoods, the overwhelming response was, what's the point, they don't listen. Quiet doesn't mean agreement, it means resignation, distrust. Councillors should be able to change their votes when they hear from their communities.

I listened until 1030pm and it was right at the end of the night that they got to that part about approving and rejecting potential amendments (which was how we got this further engagement session today approved- it was an amendment they accepted). The majority of councillors (something like 10-2) already rejected the amendment to push the date until after the election.

Council members after the public hearing stated that they didn't want to support an amendment that would push the decision until after the election because "that would mean this is as good as dead". I'm not sure what their thought process was with that comment, but to me That speaks to the fact that they may know that people would not vote to elect those in support of the guidebook

(from chat):

- A comment made by a councillor after the hearing was it didn't go the way they thought it would. This says to me that they are really out of touch. Many of the comments expressed at the hearing were also expressed at PUD on Feb 3 and ignored.
- I agree that it is completely improper for this Council to ram this through at this time. The right thing is to defer this, get proper and full engagement. Ramming it through now will just create a festering ongoing war between City and its residents.
- The sheer volume of residents speaking at the hearing directly proves that not enough of the community were informed. And the amount of misinformation that council claims is out there also proves that people aren't being educated on this matter well enough.
- There is a ARP that is also called "North Hill" - very confusing! CAs are not notified about contextual development permits until they are approved - no signs or notifications for those. There is no community input at all.
- Council members after the public hearing stated that they didn't want to support an amendment that would push the decision until after the election because "that would mean this is as good as dead". I'm not sure what their thought process was with that comment, but to me That speaks to the fact that they may know that people would not vote to elect those in support of the guidebook.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Monday, April 19, 11:00am - 1:30pm
Local area plan working groups and Community Association representatives
Breakout Group # 1

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

APRIL 19 MORNING - GROUP 1
Purpose of Guidebook: too prescriptive and unclear purpose. understanding came from guidebook intention not so much from the wording. The need and intention of the GB is unclear for most people. Some people who speak the language can easily understand it.

Should/shall is it going to make it too prescriptive? That may be an issue for some. Should(s) and shall(s) - difficult to understand perhaps easier to understand for some involve, difficult for others. there should be some clear messaging on this issue. should' s often is not followed through even if there is no good reason. Administration and SDAB discretion are a concern. Feels like there is seldom valid reason(s) for not aligning with a should statement. In the future we need to keep the should and push on developers to provide a good reason for not following/aligning otherwise they must comply.

It is a large-scale plan. people are used to talk about smaller scale (areas) plans. The need and intention need to be clearer. Does it need to be prescriptive or allow for flexibility.

Clear that most people who attended PH did not have much background on the GB or the LAP processes. Most people were not part of the process, they were not aware, or chose not to participate as the messaging was not clear.

Clarity on the relationship between GB and other documents.
Be Honest – It has been said that the GB is not going to change the community. However, as we understand when the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) changes to reflect the GB intention, changes in the community will happen. Explain the connections between the GB and other initiatives and the impacts it will have in communities. Be honest.

The fact that the land use bylaw updates would follow was not discussed alot. The worry about zoning changes worried alot of people and it was always said none of the GB would change zoning but the next step land use changes will. They are connected.

The relation with the DAG was not discussed through the processes nor at the PH. MDP relationship - Unclear about the connection to the MD, most people do not understand, please make the relationship clearer.
LAP vs GB - As Renfrew rep. feel that the NH LAP lacks reflection how it executes the GB. How they related to each other.
The NH LAP fails to show how some characteristics/points from the GB are followed. Scale was an issue - not clear not sure if its about communication or understanding between representatives and LAP team.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Balance between flexibility and certainty – communities need certainty that LAP would not change once approved. flexibility is ok as planning is a moving thing. Constant change is confusing - we need more certainty related to what would happen, however there needs to be flexibility. Certainty about what could happen could be a way to allow for flexibility.

Individuality of community is lost - Community character is different between communities and not reflected in the GB. why one size fits all? Concern was that the individuality of a community is washed away, but as communities get older, they change and get a different feeling. Look for opportunity as to how the GB can help understand this change/evolution, make it clearer.

Perhaps more detail in GB and how the LAP works, how communities can participate, communicate and reflect their individuality within a LAP.

Each community and LAP are so different.

Lack of predictability is an issue - Feels like the GB is missing this important thing. People have concerns on what would happen down the road, often people raise concerns related to change, especially in established areas, for example Beltline. When people buy a house, feeling certainty in the type/massing/scale in the area is important. For example, that predictability happens in the new communities. Developers make it clear in the plans, it is clear since day one, developers show the different housing type areas and that gives certainty to buyers. In the Inner City it feels like the idea to add density takes away certainty. We understand flexibility is important. There needs to be a balance and flexibility even for developers (who bring \$). Finding alignment and balance in things like cost of redeveloping, City investment, and community growth is a tough one – the key is to allow for flexibility and adaptability while creating certainty for communities.

Also predictability helps with stability. There is a very real fear that a lack of predictability will lead to a loss of stability. Home purchasers will make choices that they can have some confidence about.

Counterpoint: Those of us without ARP's have little to no predictability right now. We are in dire need of this and the guidebook/NHCLAP help provide this.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Trust seems eroded - Covid has increased that - comments said in the public hearing reflect what people feel in relation to the GB and NH LAP. It is important that city increases the level of trust from citizens. It is a tough process to understand; terms are difficult to understand; lack of clarity with messaging - it is important to be as clear as one can.

confused about outdated plans – what is wrong with them/what is great about them? Needs more explanation. Clean it up pls.

SUGGESTION - in order for the regular citizen to understand the whole program, perhaps create a document that accompanies the GB/LAPs. The document should be written in plain language, explain the relationship between the GB and other documents/initiatives and clearly explain the different between shall(s) and should(s) – "Planning for dummies" like book. Kind of like a summary of everything so everyone is able to understand and comment on it.

To assist the lay person, or those not as planning-jaron-savvy: re: Should and Shall - again please provide this "planning Assumption" as a written component of the GB.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Adopt the GB by resolution or adopt it, why is it important?
Unclear - If the intent is to ensure the policies in the GB apply to the whole city? what if they are non-statutory guidelines? what is the different between statutory vs non-statutory?
The status of both documents needs to match/be consistent - Issue about resolution. The LAPs will be statutory documents and the GB is the common element between all LAPs. The LAPs are the result/reflection of the GB. Would be really confusing if one is statutory and the other no. It's clear the GB would not apply without LAP.
If GB is non-stat there will need to be a way to include common language and relevant policies in the LAP. It would allow for flexibility for a LAPs to take what is in the GB and customize it to the needs of the community. However, this could be an issue with consistency between LAPs(LK)
As the LAPs are statutory, feels like there will need to copy the GB into the LAP and the concern would be that the LAP becomes too bulky. And this could be an issue as it would just transfer one problem into another document. It is a risk. Do the worries of the GB being statutory not just transfer to the LAPs as they are statutory. Things will just get transferred over from one to the other potentially?

I don't think people are asking for different tools for each LAP are they? I think using the same language and tools is still very relevant. Couldn't the GB provide that either way?

Was pleasantly surprised while looking at the MDP this week how readable it is!

Multi-community LAPs - Are we allowing communities not to have LAPs? would some communities get hit with lots of growth and others with no growth? seems it depends on who comes to the table, louder voice may have stronger representation on the LAPs.
Intent is not to have communities opting out of LAPs, intent is that all communities will have LAPs (BH)
Crescent Heights asked to be removed from NH LAP because certain items were not addressing concerns, but at the end it stayed. Bridgeland opted out an it was ok. Opting out may not be the right solution.
Unclear what the rational for grouping the communities is - The issues during the LAP process was that we didn't feel that there was the ability to decide things for the LAP. The GB seemed to prescriptive things. It is tough for individual communities to talk about details for their area, not all communities are the same and do not have the same concerns or positions in relation to other communities.
Multi-community plans should be look in their entirety however individual community details are important.

The GB Section 2.2. LAP content - we felt the NH LAP did not fulfill what that section outlines. The GB should give the LAP more control.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

NH LAP concern with the lack of teeth, there is not real commitment to infrastructure improvement in relation to density, the list for chapter 3 is not statutory.

Communities are losing people, this creates issues with schools, feels like the GB/LAP is silent on that.

Bullying during PH was not right, bullying should stop. Hear everyone whether or not Councillors like what people say. I am aware of multiple people who did not speak at public hearing because of the that "bullying," council's tone even with admin was difficult.

The opposite could also be viewed - the way certain opinions were expressed was not at all welcoming to anyone outside of certain demographics.

Challenge with representation – Let's know/identify who is not in the room! There has been a lot of input throughout many years and then we have the public hearing input. Some people could be at the public hearing and other were not able to or thought that they did not need to be there as their input had been already shared with the City throughout the years. Usually people from CA come to speak on public hearings, the CA are not necessarily the full voice of the community.

Look at who is here and who is not - there are systemic barriers that include council respect for everyone, and the wording used at public hearing adnn through the process. People at the public hearing spoke about the final product they had no idea of the work that went into creating the GB. Acknowledge the input along the way as it is crucial, perhaps throughout the process some people had the time /the opportunity to participate, that needs to be acknowledged. Do not just look at the end result!

Who is in the room - How can we do a better job mapping where people are from/gender/ economic? That needs to be done to help better understand the demographics who are able to attend/participate in the public hearing or in the process. let's be mindful, it is about timing and availability. Explore ways to understand who the voices are and how to bring more voices into the processes.

"Silent voices;" There was 450 written submission to Council. Have they been forgotten? why only hear those who spoke? feels like feedback from people who spoke have more weight than the feedback from those who couldn't be at the public hearing . why writing is not the same as speaking in the public hearing. How to know who a silent voice is and who is not? Silent voices could be the people who were part of the engagement process but did not go to the public hearing, perhaps there was the assumption that they had a voice through administration.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Concern that Council never heard those who were part of the engagement process. The comments we are discussing today are more related to what was going on during the public hearing, not necessarily the input throughout the engagement process.

Confusion that voices were not equally represented. I think citizens not being able to watch live would benefit from a reminder that they could write in, not only speak and that videos are available after the fact for viewing, yes! not enough value was given to the letters and I think there were much more. Didn't they add over 200?

Felt that the letters did not get the same importance as the people who spoke. 500 letters + 200 letters = 700 letters that were not acknowledged. People took the time to write the letters, but they did not have the same weight. Not everyone can sit for 3 days.

Lack of Trust – during the public hearing there were many supporters of the GB, and then there were others who have never seen/heard about the GB. the # of people who expressed concerns reflects lack of trust. people need to feel they have been heard.

written submissions should be equally weighed. But we do need to keep in mind systemic barriers that may restrict people's interest/perceived ability to engage at this level.

Administration read the written submission to make sure things were captured - Right now, we are relating to what was said at the PH, as per Council direction. Intention is to clarify these ideas. (LK)

Metric and Growth
it is not clear what are the targets, always mention that the GB meets the MDP targets. Make the link between the two documents, include targets in the GB.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Vehicle Oriented
Allowing vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets – was that something that came out at public hearing? is it really about allowing vehicle-oriented uses? it is confusing, the GB seems to be silent on this vehicle-oriented topic? Where did it come from? - this topic came directly from a Cllr. Office not at the public hearing. It is believed that Cllr spoke with developers/industry about it and raised concerns. Perhaps more related to suburban areas?

Vehicle-oriented - accessibility issue. that is a great assumption. Clarification required.

Feels like vehicle-oriented discussion would be more related to accessibility issues which would be the only reason why they would be allowed in an area like Main Streets as they are supposed to be pedestrian friendly areas.

Vehicle-oriented uses, sure there is a perfect world vision. However - if we look back over the past year (pandemic) and challenges to businesses... How would businesses survive without having to scramble to adapt? The pandemic has definitely changed the way we live and work!

I think missing from this list is COVID repercussions. I believe there were a number of comments on this (us included). Has there been discussion on how this will change city building? I know it is still very unknown, but it should find its way in here.

The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities" (to which I agree) - was there some commentary around the desire of some to have access to more space i.e., private yard space, space to work and school from home?

Single-detached protected?
Was not just about single-detached protection - It is more about meeting density target in a thoughtful way. Single-detached protection is just one of many issues. Its more about what goes where? It is about scale, massing, heritage, etc.

Real concern unclear – concern was raised at public hearing, "protecting" single-detached areas and there was very little questioning on this topic. It wasn't clear what the real concern was? does it mean that the only densification in these areas would be to subdivide and have two skinny lots? There was no follow up question to clearly understand the issue. Is it about massing, doors, housing form (row houses), height? People need to get to the bottom of the concern to better understand it. Not clear what would be acceptable for densification in those areas. true concern was not clear! City heard range from no density to no change (LK)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

Protecting single-family homes for how long? Things will change overtime. Being too prescriptive on what people can do or can't do may affect their plans. Perhaps can be done on a block by block bases – allow for certain threshold in a block/area? 30-40%? so people have the flexibility if they choose to density?

Take the time to work with community and try to understand all communities - It is important to work with R-C1 communities to see where density can or can't go. Would be a shock to the people who bought there if drastic changes happen. R-C1 communities also have affordable housing developments, different housing choices already and wonder if more choices would change the community? we are in the process of doing an engagement to ask people about this and people seems to take it more seriously now. Now we find that some people are open to certain house types and the main concerns is traffic in the area. however, for our community for example, we have few accesses so access would be an issue.

It is scary to think that others can decided where density go, and really who gets density. During the LAP process would not feel comfortable saying things.

Unbalance share of density - Communities may come around - communities may want to remain the way they are, but perhaps with time it could be open to something, however, it seems that some community get too much density/others too little.

Trees in private lands.
Are we saving trees for the sake of doing that? servicing vs planting trees.
Proactive planting/maintaining/caring for street trees by the city is needed, its ok to not rule on private trees. In the efforts to preserve the trees, sometimes trees are just planted in strange location within a parcel and it is obvious that those trees sooner or later will need to be cut.

Street trees provide the canopy – City needs to clearly define where property lines are plant new trees in public property.
Landscaping could be part of the planning process - protect tree canopy in public lands.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

There are tree requirements in the bylaw, they just are not well enforced - As new development goes in keep the idea of a tree per each lot. An owner should not be able to just clear-cut, trees should be kept or replaced. For new development , landscaping should be given more consideration. would be nice to see things improving in that sense. trees on every lot does not ensure the tree will survive. It falls to the individual land owner's responsibility.

We need to remember we are essentially a dessert! Most trees don't grow that awesome here, can we have discussions around how other green stuffs can support our biodiversity.

Reiterating that the protection of private trees may not be our best energy expense. It's potentially better to have developers support planting of trees in the public domain instead.

This also goes back to infrastructure investments. Look at Investment in open space, parks etc....



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Heritage does not equal character and vice versa - sounds like there was confusion and people were mixing both. Heritage is about the asset/history.

heritage vs historically significant, vs heritage assets and designation

The GB needs to be clear in the definition what does heritage mean and what are the characteristics that would make a building/area heritage? heritage home vs a home with character!

Seems like people had specific request about what they wanted to preserve in their communities. People are interesting in valuing and showing the heritage aspects of their communities. Calgary does not have many heritage assets and once they are gone, they are lost.

Not saying we're preserving too much. There needs to be a discussion about what our targets are

The list of ideas here seems concise, Great Job at discussion points!! Lots of great work in this aspect. carry on.

Streetscape and heritage - historic boulevards. Designating streets as heritage streetscape is great and it is already happening in Calgary for example take the historic Boulevard in Rosedale

Heritage could be taken as protectionism. Five points to keep in mind:
 1. how much or what we need to preserve? Is it about age? About architecture? About details?
 2. there are ways to incorporate re-development into heritage assets.
 3. there are ways to keep the building structure and allow internal change. like the firehall in bridgeland now a home. great preservation
 4. lots vs areas. Renfrew has a variety of lot that outline/heritage different eras, etc.

Does it make sense to preserve 1950 bungalows? They are part of the history of Calgary. For some people it is interesting to see "old architecture/housing forms", people see them as cool and funky.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

There are other pieces of work/strategies related to heritage that the City is working on. And generally, they would take precedent over the GB, and would be more suitable at LAP stage as they could apply to specific aspects/assets in the LAP area.

Is the intention to protect heritage and close the gap that would be created between the time of the guidebook approval and the time when a new LAP is developed? the idea is to do more to protect and yes it could be a way to protect things until LAP comes. GB just give the big picture (LK)

there is actually not a lot of ability to "preserve" heritage so I think the concern that too much may be "preserved" is probably not warranted

SUGGESTION – instead of imposing restrictions it would be better to see positive encouragement such as tax breaks, architectural incentives, use of the asset, etc. I think it is better to encourage rather than push for it. similar to density.

Concern if things are too restrictive the result can be a way for development to get forgotten and just stay there with no interventions.

Heritage and the future - provisions about how the definition may expand in the future? how to define it keeping in mind the future? Things that are built now may become heritage in the future. Perhaps pay more attention to what is significant so there is not gaps and we do not miss on great things we may not otherwise recognized.

the heritage groups did an awesome job speaking to the heritage points. KUDOS: Continue the excellent Heritage work being done by local groups.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Single-detached homes/areas
Protection vs Market Driven – Again, unclear what the real concern is when trying to protect single-detached form specially when the massing is equal to a denser development. why protect Single-detached. should be market driven.

The Land Use Bylaw (LUB) for parcels zoned for single-detached development already allows for 3 units. Theoretically there could be 3 units in every single lot. And that is a lot of density already. The LUB allows for one main building, a basement suite and a backyard suite – clarified that the land use bylaw allows for one main building and either a secondary suite or a backyard suite, not both.

Zones A & B feel arbitrary. The reality is that certain community may not need to be densified. Get rid of Zones A and B.

Affordability - targeting neighbourhood in zone A would make them more desirable for developers as they get the most benefit for their investment. Redevelopment can get more expensive in a more desirable neighbourhoods.

Why zoned A and B? perhaps if putting it all as one zone there would be more opportunities for affordable housing everywhere.

Also don't support Zone a and B, focus on citywide is fairer and could open up and make affordable housing more attainable due to land prices in established older neighbourhoods.

Market, Density and Affordability - single-detached - are there any statistics showing how many communities are actually R-C1 communities? there could be opportunity to allow for density in different ways, development that respects the character is better. How can market be directed to specific area? where and why density goes depends on market and on many factors including the context. Sometimes when developers make the case for density in exclusive areas, the new development is not affordable. How would market synchronize with the proposed zones, and rezoned large homes just to do it?

There are contextual design guidelines but feel like they do not do much. Feel like they are not really taken into consideration to densify areas.

I think the market is waiting on the guidebook to make moves in some of those spots so they have a smoother process to move through application and approval

How to define affordability? there are various definitions. Perhaps the GB can include a clear definition of what it means.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Scale - Large homes are being built next to a small bungalow. So, the GB is not what is going to generate this change. - why focus on protectionism? Focus on INCENTIVES instead.

Certainty
LAP process never talked about low density areas – Westbrook for example. When creating the LEGO Map, the lowest block we could use was for a development up to 6 storey. There was no talk about the areas where no blocks were put. No discussion on how to best put density those white areas. Feels like it was about accepting density everywhere without knowing. It feels like there was no opportunity to discuss where row houses would be more appropriate.

Single-detached areas are usually areas one or two storeys homes , when a 3 storeys comes it feels too high, even if it is allowed. It is important to discuss how to densify bungalow communities

USE UNDERUTILIZED LANDS. There are large parcels in the inner city that offer great opportunities and seems like they are not taken into consideration. Large lots near or within industrial areas are an opportunity to be redeveloped, include lots of density and do something nice. Live-Work-Play nearby.

Restrictive Covenants
Concern that City do not pay attention to restrictive covenants when reviewing a DP/ LOC. They were design for a reason, they tried to restrict high intensity redevelopment at that time.
Are they still relevant? still needed? It is clear from previous application that there is a way to go around them. There is inconsistency between some restrictive covenants and the land use bylaw.
Restrictive covenants can get on the way of the objective to densify areas if they are not addressed.
Edmonton for example open up to higher densities in certain areas and people tried to go down the restrictive covenants way to prevent density from happening.

Restrictive covenants - can they be time limited / reviewed? Can we review and determine intent? Is the intent still required?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

OPPORTUNITY
we have to discuss where higher density and all type of density should go. If community can sit down and have the conversation with City, good things may happen.

Order of Growth - concern about the process of redevelopment. Providing blanket redevelopment opportunities, could slow down growth in certain areas such as main streets/activity centres. We do not want to see redevelopment going inside the community before it goes onto the main areas. Order of Growth is important.

The two-year moratorium - should emphasize/relate to where you want to see growth happen first. its difficult to put a moratorium especially for developers. Redevelopment should not be stopped, but it should be "strongly discourage in heritage areas, in the NH, for example.

not sure what the moratorium accomplishes to be honest.

Cost of Redevelopment - Feels like redevelopment in main streets would have higher cost, too many moving parts - needs to be thought through. How to incentivize redevelopment in the areas where growth is needed/required by taking into account the real cost.

Concern about the two-year moratorium - we are trying to move our city forward, what is the market impact of moratoriums? Would it create more issues than solutions? Would it apply to all sites? Or would it only apply to residential areas? what about industrial? do we stall development across the city?
Perhaps only residential areas need moratorium.

Residential "conservational" modifier would help. context is key. Criteria for location of different housing forms. confusing for some neighbourhoods (Rosedale for example) due to their own context.

LEAD BY EXAMPLE - There are some examples that do not work well, for example a bungalow (which is accessible and friendly to all) redevelops onto a row house with lots of stairs which is a very exclusive development as not all can do stairs. Things should be built for all.

infill options are very anti-seniors

City could lead by example and build something great, and others would follow.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

QUALITY is key – when identifying what goes where. There could be ways to explore how can we incentivize good/diverse quality development. City can look at it more (LK)

SUGGESTION - perhaps instead of moratorium there could be incentives for redeveloping in certain areas. Incentives could bring redevelopment to areas where we want/need. for example, Kingsland there are areas where certain developments can go and are already approved. however, it feels that due to lack of incentives redevelopment is not moving forward. We shared these ideas during the LAP process - some communities may be in a position to discuss specific details on each area and help identify areas where redevelopment is needed/wanted.

SUGGESTION – the City could target development in certain areas, as a pilot/ incentive for other to come and move forward. City could try do somethings. bring forward examples of great developments/densification so people/developers can see. Create great development, that work for all.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Concern that positives things about the GB/LAP were not really communicated, more attention was given to the challenges/issues. the whole picture was not understood, the link between density and infrastructure for example is unclear.

The title/messaging is misleading - We are going to make your community great? was it means is not fully understood, it means, more density, changes, lost of character, etc.

Concern on Engagement Process
LAP engagement successful to a point. some exercises were uncomfortable. Putting density in someone else's communities. Lots of people including developers and some people in the Working Group in NH were not too friendly to CA rep.

I found that exercise in the Working Group difficult. Volunteers deciding where density should go in other communities?

People who are familiar with the planning system usually have stronger voices, we wonder and have concerns on how people were chosen to be part of the working group. LAP process was unclear how the Working group members were selected.

Concern is also that some people never passed the info onto residents. CAs tried but with limited resources it was difficult. It is important to remember that CAs are volunteers. there was a lot of work put on the shoulders of CA's - volunteer run organisations with limited capacities.

CA's walk a fine line on what one says on behalf of the community when you don't know how everyone is feeling no matter how hard you have tried .

Some community members voiced opinions on the Guidebook when it hit media pre-Council hearing. Really hard for CAs to capture, especially when engagement is limited between neighbours during COVID. CAs get some pretty nasty comments about our stance (on both sides). We always pointed it towards the City engagement team.

AWARENESS - the LAP process failed, in my opinion. as there is a lot of people that are not even aware what this really means. how it impacts their community/parcel. NOT EVERYONE understood the real impact on the community, on parcels, on each street. Discussion did not allow for that. There is a certain level of apathy, not everyone could be engaged. Some people did not understand the impact that is why they choose not to get involved.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

The process feels very exclusive - developers are at advantage; they speak the same language, they can understand. The language that is being use needs to change to be more universal easier to understand so everyone can understand.

THE ROLE OF CAs IN THE PROCESS
Expecting that CA rep are to report back to residents does not seem to be fair/ appropriate. The idea of one person does not necessarily represent all. It is difficult to pass on information onto the residents. most people had no ideas this was even going on. Need to look at new ways to get more people involved/interested.
The CAs or other volunteer groups should not be expected to be the ones passing on the information. Lots of work/responsibility put on CAs. Digitally we are now getting more information out.

There needs to be support from the City if that is what is required. City should try to be neutral.

The City failed the CAs through the NH LAP process as there was a lot of expectation for CA and volunteers, without realizing that not everyone can understand things easily, and it was hard to keep up. The CAs were to communicate this out to residents, and this created some capacity/expertise challenges, sometimes we do not know who to engage.

Unclear the role of the CAs - who do they represent? The community members or do they advocate for them.
It is IMPORTANT to share and discuss the draft document with communities as early as possible and allow time for feedback. Do not do this right before the draft is moving forward for approval process.

Where were the Councillors? They have to do their work and pass on the information to their residents.

SUGGESTION - can we look at doing some ground process so communities have the opportunity to discuss/review where density can go? we have common understanding on the need for density on main streets, but we need to discuss details beyond that, for example green spaces, what do they mean to residents?

SUGGESTION - include/organize community focus updates with specific information provided by the City to CAs. This can help CAs. it is unfair that people criticize the CA role into his process, even if they tried.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Appreciate the well-facilitated discussion. Also appreciate the time (and energy and thought) everyone put into this.

GB should not be an election issues - too much misinformation that can be used in different ways.
Why Rush things – and there are lots of competing processes going on and not everyone is fully aware on the GB process.

Perceived to be rushed? is this being rushed again? limited time and ability to pass on communication to residents. it is rush!

The issue is that if it is not rushed, if not now, the GB would become an election issue and with too much misinformation things will perhaps get worse.

To ask CA to do more engagement at his point is not realistic. too much going on now. volunteer work is full.

Understand that the engagement team also have limited time and resources.

City's corporate engagement. This is an objective that goes beyond this specific project. Knowing that - How do we move this GB forward? I don't have an answer.

If I've learned only one thing: everyone has an opinion
maybe the engagement team can lead a virtual field trip

Maybe the city should host a competition on adaptable residential - options?

beneficial to also clarify how the North Hill Plan fits into the discussions.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Monday, April 19, 11:00am - 1:30pm

Local area plan working groups and Community Association representatives

Breakout Group # 2

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- How do you ensure that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Unlikely, will Council not approve changes in the future? How does Administration and public enforce this.

- People want a clear process how amendments work for LAPs, when they're updated, or the Guidebook through the sustainment team. People want certainty around how the process works. Is there a defined process? When do plans get revisited? Engagement requirements for changes to Guidebook?

- You can't provide certainty that things won't change. Only really works if you're building up an entire community at the same time. Certainty of process is an important point.

- Consultation important for certainty. A lot of people aren't aware of what Guidebook is and where it's going. It's a good idea, sets a frameworks, a skeleton but needs a strong idea of what consultation looks like in the future. How do you get people aware that something is going on and how you can participate? If people choose not to participate, it's their loss.

- Working group members feel more engaged and are working along side the Guidebook so have a better understanding. The work on the LAP using the Guidebook was working in Heritage Communities.

- One instance where an individual approached the community association to participate in the LAP, but was told no. Perhaps because it was so late in the process.

- Question regarding 'should' statements becoming 'shall' - We'll come back to this.

- Question regarding statutory status.

- (HCM) - Team is investigating whether the document is statutory or non-statutory and the implications of the legal status of the Plan.

- Does the statutory/non-statutory status impact engagement requirements. (HCM)- No, we would still do engagement.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- If you're allowed to pick and choose policies, would that mean you could say we don't like Neighbourhood Local as defined by the Guidebook and want something else to replace it?

- (HCM) - This is complicated and we're looking at it as a team. This is still a work in progress. There are components of the Guidebook that could become non statutory, and there are others that would have to still be statutory. We are still going through the process of analyzing that, and that is a complex analysis.

- (TG) The system is flexible to allow locally specific discussions to occur that could result in locally specific policies whether statutory or non-statutory.

- Replacing should with shall or must: can remove discretion, which can add certainty, but can also be used to delay and reduce housing supply.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Metrics and growth targets. I see these applied from MDP to local area plans. This could be seen as a concern as 'top down' planning. It's easy to say that we're full, we're done if metrics are met. Some areas are easier to develop in than others and do we pit communities against one another. Concern about the implications of this.

- Anti-racism lens. The link between how equity and land use planning are linked isn't as clear as it should be for a lot of people. People don't understand what equity has to do with land use planning. This should be teased out a bit more so people understand the connection. Are there local examples that could be used to help people understand the link?

- Would housing needs assessment the City did in 2018 help where it showed housing costs to income in NE?

- Climate action/sustainability. Local energy systems and what those could look like in neighbourhoods. I didn't read anything about it in climate section. What kind of communities do we need to build to have those local energy systems built?

- Equitable communities came up a lot and highlighted need to have things move forward. My community quite diverse and inclusive. Equity depends a lot on location and unsure if this can be mandated.

- CPR's hiring of Olmsted Brothers (Mount Royal, Scarboro, CPR Addition to Bridgeland) might also be an example of classism in planning. How they decided what % of land should be used for parks and streets etc. Might be something to look into (reference to local example above.)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Question: vehicle oriented choices in Main Streets/Activity Centres? Is this allowed or discouraged?
- (TG) Currently discouraged in Neighbourhood Commercial.

- Don't like the idea that detached areas should be protected.
- Urban forestry, we should remove private tree requirements. Parks often doesn't like trees on public land as it costs money to maintain them. Trees are often placed right beside new buildings which isn't a good place.
- Concern that cities can't protect single-detached neighbourhoods. It's organic over time and will change in 50 years.
- When we 'protect' neighbourhoods, it's inevitably protecting the wealthiest neighbourhoods.
- There are some communities that are single-detached homes and what people are looking for is consultation and involvement in the process if you are moving away from a primarily single-detached community (i.e. including more housing forms). If you want a category that was for single-detached only, exclusivity, it would allow people to understand that change wouldn't happen unless they were aware. Is there's a good consultation process it's something that could be managed. Having over-arching goals as presented in the Guidebook is good, but this has got the interest of a lot of people.
- Does set urban forest targets also apply green spaces and natural areas?
- (HCM) - Yes, but we'll double check.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- This is an important point. We've seen some communities have their sense of community change with new development and densification. There's a lot of good things you can do with building facades that make for a good experience that is different than entirely new buildings.

- This could help attract people to these communities.

- question about how you repurpose buildings. Adaptive reuse is only included in the heritage section and parking section. I'm on board with having more incentives to encourage adaptive reuse. Have concerns about how we define heritage (i.e. pre-1945), it should be broader like to include showhomes from new communities.

- You want to protect some heritage but also have to be careful at the expense of what.

- Santa Fe has gone a long way for heritage protection but the population has increased. Now those heritage areas are filled with white, wealthy, and old demographic. We need to be cautious about applying amber over communities to say nothing shall change. They've found that between 1980 and 2018, even as the population of Santa Fe grew, its historic districts emptied out. Many longtime residents left their homes or converted them into rentals. Those people who remain are generally whiter, wealthier, and older. <https://99percentinvisible.org/episode/stuccoed-in->



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Are there any protections in the Guidebook for setbacks? Can you build to the property line?
 - (HCM) Guidebook does not contain this but it is contained in the land use bylaw and would be part of the land use bylaw renewal work.
 - This is one of the challenges of the Guidebook, some people would like to see the land use bylaw first while others see the Guidebook as a step toward a new land use bylaw.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- In terms of restrictive covenants, they've been around for a long time and I'm not sure if those are the types of things that we want to have on land forever. They were used in the past for racist purposes.

- Single-detached housing areas, I don't think there's an area in the city you can protect forever. Sensitive choices can be made in LAPs to ensure that it's sensitively done.

- (KG) If a tool were included to address the issues identified with SDH areas, would that help?

- Yes, there'd be value in a tool but would like to see what the tool looks like. People who live in communities know them very well and have a good idea of where change should go. A tool would be helpful if it were a good tool.

- Restrictive covenants are unique to titled properties and have legal precedence. This is probably an area where we should have a better understanding on what these mean in the plan. It's not widely understood what these mean.

- Legal team was asked about restrictive covenants and it sounded like it's a matter that takes place outside of the planning system. If that's the case, is it appropriate for be housed in a planning document like a LAP or Guidebook?

- (HCM) Yes, was discussed at the public hearing. It is a complicated matter and there is legal weight to RCs that doesn't relate directly to planning.

- Would be beneficial to acknowledge it or address in Guidebook.

- I struggle with the word 'stable', it's a word that is used a lot in Toronto, where it's applied in some cases (where Margaret Atwood lives) to protect and push huge development to some places but not incremental change beside certain housing. We want to respect community character, but how do we define what that is?

- The notion of character and how subjective that term is. Seen lots of incidence where in a single-family community you get a big home that doesn't really fit in but is seen as ok.

- Example of the home in Edmonton that was a duplex, but looked like a single-detached home. Parents separated but lived in same building with 'switchable' doors. You can't build this many places in Calgary. <https://theprovince.com/business/mortgages/divorced-parents-design-clever-family-house>

- RCs : Seems to be a tool for neighbours to bully each other. If Guidebook is seen as top-down, how do we get to place that's bottom up when we have RCs.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Top two actions:
(1) One of the proposed actions for single-detached policy areas, how much could you apply it? Could you apply to certain %? Whole community? Some communities would want to use this heavily, others not as much.
(2) If you take criteria approach to determining which housing forms go where, for those communities that do want to take on more density and housing forms, would that tool allow them the opportunity to do that?

- Some sort of action around single-detached should be taken but once you get into the weeds, does this allow to protect but also increased housing types and density for communities that want it?

- People are looking to have input and the ability to talk about specific areas. There are some areas that may be more challenged for higher density, such as no back alleys, no sidewalks, location and access. If communities are afforded the opportunity to present the case for their unique and special situation for consideration then I think we're on the right track. It's the unknown that people are really anxious about and being lumped into a category where you could have higher density than single-detached homes.

- Change provokes anxiety but it's inevitable. Certain communities are not as attractive for high density. Due to that, you're not going to get the density in those areas. Change happens in 50/100 years but developers and the City know the places that make sense to have higher density.

- Worried that the criteria approach makes things more complicated but can understand we need some kind of politically sensitive solution. Support broad upzoning everywhere that allows the market to function. I can see argument for % approach, but terrified to be part of local area planning process that talks about what % of Mount Royal is open to that kind of change. Prefer the idea of saying 'here's R-C2' everywhere, eliminating zones A and B but we need some kind of solution for the politics. The moratorium could be problematic after 2 years pass and then the flood gates open.

- R-C1 sometimes prevents refreshing some communities that need a bit of love. Allowing more density everywhere would allow change to happen across communities where the market goes.

- If the approach is the special area policy approach, hashing it out at the local area plan where it is applied would be a nightmare. If residents find out they made it in whereas others didn't people would be upset. It's a more flexible approach but the discussions would be very difficult.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- One thing that came up was what is the role of the community association for engaging their communities? If there were clear expectations for the community association to inform their residents to supplement the broader city-led engagement it would help address these issues.

- Experience with consultation and initiatives with the City has been disappointing over the last 20+ years. It's been consistently not really considered and extremely difficult. That experience has a lot of folks questioning how much input they really have and push back on creating a plan of this scope and magnitude. 95% of people said they hadn't heard about the Guidebook, but thought how is that possible. Would like to participate in a transparent process that really engages people on these issues. Sometimes you can get people interested no matter what you do. It's worth while if you have the Guidebook and then allow people to participate and get involved on the community basis to better understand what the Guidebook is and what the process is.

-(KG) What barriers exist?

- Somehow people just weren't aware. The city has tried to reach out to communities they're tried in the process to engage people. For our community it hasn't worked. Colleagues at work don't know about it, you ask them and you get a blank stare. There's a lot of trepidation, list four cases, where someone tried to participate, asked for consideration and never hear back on why that wasn't included.

- Speaking as former CA board member, in lead up, in terms of CA board we've had issues in the past where everyone has a different opinion of the role of the board. Our board has taken position of sharing information rather than a side. It's a struggle for boards to define what their job is. For the CA, things were put into our newsletter, pop-ups, there was outreach. Unfortunately, the last 6-8 years we've been building a new hall so a lot of resources have gone into that. we're all volunteers so limited resources going around. Going forward, the City should have presentation to community board and community of local area plans. As planning director, it often feels having the City help out with engagement in specific communities, especially going forward with LAPs, is going to be super important.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

- Heard people saying the Guidebook was rushed, but I've spent three years on this thing and interesting to watch what three days of engagement has done to three years of engagement. In Renfrew, we have people complaining about 6 storeys buildings, and there were people who thought the 6 storeys on your street should have been on billboards. Some councillors asked CAs to help communicate the plan more, then Renfrew showed 70+ times that they shared information on social media, website. There is only so much you can expect from non-experts, volunteers.

- Optimistic we can use this to make engagement better.

- I hope through all of this, the Guidebook has been around for a really long time, but trying to get people to read it and go to it is difficult. You tend to pay attention to things that are in your face and in your backyard. The Guidebook is an opportunity to address this. Hopeful that we take the divisiveness out of it, words like density, how can we tone down that rhetoric to allow people on different sides, different perspective to talk about what makes sense and can be a positive thing for Calgary.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- I don't agree it should be an election issue. Those kinds of issues can be very divisive and what's required is collaboration and getting together. Making it an election issue doesn't help there.

- If we make it an election issue, will there be an opportunity to better inform people on what it is? Or will it become an echo chamber?

- Great question, You can't. And that is why it really should not be an election issue. I don't feel comfortable voting on something when I'm not an expert. The experts who do the best practices in their field should be advising.

- Lots of risks with it becoming an election issue. But if it is, how do you boil down what Guidebook is and does to two lines on a campaign flyer. For one person it could be 'what could be built next to you', but that really simplifies the conversation and misses out on a lot of the nuance on what the Guidebook is. These are community and city level conversations. You'd be missing out on so much if it's boiled down to a parcel by parcel basis. Could be a miss if people take a populist approach and miss out on that discussion.

- I don't love the idea of an election issue as we haven't done a good job on nuance in political campaigns.

- The potential action to include an engagement strategy is that it should be consistent across areas. It would be good to know what Council expects from community associations. CAs, however, don't exist everywhere.

- Communities want to be engaged with things outside of planning and development. Maybe we need to get rid of studies, too often someone proposes something interesting and then we ask for a study that people debate. If we allowed more stuff to happen, too often we as residents say nothing can happen so we put up as many barriers as possible to stop it. Sometimes wanting to be engaged is a tactic to delay and stop things.

- In business, we often have people saying here's all the reasons for not doing something and we often looked for people who said here's the reasons we can. For me, there are still sections of the Guidebook that I don't understand or know how it applies in my community. It would be helpful to have it in not such high terminology. Give it to us for what it really means. You get a lot of different groups interpreting it in different ways and that's not helpful.

- We should hire a professional writer to simplify the document. Example of parking policies, could just say 'some areas don't need as much as parking as others'. Wish it was shorter, simpler and clear Make it possible to do good stuff and less to do bad stuff. And then we can talk about what's important.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

- Plain language is really important not just for CA volunteers but also general public. Materials for outreach for CAs, anything been given to residents and CAs, should be as plain language as possible.
- If it is in plain language, then I can talk to my neighbour about it and be confident like I know what I'm explaining.
- I feel for councillors that have to spend hours and hours hearing different presentations. Waiting 8 hours for your time to speak. I think this to try and create a better more efficient system than we have now. I don't know if I heard this come out.
- This is the logic for the system. Example of North Hill Plan and showing what's appropriate where.
- Clear language might help CPC and SDAB tool



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Monday, April 19, 11:00am - 1:30pm

Local area plan working groups and Community Association representatives

Breakout Group # 3

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

April 19, 11:00-1:30, Discussion Group #3

- unclear is an accurate summary of what was heard
- it was "decoupled" from existing processes and documents, unclear of where it fits within the land use planning policy landscape ("a unicorn")
- felt like it was an imposition, top down approach for communities
- the way it was being interpreted, Westgate is a 1950s community, and felt threatened
- goes back to the hierarchy of plans, the general public who don't work with applications/land use policy on a regular basis don't understand the Guidebook being in between the MDP and LAP
- why do we need it and what does it do?
- struggling with the name, Guidebook should be a guide
- huge communication challenge, even with community association staff
- working group sessions, not easy to transmit information to the broader community, can never do enough communications
- what is enough communication?
- needs to be clear on what it is and how it relates to other things
- elevator pitch, for all CAs, especially for communities that have not been as involved
- more effective to engage tactically and strategically on issues, but the GB didn't leverage knowledgeable communities like Shaganappi, but there seems to be attacks on communities like Elbow Park regarding covenants (counter-productive) - better to focus engagement where it is needed and where the development is going to happen, and inform the rest (may help to support the project as it goes forward if there is buy-in from the most affected)
- engagement more on interest involved
- with policy, it is not as effective unless it aligns with the bylaw, which prevails on appeal
- how does the GB relate to the update of the LUB, and how does the GB relate to existing LUB districts, people want to know what is being built next door
- with smaller groups, a lot of communities felt left out, there needs to be levels of engagement from inform to consult, so people have the opportunity to do that



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

- What is the Guidebook going to enable and prevent? Goes back to certainty (e.g., where rowhouses will go). How can we use this as a tool to get us what we want as opposed to what we don't want?
- What we want, how does the GB inform future redevelopment in the community (e.g., SFH but not McMansions?)
- how do we visually represent the good and bad scenarios
- fundamental disagreement with FCC, should be the most impacted that are most involved, least impacted might be most frightened
- why does it need to be statutory?
- does not see how it is tied into other city-wide policy, like climate change, totally missed in the local area planning process
- levels of engagement - disgruntled people that applied to working group but then weren't selected and were not as involved, need to think about opportunities for those people



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- if the GB is not a statutory document, what mechanisms would exist for the policies and urban form categories will be applied uniformly across the city whenever there is a LAP, these could be slightly different everywhere
 - the LAP is where those modifications and flexibility would exist anyways, even with the GB is statutory. Could be tied into the LUB more closely at that level



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- people want to see higher density along the higher travel routes, and preserve/have less dense within

- why should people who can't afford specific housing types have to live on busier streets - seems equitable

- there is an assumption that if you live near transit, you don't need a car

- market forces dictate where density is going to be occurring, setting targets could be arbitrary and unrealistic

- missed the mark - how is this going to be a tool that gets Calgary out of the dumpster fire of the last 7 years, amplified by the pandemic, in competition with other cities to attract intellectual capital and maintaining a competitive stance, GB could have pivoted to position Calgary as an attractive place to live, not just a place to make money

- we can't support what we have, realities that we are facing as a municipality

- targets are tricky - engagement has been disproportionate to the single detached area, this might make it easier to shove density into already denser areas to protect single detached, need to rethink LAPs as it creates friction instead of alignment, the engagement doesn't work (LAPs may need to be smaller where there are common things, or include these communities to apply densities in a more equitable way)

- engagement is not capturing broad spectrum, tends to be homeowners, not good representation of the others that want to live in denser settings. didn't hear a lot of voices from students, under-represented groups

- issue of money in the community (e.g., Wildwood vs. Rosscarrock)

- climate change, flood policies, infrastructure wasn't really visible when talking about it at a local area plan level, needs to be premapped/thought about ahead of time where these opportunities are especially since people aren't aware/do not have the technical expertise of what can be done

- what is the impact on existing infrastructure and how do we pay for this infrastructure that we need to upgrade in the future to accommodate density



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- just focus on setting targets for communities and getting communities engaged in setting them
 - get communities aligned and speaking
 - wasting time in communities like Elbow Park, where it will be more difficult with RCs, even if density could potentially be accommodated
 - opposed to protecting R-1 as a land use category, further entrenches class-based divisions, would like to merge land use categories into intensities, this is now politics for R-1 conservation. Never reach the MDP targets, but we can make small efforts in "off-limit" areas where there are large parcels. everyone will nominate themselves for protection if it is available, needs to be stringent limits on R-1 preservation
 - not much builder feedback on these sessions, there is already opportunities to rebuild in the inner city
 - part of the charm of single-detached communities, maybe large lots could be subdivided.
 - agree with not needing a protectionist approach, understand the politics that drove these amendments, would like the single-detached pieces to be stripped out
 - land use and property rights belong in front of Council, these address the challenges that have been put on the table
 - Builders have been more involved, particularly in Shaganappi
 -



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- to what degree can a building be upgraded and still be considered heritage?
 - redeveloping properties that are in disrepair, not all old buildings are nice
 - what can be done to protect tree canopies and streetscapes?
 - streetscapes and canopies can be identified in a LAP process, understanding it's hard to legislate what is beautiful or not
 - perhaps there needs to be more of an incentive to protect a building (Inventory, designation) as it is expensive and onerous, needs to be done gently
 - conflict between heritage preservation and energy efficiency, have to be careful and knowledgeable
 - rely on the knowledge of residents in a LAP for where the special places are, and the special streets in a community
 - NHLAP - heritage layers/tools/policies are not done yet, people don't see/understand that it is happening when they are not at the table (this is a communication issue)
 - need to tie things together, such as grants, organizational support in protecting assets, other resources, that won't come from policy



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- private trees and lot coverage policies, that would be a way of ensuring less local resident opposition to some of the redevelopment proposals that we see (e.g., oversized homes), more applicable at the land use bylaw

- people are eager to oppose things on other people's private property to protect their own rights, private trees shouldn't be up to debate, should not have anti-development tools and a MDP that supports infill (challenges for business owners, and those costs will increase and be expensive for families)

- could incentivize people to keep big trees, but not the role of the city to protect private trees

- heritage assets - need to understand what and why, things that contribute to the public good. old is not the same as heritage

- there might be more ability to protect some of the trees/landscaping if lot coverage is reduced

- minimize changes to existing property rights, extends to landscaping that is not just trees, different people will use private property differently

- supportive of heritage communities, but not all communities will have heritage buildings



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- reads as if the city is planning community plans for R-1 communities, this is highly prejudicial and offensive, and supports social stratification
 - when they say the zones are unfair, this affects my business
 - there are no shortage of detached homes and they are actively being built in Zone A, problem is more about the cost (average of 7 figures) which excludes many people
 - disagree with this page, Calgary has more housing in that form than anything else, we won't endanger it
 - should be more about context - not giant homes, but things that fit together well
 - this shouldn't be part of our planning documents
 - can think about access to light, encourage contextual design policies
 - have things happen from corners inwards, no sore thumb development
 - protectionist approach is bad
 - difficult to get buy-in if people are being told (or implied) that they are exclusive, classist or racist when this is a choice that they have made to live in single-detached. this just builds opposition from the best-funded people.
 - we don't have to get there today, we have to educate the public that the McMansion is as bad as a rowhouse if it is poorly designed
 - FCC has communities on both sides, but it's really about the education and asking questions about things like "what is a rowhouse" and what the issues are with this housing type that are causing issues (e.g., parking, privacy, transition, scale) - need to show examples where there are different housing types on a street that work
 - there needs to be a lot of communication, and it was incremental change
 - if we allow the protectionist mentality to continue, we will continue to see more stratification and poorly planned out density, people will be terrified about what will happen - show people what good redevelopment and density could look like (e.g., Westgate), need to put in some firewalls, and how development benefits people in the city
 - there is a demand for new bungalows in the inner city, but there is very little supply (it's an inefficient use of space and is expensive in the inner city)
 - inner city areas don't necessary need protection, due to the cost to develop there
 - plan for people who will move to the community
 - not all complaints should be equally weighted, there still needs to be the ability to make products competitive
 - restrictive covenants are problematic for redevelopment
 - Highland Park has a rowhouse mid-block, was contentious for parking, trees, people were afraid - CAs are in a hard position to be balanced between older residents and new or potential residents and their perceptions
 - mitigating risks isn't part of a planning consideration
 - RCs are a developer's risk, not the issue of land use planning, the City doesn't have the power to discharge RCs
 - NIMBY interests are clearly defined and the legitimate concerns are addressed, virtual town halls have been very helpful to allow for more people to speak positively about the development



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- node and corridors is a form of code, lets put up a strawman to locate next to "bad" areas, and allow ring-fencing and further entrench social stratification - have no understanding of the market of homebuilding where people want to live in the "best" areas
 - no support for the whole page of actions
 - also no support for this, if you put rowhouses on corner/arterial roads, why do they get stuck living on a busy road, instead of the quieter part of the community, can't just funnel intense development to the peripheral, it is a form of socio-economic stratification
 - if there is intensification, it needs to be "eased in" and fits in the interior of a community, not necessarily a large multi
 - need to think about the child-friendly city, communities and housing are designed so kids can walk to school (e.g. not on the busy roads)
 - desire to congregate around access to transit, but also think about kids will get to school (e.g., connectors divide communities and often families will not send their kids to schools on the other side of connectors)
 - stratifying communities is not ideal, but the big issue is infrastructure (upgrading along a corridor/node is easier), but can help facilitate redeveloping in the interior of communities
 - need to create great buildings and neighbourhoods, social equity through land use is a big hurdle and can confuse the issues
 - gentle density - smaller multi-family that fits in 3 storeys/similar footprint will fit better in these areas, but will be driven by the market
 - node and corridor already allowed for and supported, system works well for big builders like Truman, Guidebook is more about the middles of the communities being intensified. need to support smaller businesses as well



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- FCC - this is a short turn-around time to reach out to the under-represented groups/not involved/voices not heard (this focuses on what will be presented on May 5)

- Westbrook - think about getting into deeper engagement soon, instead of just the working group, it is complicated with so many developers as well (landowners, CA leadership, residents)

- need to break it down for people in plain language (elevator pitch - make it simple) - what does it mean, what does this mean for your community?

- if you want greater engagement with a more diverse population, what tools can we use to facilitate that? no-one really goes to the City's website, try through the CAs, provide easy to publish write-ups for newsletters and Facebook pages

- it should not be an election issue, but it very likely will be and people will vote based on it in a potentially negative way, need a communications strategy for how this will be managed

- if it's neutral, let people make up their minds - not everyone will be part of a CA

- need to consider social media and other tools to engage a broad spectrum of people from young to old (may include utility bills, waste collection) and update the Communications Toolkit

- fatigued on the Guidebook, it has been going on for a while, but some people have just heard about it. GB might be watered down or neutralized for overcoming immovable objects (outdated LAPs), the importance of it needs to not be forgotten, blocking the advancement of work that needs to be finished so that other things can come along



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Tuesday, April 20, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 1

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Is it too late to change the name of the document to clearly define what the purpose of the document is. Is it really a guidebook? law?

- guidebook is expediting development in R-C1 neighbourhoods. The LAP will neuter the oversight of the community associations concerns, concerned about the purpose of the guidebook and undermine the checks and balances in place.

- What happens if the guidebook is not statutory? What does it mean? Can it be challenged?

- Once the LAP is created, it becomes the Bible. As a statutory document people will use it as the word. Moving forward, expectations become a challenge to the process. How is this solving the problem?

- The purpose of the guidebook is an instruction manual. It will provide guidance. I do not see anything in the plan that helps us define activity centres and corridors. Where would the metrics be?

- are activity centres, corridors and heritage which are key, are they absolute or relative numbers. Would corridors for example be defined by metrics? Will every community need to have a certain number of activity centres and corridors.

- found the Guidebook to be clear but there are certain expectations that are not there.

- How far can a LAP deviate from the Guidebook if the community wants it that way?

- How large is the local area plan which encompasses the community of Mount Royal. Some communities are unique with the type of tree canopy, impacts to infrastructure, traffic etc. With the uniqueness of these communities, I am concerned the plan is too large with too many communities and paints them with a broad brush. Great cities of the world have distinct communities. What works for one community may not work for another.

- Clarify some of the specific items in the document. Page 14 - How people will live and travel in the future.

- Page 22 - Figure 7. lays out an expectation. picture looks reasonable sensitive intensification and the later in the document it looks completely different with row houses and multi-family. why is there such a variance between the two pictures. Do not see single detached dwellings in the limited scale.

- Page 25 - Where did the should language come from originally? Should statements read more like shall.

- Page 38 section 2.6 - Does not speak to massing and overlooking.

- Page 25 - talks about water and sanitary but no reference to electric.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Suggestion on new name which i believe would be consistent with the MDP would be Guidebook for Strong Communities.

- the direness of heritage issues and tree loss already existing in our communities. the importance of immediate actions. There is bylaws for tree planting and we are still short 284 trees short. It should have some teeth.

- Concerned by the outcome of LAPs picking and choosing. What is the point of the Guidebook if I hate all the policies of the Guidebook. The guidebook is flexible already and the LAP is a way to fine tune it.

- Is there an opportunity to work backwards. when looking at flexibility, picking and choosing policies using the word should. Work with density targets first and then choosing policies to meet MDP targets. Rather than lead through a journey of discovery, get real and tell us what we need in the local area plan for example, amount of people, types of housing and work from there.

- the implications of it being non statutory and then using language of must and shall becomes a non issue.

- confusion on the actual purpose of the Guidebook. Provide clarity up front.

- the MDP states that developing areas will increase 50%. The community can come up with the number. Multi-community plans concern me based on the amount of communities and people. Don't see how different communities can work together to agree upon where density occurs.

- City has often allowed developers to what they want. Loss of confidence when there are rules, the City should protect the community first and not the developer.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- a lot of the complaints come from a particular community and particular areas. The nature of this document is not to give a neighbourhood a power just because you don't want a specific thing. Comments come from missing the whole purpose of what the guidebook is trying to achieve for the City. Want the creators of the document to remember what the purpose is.

- the MDP states targets in particular areas but not by community. There are some communities more suited for intensity. We shouldn't look for increased intensity in every community.

- With respect to maintaining urban forestry it should read private and public trees. I would like to see it more in the discussion.

- It would be spectacular if we were not under the time compression of May 5th so we can have many more gatherings like this.

- There were some themes in the public hearing. Planning is a technical discipline. It is really important to have public input and participation but we should let Planners do their job to plan for the city's future.

- Density targets in a local area plan. for example in Crowchild density targets can be met by taking down used car lots and intensifying through TOD development.

- If the city feels that there are certain communities not represented, then the city has an obligation to seek out those communities for input.

- Concern with relegation of climate and sustainability. The guidebook assumes business as usual and does not take into extreme weather in the future. Not sure why cars are included as they are not under threat in the City.

- People who are suffering from poverty are not included in the discussion as they may not have the means. This guidebook is focused on those most vulnerable and it should be the focus of this document. Climate is going to be forefront in our world and should be forefront in this document as it is all linked to our community.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Are we looking to support more drive thrus? I disagree with supporting new vehicle oriented uses especially on our main street.
 - new vehicles do not need additional support. I would like to cycle and walk more. Needs more support to other forms of mobility
 - drive thrus, gas station and car washes should not be on main streets. defies all purpose. Alberta needs to show that we are not all about oil and gas.
 - recognizing pre-colonial history is a no brainer.
 - We don't need to prioritize the vehicle anymore. Lots of vehicle infrastructure already are developed. the document should allow for more fluid ways for road upgrades for other mobility choices such as bicycle infrastructure. This also affects the climate part and allow us to be a more climate resilient city which would be a draw for people to come to the City. It would be a great addition to the guidebook and bring this topic as something that is expected rather than unexpected.
 - Need to move forward and not look back over our shoulder. Look at different ways of mobility.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Good to hear that the City protected 10 boulevards with trees as a resource.
 - As I look at the 9th Ave in Inglewood where we have damaged the original main street. How can the guidebook help resolve the issue of new development in existing historic streetscapes?
 - in every meeting or discussion with the City, the issues of tree retention, heritage always comes up. We are not able to save any. It needs more interest and intervention from the City to save Heritage buildings and forestry.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Would they be happy with these amendments. Would it serve the desired outcome?
 - Is heritage in the eye of the beholder?
 - Heritage evolves. How do you write into the document future considerations of heritage assets? What is relevant as heritage and how do you keep it relevant?
 - if the Guidebook is flexible then it is inherent in the process in terms of calling out landmarks/ unique sites in the community.
 - Heritage trees - trees get bigger and better with age. The moving heritage line is just not buildings, it is also the future heritage.
 Want more trees to stay. Not sure if that is through limiting footprint to protect trees.
 - Protecting trees creates a future heritage for us. canopy cover of native species is important to protect.
 - Heritage can be integrated flexibly such as the National Music Center.
 - we have lost to many heritage assets in our City. ex the York Hotel. The old public library is an example of heritage building we do not consider as being a worthy heritage asset. Another example the old science center. The city should look at how they can protect their own assets to demonstrate leadership and develop tools to protect the heritage asset such as density bonusing. Can put a monetary value to protect them.
 - Is heritage done to people? We look at our area and define heritage assets. Is there compensation for those that have been heritageized?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- What is meant by recognizing the importance of single detached areas? It is a vague and strange housing type to build the city around and contributes to the sprawl problem.

- lot of this speaks to the idea of the lack of architectural controls that are seen in new communities. When we talk about character of our community, if we eliminate existing character housing then we eliminate the character.

- lots of hardworking community volunteers see single detached housing as an issue. Overly large and do not fit, understanding that change is required to survive, there must be a better way to do it. The people that are existing in the community have to appeal the DP to preserve the character. Huge issue in the inner city and NIMBY is a result of this. How do we assure moving forward, what happens today, doesn't happen in the future. How does the Guidebook address this issue.

- It should be the communities wishes first, and then the developer second. Not talking about style, cant regulate peoples taste.

- I don't see single family homes being put to risk in this document. I do agree this kind of development should be spread throughout the City. Need to diversify the sprawl. Single family is the norm in every community minus the downtown and Beltline. See the argument with apartment buildings but huge homes of the same size is not the issue. Aesthetic and heritage value do not mean a lot and we cannot deny development in certain areas just so they can keep the areas the way they are now.

- neighbourhood character - the concept is vague. It usually is euphemism of something ugly. A lot of zoning is to be exclusionary and classicist. Residents should participate and engage on this but feel like the trust issue with the City, neighbourhoods don't understand their jurisdiction. every decision becomes a democratic exercise but it is not.

- I live in a cul-de-sac and in someways protected from multi-families developments around me. As a family, there is a safety and security to live in a single family residential home. With multi-families there is a sense of overlooking and having multi-families we may not know who they are. Single family homeowners like their amenity space. There is a massing issue and shadowing with multi-families or otherwise. people like the single family residence for safety, security and overlooking issues.

- Our residents value peaceful calm orderly neighbourhoods with green space and feel that they can enjoy it through a single family neighbourhoods. New communities inspired by the guidebook result in no parking on the street.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Eliminating A and B - see it as counter intuitive. Not all areas of the city are the same. Being close to the core of the city changes the function of where you live. they are denser closer to the core due to employment opportunities. If you build dense in the corner of the city and does not seem functional. if we treat every part of the city the same it would result in illogical development patterns.

- newer communities are very different and have a good cross section of housing typology. For the most part done in a thoughtful and planned manner. Ex. Quarry Park. Communities in the A zone are at cusp of survival and need to bring new people into the community and the only way to do it through greater housing types. Need to think about what works moving forward but need to do it a thoughtful and planned manner and it cannot be just about developers making the most money. We need guidance and direction on where we can put some of this new development.

- zones A and B challenge is in how its was determined. State of readiness is important and take into consideration the mobility issues with redevelopment and intensification. Lots of areas in the city with high employment with low residential density. These areas can benefit from increased residential density. We need to look at making our communities more complete. It is important to do it sensitively through consultation with community associations. zones need to be determined by greater public consultation.

- Is there planning rationale to the first point? Rowhousing, duplexes are low density and do not see the merit in excluding these housing types. Disagree with the first action on this page.

- I am in favor of the proposed amendments.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Engagement at the library may have helped reach a large number of people. Was it a worthwhile endeavor? Why was it not brought up?

- Anything the city can do to include more people in this process is needed. Do not agree with the lack of engagement and pushed through comment. People are unhappy with the outcome rather than the process itself.

- Planners should be able to do their job and do not think it was rushed through. There has been lots of engagement and would like to see it every where rather than just downtown.

- Thank you for this process.

- The mayor and some councilors are not going to be running and the timeline is compressed. Would love to see more engagement. Hope to see more of these sessions.

- at some point those that live in our communities have to be responsible for our own engagement. to be engaged you need to grab the audience. Changes coming to your community would be a better approach for more participation.

- i just want to add that I think COVID made engagement easier for a lot of people and if virtual engagements like this can continue/be integrated into future projects that would be a positive step

- engagement was excellent. Engagement is expensive and we should be aware of how much money we spend on engagement.,

- thank you for the opportunity and engagement tonight. was involved with Crowchild Trail study. Only 50 of the 280 communities in the City participated. Did you expect more communities to be involved in this process? do you think the negativism dominates the public hearings and are truly not representative but reflective of the voices.

- applaud the efforts in reaching out to communities given the pandemic. Councilors could have helped engage the community. Similar to assessments where the value of house is positive but seeing taxes is taken negatively.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- if this does not get resolved quickly, it will be an election issue. will not have quorum.
 - This needs to get resolved quickly and do not want to see this on the ballot. People may not have all the right information to make an informed decision with a lot of misinformation out there.
 - The guidebook is ready and will be dead if it is not resolved before the election.
 - first action is a terrific amendment. There needs to be education first and then engagement. Kind of concerned to see some communities drop out of the LAP process. How do you handle that if some communities in your local area wont join in.
 - This needs to be completed before the next election. will not benefit of being a political hockey puck. all the hard work will get changed for the worse and will have to do all these engagement session again.
 - What information do councillors have access to that we do not.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Tuesday, April 20, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 2

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Confuse and do not really know the difference between statutory and non-statutory. This is a general statement that applies to all documents: LAPs, GB, NH LAP, MDP. Concern about the wording and prefer it to have less teeth. Statutory means that it would be adopted as a bylaw; it would only apply if there is a LAP; will have common policies that will not need to be repeated in every LAP; and it will not apply to the whole city (SR).

If approved as a non-statutory document, it will not have much teeth; the new LAPs will need to copy and paste relevant sections which will then become statutory in that LAP. sounds like we would just be transferring a problem.

Difficult to understand why the NH LAP and the GB processes run concurrently? One depends on the other and what happens in the GB will need to be reflected in the LAP. If the NH LAP is approved prior to the GB how would that work? What would it mean for the NH LAP? The NH LAP would need to take policies from the GB if the latter is approved as a non-statutory, and the NH LAP will become bulkier, perhaps more confusing.

The NH LAP also has instruction for amendments which are happening parallel to this GB sessions. It is likely that the NH LAP would need to wait to see what would happen with the GB (SR).

Concern about the situation that we are at right now. Seems like the GB is sent back to Administration too many times. So, if the NH moves forward in addition to including policies from the guidebook, would it need to have its own Land Use Bylaw for it to be better understood and clearer?

Is there an opportunity to write a policy that would prevent Council from approving changes to a LAPs, especially when residents are not in support of such changes? Feel like there is an enforcement issue as it is very common that policies and plans get amended based on specific applications. This happens now with existing ARPs and ASPs, and there is no way to stop that. to me it would not make a difference whether the document is statutory or non-statutory. The main issue is enforcement.

Concern on the language used in the GB, its vague - The language can be interpreted in different ways by different parties. So, the way it would get approved would not make a difference. If it was a real guide to development, then it would make more sense if it gets approved as a non-statutory document. Without the LAP, the GB would not apply. This statement is confusing.

Title is a concern – the Great Communities Guidebook or the Guidebook for Great Communities is confusing. The common understanding was that this document was a guide to development that would guide processes for the creation of a statutory document (the LAPs). People decided to not participate in the process as they did not understand the real impact of the GB in their communities.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

CERTAINTY is important - GB, HN LAP need to provide certainty, no unpleasant surprises, regardless what happens or how it gets approved I want certainty. We bought our single-family home with the understanding that some redevelopment would come, however we expected changes no greater than R-C2. Heard lots about "protection" of R-C1 neighbourhood, we are looking for protection on R-C2 communities as well. Our ARP is clear, and we are comfortable with it. The ARP allows for some density beyond R-C2 in certain areas, where it makes more sense. Yet, we feel like the ARP was disregarded; it has good things and reflects the wishes of the community.

Emphasize that the R-2 neighbourhood deserve protection as much as R-C1 neighbourhoods.

Concern is also that some CA members seem to be misrepresenting the community. As residents, we are ok with limited changes and feel that we were not consulted on what was discussed/brought forward to city planning. As a CA rep, it is hard to engage people, hard to talk to everyone, we have limited resources and time. It is not great when Councillors say: CAs you need to do your job; you need to engage people.

Existing Plans - Hillhurst Sunnyside ARP was recently amended to provide more certainty on heritage. Difficult to understand what would happen now with the GB and LAPs. Heritage organizations sent a letter noting feelings about should and shall. From our experience, using should resulted in little preservation over the years. Existing ARPs have good stuff – they are great and work for the communities, why just cancel them? Renfrew has not had any planning exercise since 1971. In theory we have 3 ARPs but not one for the whole community, it is great to unify but do not disregard them completely.

RISK – it was said that the LAPs would be able to pick and choose policies from the GB, it could be risk as the small group that will directly work on that may not really represent what the community wants/needs. There is concern and little understanding about how the committees (Working Groups) are form, who gets selected and why. Residents agree with high density in certain areas, but there needs to be more transparency.

Density Equality - density should be equal in every community across the city. It should not only be put on certain communities.

Believe every community needs to take density equally, however certain communities could be given a break from high-density as a way respect/keep their history/richness. Let's not destroy our history in the name of density. Let's be flexible with certain communities yet let's make sense of it.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm **1**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

Repurposing - We are planning for a future where we don't know what can happen. Its uncertain times and there are a lot of underutilize areas/buildings including our downtown. Could we talk about repurposing development to include density? LAPs should consider this as well.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Density Targets / performance measures
There is a figure in the GB that talks about the Targets of the MDP - referring to the # of housing units required in Established Areas; however, it lacks performance measures. It is unclear how many units would be placed in each community. It is unclear to know what the density cap for each community is, when enough is enough? Agree with density, yet I also agree that some people prefer R-C1 areas - however there is no performance measures to clearly tell me the number of units for each community/area? yet I am skeptical to ask for it now, because people would feel numbers may be arbitrary. There are broad targets not community by community targets, and we are aware that density target may be prefer by some communities/ others not so much.
if targets are not established, how would we know what the limit is. enough is enough? Would development just keep happening until we end up with empty buildings? targets would help define if we are well-served, under-served or over-served.

Concern - confused when I hear that communities will decide growth - how to understand growth without targets/measurements. It is true that certain parts of the city would be easier to densified than others. Some areas could allow more density - would that create issues between neighbourhoods? what would happen at that point? perhaps ok to get rid of MDP - not sure how planners are going to deal with these questions - difficult. density targets!

Important to add the right amount of density in the right location. These amounts and locations should be determined by the communities, not the City.

When trying to decide how much development is appropriate it is good to have targets, because reality is that developers decide where to develop. If there is a blanket for development over the existing communities at the end developers will be the ones choosing where and what. In our community we have both R-C1 and high-density areas, we like to think that we are ahead of density target. If targets are clear for each community developers would think twice and perhaps go elsewhere. The real market forces are important and not sure if and how are they being considered in this exercise.

I've been able to stay in my community for the last 12 years because we could move from a townhouse, to a detached house on a 25 foot lot, to a detached house on a 50 foot lot as our family and wealth has grown. I'm fully onboard with a variety of housing.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

If people are given a choice, people would certainly pick the cheapest way in the most desirable neighbourhood. If a blanket zoning across the City is considered. R-CG for example (we called it R-8) if put next to an R-C1 or R-C2 its unfair to the neighbour as suddenly lot coverage changes, privacy changes, and a lot of other changes happen. we are a brown fill neighbourhood.

Developers usually take the lot that is available and try for highest density possible because the more doors the more profit, no matter the neighbourhood or the context. For new neighbourhoods they group the single-family homes, they group the townhouses, the high density. This type of planning creates awareness as it is there, it is clear. Goes back to CERTAINTY. we need to discuss with all parties and get agreement on what can go where. density and location matter, it really matters.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Urban forestry
We do not have a robust private tree protection; the GB has something but weak. We need to have a stronger plan/policy. It can be linked to environmental and climate resilience plan. It is important the urban canopy includes private and public trees. Tighter policy/processes needed - Biggest challenge is that developers demolish houses and take off trees, so a vacant parcel with no trees to "protect" is shown when applying for a development permit. Perhaps tighter demolition permits to preserve trees. Most people do not want to take down trees but when redevelopment happens the urban forestry goes because larger lot coverage, higher densities need that space that trees take. Feels like there are many underfunded parks. Feels like maintenance budget is small and tree replacement budget is low. This can be the reason why there is no desire to take over more parks/trees. Yet we ask developer to plant a tree which usually die after. Would be easier if there is no required for them to plant trees, people can do it by themselves and instead in a location that is suitable for the tree. City can collect the money from developers from tree replacement and plant more trees in public lands.

that's a really good point! (demolition permits should safeguard private trees)

Vehicle-Oriented
Not allowing vehicle-oriented uses in main streets or activity centres is ok. for example, Edmonton Trail is set to become a pedestrian friendly area, so why allow driveways to serve cars?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Heritage Protection
Need stronger wording to be able to protect heritage/historical assets. Understand that we need heritage protection - the how we do it is a concern. Some neighbourhoods like Mount Royal had to use a DC to try and protect the character of the area. Some Heritage Protection Areas in the NH LAP were intended to be used to protect middle and upper class neighbourhoods.
More work needs to be done - how do you preserve the buildings without preserving the ideas that were in place at the time? part of Renfrew does not qualify for the heritage tools due to date of construction / in Scarboro it seems to be a conflict because of the context. There are some great examples around the world where a great job of preserving buildings was done but the demographics that were attracted was exclusive and did not allow for anyone to come.

Concern - To eliminate heritage because of various concerns related to wrong history is concerning. Heritage assets need to be preserved and interpreted in the context of that time. It is not ideal to eliminate heritage due to ethnicity, racism, or wrong history. The question IS: would all heritage need to be preserved, perhaps not?

interesting point re: social engineering from the past impacting the future of our heritage buildings

Heritage buildings vs areas
The GB would have problems because in order to keep a COMMUNITY CHARACTER and its AMBIANCE certain development may not be appropriate. the GB lays a blanket and if a property goes for sale, developers could come and put higher density, which could be inappropriate due to the context. It is difficult to plan for situation like that but certain allowance for certain districts that have a special character need to be in place.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

I have no problem with preserving heritage buildings but I would like everyone to note that this effectively freezes the density also. Something I fear may not apply in my area due to a lack of designated heritage buildings. In Mt. Pleasant, there seems to be few homes of historical value. The realities are that buildings eventually reach the end of their useful life, and we live differently today so here, most original homes (built in the 40s and 50s?) get knocked down and replaced with infills. I feel this is largely appropriate in this area.

Repurposing – lack of details
The NH LAP has some good ideas but there are no plans for repurposing buildings. Heritage is mentioned but implementation is a concern. What can we do to encourage repurposing? there needs to be a process in place and the only LAP example lacks details on what they will do with certain buildings that are mentioned as historical/heritage buildings.

Metrics/Repurposing/LAP lacks that. repurposing - metrics and targets are required to be successful

I wish North Hill talked more about adaptive reuse.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Agree the useful life of buildings is important. It goes back to the choice of materials at the time of construction and the level of maintenance it had through the years. It is also true that at some point things reach the end of its useful life and need to be turn down. It is something that have observed.

Do building reach the end of their useful life in Paris? My home is 115 years old and is energy efficient and sustainable

Demolishing by neglect is very common and it seems to be because of developing pressure. People let their homes with very little maintenance so that developers come, buy, demolish and built. Seems like there is no interest to preserve certain type of housing. Usually those houses go from owner-occupied to renters-occupied at which time there is little maintenance, then they get demolished and replaced by one or two homes. seem this in various communities in Calgary.

I fear if allowed developers are allowed they will re-develop the most prime locations first. Unfortunately, this will mean that the least desirable lots remain dilapidated. If these documents can force re-development along busy roads (less desirable lots) first that would be ideal - and this could be higher density. This concept is similar to what new subdivisions do in releasing phases of lots at different times.

We know that there is less than 1% is 1940 homes in the city. Think that heritage policies could protect the little we have left; they are part of our history and character.

I Agree it varies wildly, largely based on choice of materials, and maintenance. As a result, nearly everything reaches end of life - apparently 99%. With that added context, absolutely lets save the 1% worth saving.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Really want to see single-detached homes protection expand that to R-C2 neighbourhoods. the point is to have no more than 2 units per lot which would aligns with the context.

Restrictive Covenants
It is a hot debate. A community is suing the City due to that. Surprise that City think they can be dismissed - not sure why not considered when approving a subdivision or development permit.
City acknowledges the restrictive covenants, yet they are part of land title. The City knows they are there but cannot enforce them. It is the landowner's responsibility to align with those Restrictive Covenants. The City is not a party to those agreements. they are on title. (RS)

Restrictive covenants are on title and are independent to ownership. Could be removed by owners however, many restrictive covenants are difficult to remove. Restrictive covenants can stop redevelopment - for example, in Parkdale there are restrictive covenants in some properties to restrict the number of units and/or number of lots in a certain area. City could approve a subdivision, or development, but other landowners can stop the approval from moving forward. Ingenious from the City to approve a land use when the restrictive covenants do not allow for it.
In University heights also restrictive covenants and had to defend them in the court against a Secondary Suites for example which were blanketed through the neighbourhood. Any one person in the restrictive covenants can defend it against anyone trying to do something that the restrictive covenants do not allow.
City should accept restrictive covenants exist and plan accordingly - Restrictive covenants are a way to protect the community and when you buy on it you will have to follow them. Surprise the City do not make allowances for it, strange to approve DP when not allowed under the restrictive covenants. Seems like a waste everyone's time.
Restrictive covenants seem to be the way to restrict things in communities - yet they could create friction between communities. if we do not like top down planning, we should allow down top planning and use restrictive covenant to prevent unwanted density.
Restrictive covenants - are a means of controlling/having say in regard to setbacks or other things related to the restrictive covenants. I know the City will not be included in the discussion between neighbours.
The GB as well as the LAPs needs to reference/discuss restrictive covenants and explain what can happen or can't happen. do not dismiss its existence. seems to be opportunity to discuss more about restrictive covenants -



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

Housing choices – single-detached areas
If building types do not change the demographic would not change - the same demographics are the only ones that would be allow to come back and rebuild a much bigger home. R-C1 zoning works for developers as they can build bigger houses and get bigger profit.

Feel like in R-C1 areas, R-C2/R-4 would allow for appropriate density without the need of R-CG or higher densities.

Feels like single family homes owners were getting attacked at public hearing, they are just a house type for the different circumstances people have at a certain point in their lives. Lived in various housing types - in regard to protecting wealthiest parts of the city, we need to understand that live changes, needs change. Living in single family homes does not make the person rich or more important it is only a way of life in a certain stage of life. Housing choices need to exist to serve the different live cycles.

There is no need to have ALL housing types everywhere, they could be grouped together, so people can choose within the same area/community. It is all about having options through live, and its important those choices are there, not necessary all in one neighbourhood or all packed together. For example, Tuscany has a variety of housing choices and in comparison, this community is larger than other communities in the inner city. Their plan shows the state/single-family area which could perhaps be larger than Rideau Park for example. So why could Rideau Park not stay as single-family homes community.

Given that a newly built home that is well built and well maintained can last for hundreds of years, it is all the more important to protect current zoning. It would be unfair to those who made investments under earlier zoning/rules. I wondered if grandfathering zoning might work, but I've concluded that it won't as nobody will agree to this. No homeowner will want to lose financially. Unless the City wants to they could expropriate and buy people out at fair market value.

OPPORTUNITY - Now that we have multi-communities plan, there is the opportunity to perhaps identify areas/neighbourhoods that could remain R-1 or R-2. Maybe some increase density belongs to other communities within the same LAP. Yet, all neighbourhoods deserve more densification along important roads, important intersections. Spread out the density but in a way that single-family homes/areas could be kept, as a housing choice.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

Zones A and B
Dislike with having zones- feels like they are more a political decision that related to impacts onto R-C1 areas. I think they are not equitable, they should not exist. Zones A and B understood as a way to densify the neighbourhoods closer to the core. To me this is not a great strategy for Calgary. We should be densifying in certain areas in the outside areas. There are many centres in those areas. If we allow for more density in that area, those areas would thrive and provide services to people there and reduce the need to come to the core. Densifying the core does not make sense. Not happy with this zone A and B idea.
Not fan of Zone A and B – rational that laneless lots prevent density is strange. It is not a real restriction to build moderate density in laneless lots. Development should be allowed everywhere so we would be responding to what the market dictates. Delete Zones A and B as it seems difficult to even get the result wanted, difficult to know what 5% of more dense development means.

Two-year moratorium
A moratorium could work but the issue is that we are rolling our heritage policies at the same time the NH LAP is happening, there is not much teeth related to the heritage layers and they may not work. Especially if both documents don't move forward together.
Two-year moratorium - heard the process had been going on for 12 years? would like to see the process slow down. - AWARENESS is a real issue. There needs to be a level of knowledge and understanding before moving forward. The public hearing was just an opportunity to get people's attention. It feels we need more time.
Moratorium may be good as I do not like the fact that the NH LAP would take effect with no transition period. Grandfathering of the zoning could help? However, when that period expires there could still be uncertainty about what would happen in the neighbourhood. Need more certainty from all the documents.
Two-year moratorium not sure it would work - applications take long time - and people will wait until the time passes and then go for their ideas to redevelop. not ideal.

Like the summary on the table presented. want to see inclusion of R-2 neighbourhoods not just R-C1 neighbourhoods.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

Engagement process
only until recently I feel that I am heard. I have been involved for 5 years. Admin have been good at responding, appreciate the time taken to answer. Council have been slow or silent. That is an issue that elected officials are not call-out on their responsibilities.
Feels that only because we participated in the public hearing, it is now that out concerns are being heard, getting attention. Do not think engagement have been a success.

I'm annoyed at the constant need to provide feedback in this process. However, I inquired about joining some committee a while back (possibly the NHP LAP committee) and was told it was full.

Awareness - The two first bullets say lots and the ones about the LAP are also meaningful. They show that unless people understand the impact, they do not feel that they need to engage. For example, during these sessions where we are discussing the public hearing comments, which otherwise would not happen. Challenge is that people were not aware, they did not get involved, they did not feel engaged therefore they came out to speak at public hearing. Raising concerns at public hearing is only the result of bad engagement. Challenge to think that there was robust engagement for the GB when lots of people are not even aware of what it really means. talked to neighbours it feels like no one knew about this- wonder if this is the final opportunity or if there are other sessions - perhaps timing does not allow for that. With regards to engagement I do not think that the process was robust enough. it seems like this issue will affect a lot of people in Calgary, there should've been a plebiscite to get people opinions on high density in single family areas for example.

Generally, agree with topics in the list, however, disagree on the comments related to the LAP engagement. Feel that the NH LAP engagement was poor and terrible. I participated in some discussion as well as missed a few. Sent comments/went to open houses and felt I was not heard. Felt it was about checking boxes and feel that my concern/wishes have informed neither of these documents.
NH LAP engagement felt like it was a check list- Lets go here, let's do this, what do you want? took a lot of effort but I think up until now engagement have not been that great.

The fact that the GB keeps being coming back to Administration, it only means there is still lots of discussion/work to be done. Concern about the City not contacting me to participate in these events when I spoke at the public hearing, heard about it through other people. There needs to be a process/ need to be more clarity. The City controls this and I feel small against the city. Feels like I am at a disadvantaged. And the participation was limited to people who participated on public hearing, not sure why? I would like to think the city is always looking for more feedback.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

The direction to engage with the voices at the public hearing came from Council and due to FOIP, we were only able to contact people who reached out to us after the public hearing and/or provided their contact information directly to us. (SR)

Timelines
Difficult to understand relationship between Council and Administration feels like there is not enough time to really re-think and engage with additional people. Seems challenging for administration to really change things before they go back to Council. Council set the timeline and engagement as required

I think the reason why May is the date for decision is that it is before the Red Zone (pre-election) Administration is asked to not hold public meetings for controversial items. They want to have it voted for before elections. A new public hearing would be required if it happens after election and to me it would be ok if this goes after election.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

City-wide engagement
As a resident feels like my CA does not speak for me. They are volunteers, their views can be very different, and those are the people who the city if talking to. They feel ok with about the result of the NH, density everywhere which is exactly what the city wanted to see. Their views are theirs. Residents were not asked about how they felt, they were not asked if they had concerns, or comments. There is no real understanding how everyone/most residents feel.
CA views vs Residents views can be an issue. I don't think its "cool" that the City takes the word of a few individuals as the voice of the residents. CAs need to do a better job engaging with residents, asking them questions to better understand what the residents want/need. City should also confirm if their views were those of the residents. Ask questions, ask for details where views and opinions are coming. If residents opposed and CA is ok, its bad.

The City should not assume that the community association is actually speaking for their members. Unless the CA can demonstrate hard data like survey results, you can't just take 1 or 2 individuals word.

One resident did a survey which showed that the majority of residents had concerns about the GB/NH LAP or simply they did not know about it. That information was shared with the City, but it got dismissed, (feels it was because it did not align with what the city/Cilrs ideas).

Agree that CA struggle to represent people and it could be because they are accountable to the CA members only, so that creates this difficult situation. The City put that responsibility in CAs by building this into their planning systems. There are issues when expecting that CAs can undertake wider engagement, difficult as there are not as many CAs in all parts of the city and not sure how the results would be communicated to the City.

It is unclear what a city-wide engagement is – why only engage with CAs, there should engagement with residents. We understand that it is a challenging because not enough resources. But people are still afraid and not clear about what it means for their investment.

The City has to define what robust engagement mean. It is never clear what it means. To me it means adequate input and opportunities for people to understand what is being proposed. Challenge is that the city relies on CAs to communicate with residents, but they do not have resources/time, nor do they have people who can focus on planning and communication/surveys/feedback.

A robust engagement plan, I hope this is equal to all in the city.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

(Continued from previous page)

MORE TIME would help. why are we rushing? This is a difficult time for all of us. Wonder if this is as urgent as the city and Cllrs make it sound. We can't predict future, and there are a lot of moving pieces for example lots of people have left Calgary so do we really have a housing problem. I think we should TAKE MORE TIME to have more discussions and produce a better plan. Delay is ok but the concern is making this an election issue. It may get distorted and may become less useful and generate more concerns in people. the delay can also allow the City to think this through, there is a list of difficult questions/tasks and the city only has a week to deal with all that.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Tuesday, April 20, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 3

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- people didn't understand if Guidebook had force of law
 - confusion of whether zoning would change
 - recognition of single-detached housing in the city
 - unclear if Guidebook was to replace Developed Areas Guidebook (statutory)
 - unclear of the description of the Guidebook as the 'glue' between MDP and local area plans
 - Wendy: Guidebook does not replace Developed Areas Guidebook, provide underlying policies for local area plans
 - clarification- area redevelopment plans and local area plans are synonymous
 - Language in the Guidebook was vague/loose (such as endeavour to)
 - concerns about how appeal board will treat the document
 - Wendy: one purpose of Guidebook is to avoid repeated policy in multiple policy documents
 - documents are hard to follow, and understand how they relate to each other
 - which takes precedent- Guidebook, zoning or Local Area Plan
 - clarity around R-C2, R-CG (let's not just think about protecting R-C1)
 - what recourse do people have with respect to zoning
 - Wendy- Local Area Plans do not change the zoning on properties, applications required to change the zoning on a property
 - concern of if the Guidebook will change the process of rezoning, will this help residents be heard?
 - Wendy- decisions on zoning are up to Council, so difficult for us to predict/forecast decisions
 - understanding is that Guidebook implements the Municipal Development Plan (MDP)
 - confusion around the fact that several Guidebooks already exist- are these all needed?
 - Wendy- existing guidebooks serve different functions- ie. centre city, new communities- these will remain in force as existing plans refer to them
 - confusion of whether local area plans have been done for the entire city (reference to the local area plan map)
 - is this guidebook only for new local area plans?
 - Wendy- Local Area Plans refer to a Guidebook explicitly in the Local Area Plan itself
 - Wendy- we have over 200 plans from various decades, using various language, Guidebook provides some consistency to Local Area Plans
 - confusion on the local area plan map- is this a map of existing plans, or planned plans?
 - Wendy & Peter- the Local Area Plan strategy aims to replace some plans, make plans for some areas that don't exist etc
 - question/uncertainty about when the guidebook and local area plans will apply?
 - how do homeowners get certainty around zoning in their neighbourhood (i.e. R-1 or R-2)?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

(Continued from previous page)

- Local Area Plans seem to group communities that seem disparate
- why can't local area plans apply to a single community? communities would have a greater voice in their community plan
- what problem is the Guidebook trying to solve? is it population stability/decline? is the goal densification?
- what triggers a LAP? can communities opt out?
- Wendy- local area plans were based on common characteristics, amenities, infrastructure, catchments (schools), recognizing communities share amenities
- Wendy- deciding when a LAP is started depends on several factors, one is development pressure/change, need to analyze infrastructure needs
- question- Altadore and Elbow park are different, but why put together? the problems are different
- unclear how everything fits together, no good summary is available (Guidebooks, Transit Oriented Development Etc)
- understood that Local Area Plans couldn't interfere with Transit Oriented Development- unclear how these fit together
- desire to get rid of should statements- anyone can propose anything
- unclear on the local area plan process- how were communities grouped together, dissimilar communities grouped with each other, potential for conflict between communities
- concern about outdated policies- what is the lifespan of the Guidebook? how long will it take to undertake all the local area plans? concerned about the longevity of the process
- Wendy- there will be a sustainment team for the Guidebook to keep it relevant, will work with local area plans. Can keep things like climate policy, urban forestry more up to date. Guidebook won't be stagnant
- if we create a local area plan today, does the local area plan also change with Guidebook updates?
- Wendy- if Guidebook is updated, it will also update LAPs (if statutory)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A) Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B) Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- do these actions fully address the questions/comments raised?
 - feel that there are actions lacking
 - need to address forms- specifically the low-density form, includes rowhouses, duplexes, this is the lowest level- doesn't work for everyone- biggest issue for some
 - expensive inner city redevelopment has happened, but isn't relevant to areas outside the inner city- confusion about how the guidebook will address newer communities
 - action- LAPs should only apply to individual communities, not groups of communities- greater say for communities in their policy
 - communities should have a say if they want to join other communities in a local area plan
 - disagree with the action above, for example Sunalta does not have the same resources/population to influence desired outcomes that affect them (for example a new recreation centre)
 - concern about existing Guidebooks being replaced for newer terminology
 - communities need to be able to opt out of a local area plan



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- city is trying to find an economy of scale for planning- difficult to approach planning for smaller neighbourhoods
 - challenge is trying to define what a complete community is, is it just a number? do we have the right boundaries?
 - some communities will have significantly more population than others- for example Northern Hills (has 90K people)
 - LAPs are currently grouped geographically, perhaps they should be grouped by different characteristics (affordability?).
 - Need to recognize unique characteristics of communities within an area
 - disagree that there is disproportionate investment in inner city (i.e. rec centres in the newer communities)
 - agree with disproportionate tax burden on inner city communities
 - consideration needed for things such as recreational amenities for inner city communities
 - diversity, inclusion are admirable qualities, but feels like just using buzzwords- how does this translate into our community plans? can the city govern this?
 - need to accept that some areas will be more expensive, others will be more affordable
 - how do expensive infills contribute to increased affordability?
 - concern about ability of infrastructure to handle increased density, if community grows by 30% how will infrastructure handle this?
 - need to have investment/amenities in inner city along with growth
 - complete communities is a challenge due to economic competition for small retailers (for ex hardware stores losing out to big boxes)
 - if we need to talk about densification, we have to talk about targets- otherwise we create have and have not communities
 - loss of urban forest, greenspace with densification, need to balance this
 - struggle with definition of complete communities? what does this mean? geographic, population, etc
 - do we need every outcome in every community? for example mix of housing, does this have to happen everywhere?
 - how is accessibility included? for ex- bungalows in older communities- more appropriate for people with mobility challenges- challenges of keeping these types of housing affordable
 - Wendy- agree that not everything here can be addressed through the Guidebook,



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- disagreement on single-detached area policy- does not adequately support needed infrastructure. However, low density policy/approach needs refinement

- potential solutions that use lot area/coverage rather than number of units in the policy

- concern about focus on vehicle orientation- vehicles already have sufficient space in the city, appropriate to restrict them from areas such as main streets (for example drive-thru on Macdonalds on 17 avenue)

- need to have amenities follow growth- reverse the hollowing out of the city

- concern with homogenous low density form, Calgary is the largest concentration of single-detached homes in the country, but doesn't mean we shouldn't try and change

- single detached communities feel under siege

- covenants need to be respected, need to reconcile private tools (covenants)

- redevelopment should be concentrated along corridors!

- low density issue is not just single detached issue, how do we respect the existing/adjacent properties (can be R-C2 as well)

- respect what new development is being built next to

- need to reflect on the city we live in (we don't live in Europe or New York), we need to redevelop thoughtfully

- what are we trying to solve? economic downtown?

- do want protection for single detached homes

- let communities be different and unique

- protecting existing character is a desired goal (for example R-1, R-2)

- struggle with idea of needing higher density, people don't need to work downtown anymore

- can we leave communities as they are? allow some density, but leave densification to specific communities

- people have concerns about development in their community that wasn't what they anticipated

- communities will change naturally (empty nesters create space for new families)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- agree with the comments on the page
 - question- what is heritage?
 - Wendy- there are different buckets of heritage- heritage inventory (assessed), designated (through prov or muni bylaws), heritage assets (pre-1945, have heritage value, but not protected)
 - Wendy- heritage tools and incentives program is aimed at addressing heritage
 - how does this relate to heritage homes? (i.e. 100 years old or so)
 - Wendy- these properties can be protected by the homeowners initiative, allows access to potential funding (decision is ultimately up to the homeowner)
 - consider a way to encourage protection/maintenance of heritage homes
 - discussion of city program to incentivize homeowners to protect their homes - concerns about losing heritage homes in communities
 - funding may be needed to help
 - should have process to inform owners about heritage status of their homes, can help preserve homes
 - having new homes adjacent to concentrations of heritage home can stick out like a sore thumb
 - challenge is there are few carrots for heritage preservation (recalls \$200K city funds for preservation)
 - City cannot designate properties without compensation to owner for loss of value, little incentive to preserve- need carrot approach
 - urban canopy challenge trees in calgary are mostly planted, not natural
 - need incentive to keep existing trees
 - should capture some language from existing plans, don't need to throw this out



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- desire to capture properties identified in windshield survey, create incentives for protection (grants, etc)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- feel that desire to live in R-1 community has been perceived as protectionist, desire is really predictability
 - people tear down small bungalows and replace with large homes, people cannot afford th bungalows due to competition with new development
 - ability to be more specific about housing forms in local area plans (more granularity)- specify lot coverage, setbacks, trees, etc
 - in new neighbourhoods, developers decide where different types of homes will go- creates stability
 - challenge is that allowing everything will result in a mix of housing- creates tension as existing residents desires are not reflected in new housing forms
 - concern about loss of green space, yard space
 - we need to look at green space/lot coverage when considering sustainability (creates issues with drainage, etc)
 - restrictive covenant communities (built between 1925 and 1975), concern about the low-density policy and how it relates to these communities (not just singles, but also semi-detached homes as well)- option for single detached homes is not available in Guidebook (or duplexes)
 - create incentives (carrots) rather than sticks
 - can we create density, but staying in the same volume
 - most important consideration- maintaining character of community (this is what people choose when they purchase a home)
 - more granularity at the low end (single, semi-detached or rowhouse, townhouse) of the policy is desired
 - some criteria for low density seemed impossible (for ex 600m from a transit stop)
 - flood protection/issues are not included in local area plans, but should be
 - new communities don't mix singles, semis, rowhouses, why in the inner city?



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on rezoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- 2 year moratorium is a bad idea- lots of unintended consequences
 - support for lot coverage tool/criteria for redevelopment
 - reiterate support for granularity of low density forms (create forms for single, semi, multi-family)
 - support for concentrating redevelopment/rezoning on main streets first
 - legally council cannot stop applicants from making rezoning applications (with regards to moratorium comment)
 - R-CG rezoning on corner lots is an intrusion into low-density areas. corner lots are only the first step
 - until council makes a policy on rowhouses (R-CG), we will continue to see spot zoning (make a policy to focus on main roads first)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- concern about timing of Guidebook, seems rushed, why not wait for the election?
 - approval of guidebook timing- will this be rushed through?
 - we need a planned approach to the guidebook
 - strongly disagree with Local Area Plan engagement was a success- never heard of the plan until a year into the process, feel that resident's concerns were not heard, few opportunities to influence the plan outcome, many people's concerns about parking, lot coverage were not addressed
 - concerns about how many people have heard about the guidebook
 - Guidebook 101 sessions were good, work on engagement during COVID was good- however had to be already engaged, difficult to get new people engaged
 - biggest issue is trying to get residents to care about planning before it comes up
 - silver lining- more people are engaged
 - is this the right time considering an election is coming up?
 - there is a lot on our plates, we need to have a better idea of where we are headed
 - rushing this may make people more cynical of the process
 - not feeling engaged on local area plans
 - feeling that a lot of decisions are made before a local area plan starts - engagement feels like verifying decisions rather than creating them
 - feels like communities don't have a lot of control of the process



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- more constructive approach to engagement: doing local area plans before guidebook seems backwards, however going through a local area plan is more engaging

- delaying approval of the Guidebook, is this an option?

- Wendy- our direction is to report back, what we heard report will be prepared

- does this engagement consider a delay for the Guidebook as a recommendation?

- appreciate the opportunity to engage with planning staff at this session

- we need to utilize new technologies- online surveys, etc, we have momentum, let's not lose it

- need to educate more on why we are doing this, people tend to think in terms of how it affects them

- doing the math is important (re costs of infrastructure)

- local area plans- small meetings, more back and forth discussion is useful (feedback is acknowledged and responded to)

- finding out why suggestions may not be good ideas is helpful, helps with understanding

- continuing education on how development happens is useful (i.e. development and planning 101) (people don't care until it affects them)

- Guidebook should be finalized before approving any local area plans (impacts what the local area plan will look like)



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Tuesday, April 20, 6:00pm - 8:30pm
Members of the Public
Breakout Group # 4

Guidebook Engagement Workshops | April 2021

Workbook



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Agenda

Topic		Time	
		Day Sessions (11am-1:30pm)	Evening Sessions (6pm-8:30pm)
Introduction	20 mins	11:00am - 11:20am	6:00pm - 6:20pm
Clarity, Predictability and Certainty	15 mins	11:20am - 11:35am	6:20pm - 6:35pm
Complete Communities	20 mins	11:35am - 11:55am	6:35pm - 6:55pm
Heritage	20 mins	11:55am - 12:15pm	6:55pm - 7:15pm
Break	5 mins	12:15pm - 12:20pm	7:15pm - 7:20pm
Neighbourhood Stability & Character	35 mins	12:20pm - 12:55pm	7:20pm - 7:55pm
Engagement	20 mins	12:55pm - 1:15pm	7:55pm - 8:15pm
Wrap-up & Next Steps	15 mins	1:15pm - 1:30pm	8:15pm - 8:30pm



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Unclear about the purpose of the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Guidebook fit with the Municipal Development Plan, local area plans and other City processes (like planning application reviews)? How does the Guidebook relate to the update of the Land Use Bylaw? Guidebook feels like a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach to planning our communities. Plain language is needed to increase understanding.
Policies are unclear or vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of "should" statements – these are vague and their effectiveness is unclear. Statements that allow for flexibility introduce unclear expectations.
Is the Guidebook a guide or a statutory document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications? Can we just amend the Developed Areas Guidebook?
Set foundation for predictable planning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdated plans lead to unpredictable outcomes, need updated plans. Need certainty that local area plans will not continuously change once approved. Need consistent expectations about planning applications (for residents, investors and businesses).

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- About setting the foundation for predictable planning, once guidelines are set, they immediately tend to be bent or broken. There should be a shared understanding about when the rules apply. When a limit for building is set, there needs to be a commitment from Admin to stick to that.

- There's a lot of confusion about what the next step is. What is the effect of the guidebook being stat have on zoning? There's confusion around that.

- The guidebook will not change things but it will guide rezonings. About equitable communities, his presentation did deal with increasing socioeconomic segregation. We have people being sorted out spatially based on their ability to pay. There is no mechanism in the guidebook to address this. There are some nice statements but there are no implementation mechanisms. Advocates land value capture. The guidebook will result in much upzoning. The value generated from that should go to affordable housing and not to the developer. This has been done in a number of places globally and in N America. Do this in all neighbourhoods of the city.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Clarity, Predictability and Certainty**

11:20am - 11:35am
// 6:20pm - 6:35pm

1

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired outcome
Adopt the Guidebook by resolution as a non-statutory document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policies in the Guidebook are not statutory so that they do not universally apply across communities with a local area plan based on the Guidebook. Allows local area plans to pick and choose which policies from the Guidebook they use.
Replace "should" statements with "must" or "shall"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates certainty that policies will be followed. Especially noted with regards to heritage preservation.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Agrees that more definitive statements like must and shall are important. When it comes to heritage preservation, it requires a delicate approach. Does not want heritage to be a negative restriction. Advocates incentives based approach. Using stronger language for heritage could lead to issues later.

- Lack of clarity between the guidebook as a starting point for Local Area Plans and the effect of stat versus non-stat adoption. A: If stat, the guidebook houses common policies, if non-stat, policies will have to be repeated in individual plans.

- What is the motivation for adopting it as non-stat? If there is a desire for more flexible application, then non-stat makes sense. If we have to copy over policies to each plan it makes less sense.

- If it is passed as a stat doc, no need for redesignation? A: A land use redesignation will still be required to move a property from R-C1 to R-C2 or R-CG (regardless of whether or not the guidebook is stat).

- There was a lot of talk about misinformation. If there was a lot of misinformation, maybe there is a need for more time for people to understand what the impacts of the document are. People may not be able to appeal changes later.

- Doesn't feel that there was intentional misinformation but rather just confusion. If you don't understand the planning system, it's difficult to understand how this document changes things.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Diverse, inclusive and equitable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in having different types of housing mixed together and sharing our services with others. • The pandemic has highlighted the need for proximity and access to services and amenities.
Representation in the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to use an anti-racism lens to planning, there is socio-economic segregation in planning. • Perspectives from the Public Hearing were more valued and many that participated in the local area plan process were not able to attend the Public Hearing. • Need to recognize the many "silent voices" that can't speak up. • Need to recognize pre-colonial history and have a land acknowledgment in the document.
Infrastructure, Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are full, there are enough people in our communities. • Residents are worried about schools, businesses and amenities closing due to declining population. • There is a disproportionate investment and tax burden in new communities vs. the inner-city areas as infrastructure ages. • Are we putting the cost on future generations?
Mobility Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of mobility choices and investment in alternatives. • The future includes cars, especially for a winter city like Calgary.
Metrics and growth targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density and population targets are required for each local area plan and how do these respond to world events (ex. Covid). • Downtown may not be the economic driver and location for higher density living anymore • One-size-fits-all is not appropriate, residents need to be involved.
Climate Action and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good first step, but the City needs more aggressive climate change policy. Needs to be more prominent in the document. • Policies need to address challenges such as flood mitigation and maintaining urban forestry

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- The first topic - what's important to capture is that the guidebook advocates internally diverse communities. The guidebook does not promote communities that are diverse from one another.

- One thing that's troubling about North Hill is that it doesn't allow communities to develop a distinct character. We don't want the same thing for every community in the city.

- Land value capture comment above applies here. If we assume 100k parcels are upzoned in a way that created \$100k of value, that's \$10bn in value created. This is an opportunity that shouldn't be missed.

- The guidebook has been likened to a cookbook. The recipes are the LAPs. There are a lack of clear mechanisms to provide housing options in each community. We're relying heavily on the market and that's not showing a serious commitment to diverse and inclusive communities.

- Comments from Clirs at the public hearing suggested that some inner city communities were not open to density. How are we going to ensure that those who typically aren't able to afford to live in inner city areas might do so? What's to stop a developer from buying up a property and putting up expensive high-density condos? How will the guidebook influence price?

- There is support in the inner city for a variety of unit price points. The problem is not so much residents but how the market prices units. How the guidebook influences the land market has not been adequately explored.

- The role that non-market housing plays in the housing market is extremely important. If we don't start diversifying our housing stock now, we're not going to have additional options in 30 years. New construction is always more expensive.

- Established communities are more alike than different. The guidebook and LAPs may not promote diverse communities, but those communities are already fundamentally similar.

- What is the guidebook team going to do with comments that are objectively wrong? A: There are two streams of work. 1 - the team will take all the comments and see how they should result in changes to the guidebook (not everything can be accommodated but the desire is to listen and reflect). 2 - there will be a what we heard / what we did report. What comments are neighbourhood specific? Which ones are citywide?

- On the infrastructure, services and amenities, feels that there was effort to ensure that public investment would occur. There was a specific focus on transit.

- Using the cookbook analogy, the guidebook doesn't have the ingredients to continue the sort of development (or not) that communities want to see. The trend is towards ultra low and ultra high density. It's not allowing for the preservation of ultra low.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Complete Communities**

11:35am - 11:55am
// 6:35pm - 6:55pm **2**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Identifying growth targets in local area plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that single-detached areas are protected if they don't need to intensify to meet growth targets. This will correlate with how this infrastructure is maintained and funded.
Future sustainment work for climate change targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the climate targets set out by the City, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Include references to climate change throughout the entire document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep climate change at the forefront of planning.
Set urban forestry targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guidance for protection of trees on private and public land.
Support new vehicle-oriented uses in Main Streets and Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vehicle-oriented uses to be a choice when developing on Main Streets and Activity Centres. Recognize the importance of these uses in supporting vehicles as a mobility choice.
Add a land acknowledgment to the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize pre-colonial history.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- There needs to be a mechanism to preserve whatever character is intended for a community. There needs to be clarity about what the targets are for each area. Understand exactly how much density is intended and then plan accordingly.

- It's not just about protecting single-family, but about protecting certain types of unit over an area. There's no protection for single-use areas. Preserve some R-C2 areas.

- There needs to be a definition for what the city means by diversity (race, income, etc.) - does it mean housing types? What is the goal here?

- There were also comments at the public hearing that suggested that density (i.e. R-C2) should be allowed anywhere.

- This document (content to the left) is the city's attempt to capture the highlights of what was said at the hearing, recognizing that to summarize means to drop some particulars.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Protect our heritage buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing prevents the demolition of (unprotected) heritage buildings. Heritage conservation is important to residents. Heritage buildings and spaces are an important component of communities and need to be preserved and protected for all Calgarians. Re-purposing of buildings should be required. Residents feel that there should be more incentives to protect heritage over redevelopment. Heritage in the Guidebook does not recognize pre-colonial history.
Protect our heritage streetscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees and streetscapes are part of Calgary's heritage landscape. Our historic boulevards should be protected.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- An additional comment is that something that the guidebook doesn't cover is heritage spaciousness. Most people would pick a modest semi-detached over a mc mansion. More about building mass over unit count. The cost of intensity is greater lot coverage and loss of greenspace.

- Form scale, massing, streetscape cadence are important.

- Heritage area requirements are fairly high in the guidebook. Not likely to see too many.

- The summary to the left is kind of accurate.

- There are incentives to prevent demolition. There is no legal prevention to demolish heritage buildings.

- Heritage is sensitive and requires a delicate approach.

- There are some items in LAPs that address pre-colonial history. There are ways to address the cultural landscape that go beyond colonial past.

- The formation of buildings and space together is included.

- There are reference to policy tools that haven't been written yet, and that's a gap. There are heritage areas identified, but all that says is that if you tear down a heritage property, there will be architectural controls on what gets rebuilt.

- A lot of the heritage streetscapes are due to restrictive covenants, but nowhere is there any mention of them. There needs to be something to address that.

- Restrictive covenants were brought up. Hear that they play a negative role in communities that are trying to redevelop. For example the single-detached homes on the east side of Banff Trail Station.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Heritage**

11:55am - 12:15pm
// 6:55pm - 7:15pm **3**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Specify maximum scale, massing, lot coverage, and include side setback criteria in the Heritage Guideline Area policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be more restrictive in the Heritage Guideline Areas to incentivize conservation of heritage assets. Protect heritage streetscapes.
Protect residential heritage areas adjacent to heritage Main Streets (commercial areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the heritage assets near or on commercial streets. To protect the most heritage assets.
Extend protections for potential heritage resources awaiting evaluation and inclusion on the <i>Inventory of Evaluated Historical Resources</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets.
Strengthen language for conservation and re-purposing ('must', 'required', 'will' instead of 'should', 'encourage', 'may').	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the most heritage assets. To eliminate ambiguity and make the policy mandatory in all cases.
Make Development Permit applications for all Identified heritage assets discretionary to allow for Community Association circulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the circulation, notification and engagement with stakeholders when development is proposed to affect heritage assets.
Strengthen protections for private trees by limiting lot coverage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the protection of private trees. To limit the size of new infill.
Introduce language about "enhancing" existing communities' sense of place, rather than just creating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recognize the sense of place our communities already have, and better support enhancing our communities' current strengths.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Generally, the comments to the left reflect the public hearing.
 - We need to take the heritage conversation offline with the city (Heritage Calgary) and have a more fullsome conversation.
 - They don't want to infringe too much on property rights. Believe in a more incentivized approach. The blowback from more forceful measures may eventually do more damage.
 - These are interesting actions but a much more detailed conversation is warranted. Any comments in the chat?
 - Protection of trees needs to go beyond limiting lot coverage, and it needs to include public trees as well as private trees. We need to make sure mature trees are protected so that they can't be removed by simply paying a "fine" and replanting elsewhere.
 - Trees are heritage resources, and that the tree canopy itself is a heritage we need to protect.
 - The idea of following through on new development to actually plant new trees. Trees in renderings should actually be provided.
 - Think it's important for the party responsible for planting new trees be specified in new development.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Recognize the importance of single-detached home areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-detached home areas are important to preserve. Mature single-detached home areas are Calgary's most stable communities that provide an aesthetic value, an important housing choice and heritage value to the city.
Need certainty on housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mechanism in the Guidebook to protect single-detached areas in a local area plan. Residents want input as to where certain housing forms go within communities and need tools to do so. Zones A and B don't provide enough of an ability to determine where housing forms go. Zones A and B unfairly target inner city communities for redevelopment.
Land Use Bylaw rules – Height, landscaping, setbacks, massing, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the character of communities as it relates to lot coverage, height, trees, as well as streetscapes. Residents feel that they need to be engaged on what characteristics should be retained in their communities during the local area planning process. Redevelopment needs to be more sensitive to what's already there (ex. small bungalows should not have big houses built next to them). Concerns about loss of trees and green spaces on private and public property.
Restrictive covenants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive covenants should be adhered to by the City. Restrictive covenants don't reflect the investments and changes that have happened since the initial development of certain communities.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Is there any mention of flood protection in the guidebook?
 - Who actually determines density and the need for it? Through the LAP process? The ability to define where density goes and where single-detached should be preserved? There are 16 communities in the West Elbow LAP. Have flood affected communities grouped. There are different risks in flood areas. Heard that at the hearing but doesn't see that reflected here.
 - It's not just recognizing single-detached housing but any sort of contiguous areas of a single for of development. It's important to have a diversity of communities not simply diversity in communities.
 - Stability - the idea that a LAP gets developed but then the increases of something that goes to council through a redesignation - get things right in the LAP the first time - build in development considerations in the policy so that development doesn't erode it.
 - There were a lot of comments at the hearing about protecting single detached houses. A challenge of the guidebook is that the lowest scale of development is at 3 storeys. Going from a single detached neighbourhood to rowhouses is a couple of increments of change. There needs to be a split of that category to finer gradations.
 Rowhouses get into massing and lot coverage issues.
 - Single detached house does not mean small or family oriented. Massing and community character are more essential to him, but not necessarily what was hear at the hearing.
 - Helping the community understand its role in determining where density goes. Process needs to allow communities to define where density goes.
 - It's not just about single detached housing. The essence is about creating a building scale that's below 3 storeys. Semi-detached built to the maximums are comparable to mcmansions. There needs to be something that is at a low scale regardless of if it's 1 - 2 units.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: Neighbourhood Stability & Character

12:20pm - 12:55pm
// 7:20pm - 7:55pm **4**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Allow for communities to delineate single-detached areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows communities the ability to identify and delineate areas of single-detached homes within the local area plan.
Providing criteria for the location of different housing forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides specificity for where certain housing types are located and allows for a Local Area Plan to map these areas parcel by parcel. Applies broadly to all Neighbourhood Local (limited scale) areas. Includes area of conservation that limits redevelopment to what is there now.
Eliminate zones A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treats all parts of the city the same in terms of where redevelopment happens.
2-year moratorium on re-zoning in residential areas outside of Main Streets & Activity Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits any redevelopment to what the zoning currently allows. Focuses development in nodes and corridors.
Criteria to maintain current lot coverage, lot width, height and setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more certainty around specific development characteristics.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- Delineate all areas of single dwelling types. Echo comments above. Not doing this may cause bigger problems like registration of restrictive covenants.

- Massing and community character are more essential. Some houses look like they could be 4 apartments.

- Focus on building dimensions and styles is something that heritage is looking at. Massing, form and scale dovetails with the directions on heritage.

- One of the desired outcomes of delineating single-detached areas is that density may go places where it won't support other planning objectives, like main street revitalization. Deincensivating building in the middle of communities relative to the targeted areas is problematic. There's a flip side to protecting those areas that isn't being captured.

- Semi-detached redevelopment changes the character of areas by building to the maximums allowed under the Land Use Bylaw, and there are no protections through appeals. The concern is that residents won't have a say about what happens in neighbourhoods. Residents want a say and to feel empowered. Trust needs to be established.

- Comments above have been about how plans work in the context of the market. Development often happens outside of main streets where the land is cheaper. Developers are steering clear of higher density policy areas where that density has been priced in to the land. Some cities zone everything low and enable redesignation only through a density bonusing scheme that targets public benefits.

- There was a lot of discussion about aging in place.

- Some buildings just seem too massive for the neighbourhood. Fix mass and be flexible on units. Density needs to happen to avoid sprawl. New units need to happen in all sorts of places.

- One of the biggest challenges is regaining community trust. People don't understand how they can impact the process. There's a perception that this is a 'done deal'. Hope that we can arrive at a point where people feel at peace with changes.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

1A Summary of comments from the public hearing:

Key Topics	Discussion points
Concerns around engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are not engaged early, often or meaningfully enough. • People want to be involved in shaping the future of their community. • Why is the Guidebook being rushed through? • People feel that engagement was not done in good faith and was geared towards a pre-determined outcome. • Engagement was negatively impacted by the pandemic.
Local area plan engagement was successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people involved in pilot local area planning processes felt like the engagement was robust and that their input was considered. • Engagement followed best practices. • Residents felt informed.
Accessible engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is value in engaging with diverse populations. • Communities need a path for engagement outside of a local area planning process. • Public Hearings and engagement events need to focus on accessibility.

1B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the comments captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Would you like to provide additional detail on any of these comments or provide additional comments?

- Is the material generated from these sessions going to be presented alongside the feedback generated from all of the earlier engagement sessions? Hopes that it isn't just the people that signed up to the last session that get heard. A: What we're going to be sending back to Council will include both initial engagement, summary of Public Hearing comments and the comments from these sessions.

- There were some positive comments at the hearing that spoke to the positives about the engagement process.

- The engagement that was done was done well. The problem was that the vast majority of residents were still unaware by the time the document went to council. The word needed to get out better.

- Does the city collect demographic data on attendees? A: Likely not.

- If we could demonstrate what sorts of people were engaged then we might be able to counter claims that the process was unrepresentative of the city's population.

- Both of the first two themes to the left are inaccurate. The engagements on the guidebook were not successful. It's a complex topic and a difficult one to get meaningful participation on. The LAP process was also not seen as successful by many as well.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Theme: **Engagement**

12:55pm - 1:15pm
// 7:55pm - 8:15pm **5**

2A Summary of potential actions:

Potential Action	Desired Outcome
Include an engagement strategy for local area planning processes in the Guidebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is a robust engagement plan. • Ensure engagement expectations are clear.
Request to do city-wide engagement with all community associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities not directly impacted today will be impacted in the future and want to have a say. • Communities want to be engaged in Calgary's future outside of local area planning and planning application reviews.
The Guidebook should be an election issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next City Council will be implementing the Guidebook policies via local area plans. • A candidate's opinion on the Guidebook may inform a voter's choice in the election.

2B Questions for discussion:

- Do you feel that the potential actions and outcomes captured here reflect the presentations and submissions heard during the Public Hearing?
- Do you have any additional thoughts to help us understand these outcomes better?

- What are some good ways to keep people informed? In Enmax notices. A menu of email topics that people could subscribe to. Do the type of advertising that led up to the public hearing at the start of the process. Get people keen on the engagement.

- As a CA planning lead, they don't recall being engaged at all about this. Feel like they're being left in the dark a lot as opposed to being in a partnership with the city.

- The neighbourhood app could reach people who aren't active in their CAs.

- CAs are not always representative of their communities. With 40-60% renters, no renters have ever been on their CA (x2). How do you represent communities better? Schools, places of worship, etc. may better represent communities. Try comparing demographics of those engaged to community demographic profiles.

- There should be a balance of densification even within established areas. No one area should be allocated too much.

- Why can't the city send a letter to all impacted people? The onus is on the city to inform people. Doesn't see why this has to be so urgent. Educate all people running for council. Until people understand what's being proposed, it's hard to get buy-in. So many CILrs seem entrenched in their positions. What's the harm in more time? Investors aren't just developers. What's the purpose of this guidebook? There needs to be more clarity on the point of all of this.

- The certainty of something like a guidebook and a LAP that's actually adhered to will help development be less haphazard.

- If a citywide process is undertaken, it could take in people who aren't invested in the process. People who are scared of density and will just add friction to a process and a document that is needed. The other side is that by involving them, the amount of density that could be allocated to established areas could be higher than if the process slowly allocates development to areas such as those developed in the 90s when they actually experience redevelopment pressure. The right time to engage them is closer to when they may actually be affected by redevelopment.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Next Steps:

- Taking the feedback received during these sessions to develop potential amendments
- Information session to report back on amendments (end of April, date TBD)

Upcoming Dates:

- SPC on Planning and Urban Development – May 5th, 2021
 - Agenda & Report - April 29th or 30th
 - To submit and/or speak: calgary.ca/publicsubmissions or email publicsubmissions@calgary.ca
- Council session date & format TBD



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

1 Agenda

- Introductions - 5 minutes
- Opening Statement of Community Interests, Opportunities and Concerns - 5 minutes
 - Community concerns and suggested amendments (written summaries provided in attachments). Mutual discussions will follow each topic area:
 - Introduction, Chapter 1 - Principles & Goals, Appendix - Visualizing Growth - 5 minutes
 - Section 2.2 - Local Area Plans - 15 minutes
 - Section 2.7 - Neighbourhood Connector - 10 minutes
 - Section 2.8 - Neighbourhood Local - 15 minutes
 - Section 3.8 - Heritage Resources - 5 minutes
 - Section 4 - Heritage Guideline Tool; Glossary - 15 min.
 - (New) Urban Forest and Parks - 10 minutes
 - Commercial / Industrial concerns and suggested amendments:
 - Section 2.4 - Neighbourhood Commercial - 5 minutes
 - Industrial Transition Areas - 5 minutes
 - Restrictive Covenant - 5 minutes
 - Statutory vs. Non Statutory - 10 minutes
 - Other amendments the City is considering - 5 minutes
- Closing Community Comments 2 minutes
- Sponsors comments and next steps - 10 minutes

2 Opening Statements

- Opening statements were provided by both community leaders and The City.

3 Community Concerns

3.1 Introduction, Chapter 1

- From a Heritage perspective, we support the Heritage tools approved last July. Still don't understand how these work within the Guidebook. Have not yet seen these demonstrated in the North Hill Plan, which is the crux of where some of the pushback came from at the PH.
- Outcome: build trust with residents, set tone that their communities are great places to live and work, and the strengths of those communities need to be brought forward as the basic building blocks of LAP.
- Proposed specific wording changes. Look back to MDP about enhancing community character. Community character was dropped from the GB, but is something the community can connect to. This, as well as words about enhancing versus creating community character, would go a long way to build trust.
- Have heard that wording around character can lead to communities being static or is perhaps racist, and are not entirely sure where to go with that. We have, however, provided wording to hopefully address this issue.
- Questions section



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

- We are looking at established communities where it is not a blank slate. There is established infrastructure, housing, residents, etc. This is very important. Heritage can be a site or a building, and there are cherished aspects that are contextual, and not just pre-1945.
- Regarding allegations of racism, all communities have diversity in place, and the place where people choose to live is what establishes that diversity. It's where people chose to live and not where people have been forced or driven to live.

3.2 Section 2.2

- North Hill LAP and other ongoing LAPs have provided experience, outcomes and responses that provide learning opportunities. We drew from these for our recommendations.
- In chapter 1, wanted to strengthen role of individual communities. We feel these strengthen individual community attributes. NHLAP exposed residents not feeling heard. Added new section to ensure residents are involved and can support outcomes.
- In chapter 2, amendments focus again on involving individual communities. Relate to recommendations in section 2.8, and incorporate CHI recommendations.
- In chapter 4, strengthened wording to involve community in amendments and acknowledge restrictive covenants.
- In page 3, the Guidebook provides structure through UFCs to build LAPs, but does not dictate where they should go. Cannot have all UFCs in all LAPs, but need to have them in at least some communities. Hoping this flexibility will lead to a better LAP process.
- Questions
 - Q: For restrictive covenant amendment, could you illustrate how you understand informed process for restrictive covenants?
 - A: Went through many iterations for this topic. Ended up that they should be identified in the document, and the wording is taking from development permits that have been approved. Talked about having maps in the plan that identified RC, but didn't ask for it. In 2.2b, 12, wanted people to know that there are RC in the LAP area, and are not asking them to be mapped, but want the planning committee to acknowledge and be cognizant of these things. They are a superior government document that impacts policy just like the AVPA.
 - Not sure if it is possible to include all RC, as this would require a title search across the community.
 - A: Yes, just asking that they are identified and that people acknowledge as something that needs to be dealt with.
 - Re: RCs – intent in section 2.2, 12, is in a section talking about LAPs being informed by community attributes. In 2.2b, pattern of streetscape is a proposed addition, for example. Would like these things in RCs that have been respected for many years be included in the LAP process. Ideally at a DP stage, in practice this could mean that in communities with RCs, these are flagged so that there can be early communication with the developer regarding the RC so that they are aware and can accommodate.
 - We do require title and any relevant RCs for DPs, so applicants should be aware.
 - Q: To clarify regarding UFCs not needing to be in each plan, do you want that to be up front in the GB? This wording does currently exist later in the document.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

- This was an example to illustrate the main point. The LAP should use the GB as a guide that gives the tools, but it is the LAP that decides where that tool should be used. The LAP is the document where the rubber hits the road.
- Re RC – RC are private contractual matter, and are not within the legal authority of the municipal government. Through amendment, wanted to acknowledge they exist, and wanted to used language City currently uses regarding RCs. Better outline what these includes, and caveats they have. Must acknowledge landowners rights to have the RC respected. They are contractual obligations regarding landowners' rights, and wanted to acknowledge that we will be dealing with communities that have RCs.
- Section D, which talks about the LAP process, the 8 things we have there are what we came up with. Not wedded to those, but want a stronger LAP process.
- Communities want to have greater input into LAPs and greater role in deciding its final form. Stat vs non-stat is important to this. Most here would agree a non-stat Guidebook is a better way to inform, lead and construct better LAPs.
- Section D: We identified some specific problems with the working group sessions and how that was fed back to communities. Heard comments of how there was lots of pressure put on CAs, and we want to lessen this in the future and give community members more ability to contribute.

3.3 Section 2.7

- Main problem is a lack of clarity of what is a connector street versus a connector area. Collector street is only used one place in the section. For NHLAP, understand that the working group identified these and then decided what development would be appropriate on those streets. Most residents have an idea of where the high traffic streets are and where small scale commercial might make sense. Should also identify block faces where existing houses or developments should be retained to maintain the character of the neighbourhood.
 - Question/Clarification:
 - In section 2.7 from email, doesn't look like anything is red. Could you clarify what changed?
 - In the end, it was easier to rewrite.
- Collectors are not defined in the CTP
 - Named in the a UFC, but do not include a definition. Understand that we need to make this more clear.
- Collectors not defined in the CTP. Mapped, but no definition.
- For residents, it would make sense for us to define the connector streets. On the map for the NHLAP, we think of them as streets with development along the streets.
 - We were mapping activity levels on different streets which helped inform where different UFCs were applied. This might be an opportunity to better communicate this step in the LAP process.
 - When I hear the word "connector," I think of something that connects one area to another. Connector area is the area on that street.
 - This description goes to the heart of one of our concerns. Heard that the City planning team is doing this evaluation. We want to be involved in that conversation and debating with the



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

City and coming to a consensus based on your knowledge and data, and our feeling of the community.

- If we look to the CTP, we see a map of what is defined as a collector but within communities, where the traffic is is different. Doesn't always seem appropriate that development be focused on those areas. Would appreciate clarity about this in the GB, or define what is meant by "connector" within the LAP process.
- Intention of the neighborhood connector is the UFC for the community where there is a higher volume or wider road. For some, we should define not the whole roadway, but a portion of it. Also, want to be careful that we don't suggest that higher intensification needs to happen everywhere just to meet MDP targets. Achieving that target can be surgically applied through communities.
- Once you've determined neighbourhood connector, concerns are around application. Need to be clear if this is applied everywhere or just certain parts of the street.
 - This is something that would come out during a LAP. Would suggest that this is something we could do better job during the LAP. Also needs to be an open space where we can discuss this with the community and outline the particulars.

3.4 Section 2.8

- Maps suggested there are very few areas left for development. Do away with zones and let communities decide what development goes where.
- If maps zones are done away with, development types will be allowed across all areas. This is the clause that causes the greatest concern – would allow that kind of higher development anywhere. Once LAP done and LUB revised, RC1 and RC2 neighborhoods will disappear. Want that section removed, and allow LAPs to designate where high, moderate, and low intensity development forms will go.
- Residential intensities – good versions in earlier iteration of the GB that gave more granularity. Only discussed in the appendix, and the appendix is not statutory. Amendment moves the description of the intensities from the appendix into the statutory part of the document to provide more certainty.
- Collector streets – MDP 3.6 discusses internal and primary collectors for new communities, but not established communities. Seems like concept of neighborhood collector streets is meant to be applied to greenfield, not retrofitted to established areas, which were not designed to be collectors. LAP with strong community input is the best place to designate which streets would be best as collectors in the MDP.
- New conservation residential intensity – concept of contextually appropriate redevelopment. Applied to décor of mature residential areas to comply and implement the MDP section 3.3.2, enhancing neighborhood character. Comes from existing practices in the LUB. Has guided development in neighborhoods. If we want to maintain this character, should have the tools to do this.
- Discussion
 - My community has not been consulted about why we were put in our zone (Zone A/B). From a state of readiness perspective, to specifically identify those areas within this process didn't make sense.
 - Explain Conservation Residential Intensity again?
 - Lowest intensity is single detached housing. Conservation indicates that whatever redevelopment that happens would respect existing low density residential forms.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

New duplexes would match existing duplexes, new row houses would match existing row houses, etc. Also, tries to incorporate that lot coverage would be maintained in large lot areas.

- LUB already talks about contextual rules. Already try to have it to be sensitive. How would you restrict further while not creating false expectations.
- Neighborhoods that are currently RC1L, for example, has lot sizes larger than normal. Character is defined in part by this. Development should be like for like. No issue with nodes and corridors. Trying to conserve core of the neighborhood.
- We know anyone can apply for a rezoning anytime they want to, and that's fine. We wanted the change to be slower and based on what residents wanted.
- RCG – In 2019, Cllrs Farrell and Carra had motion passed about mid-block and new rules in LUB to improve interface between RCG mid-block and surrounding development. Thing this referred to the DAG at the time. Was delayed twice as to when this would come back to council. R2 communities are most concerned about this. We accept RCG on corners, but are concerned about mid-block. Have been waiting on work on this motion to be completed to be included in the LUB, and we don't want new mid-block development until this work is done.
 - Where is this at?
 - Has been pushed to the LUB renewal. Which are you concerned about? Cllr. Farrell was trying to be more friendly to mid-block.
 - We try to fight like crazy to get developers to buy all the way to the edge of the block. My understanding is that the Cllrs knew this importance.
 - Lisa and Phil to follow up on this item.

Section 3.8

- 3.8 G: Would like to see this expanded to include the properties that are under contract with Heritage Calgary for evaluation. The reason for this is that there are about 4,000 assets identified in windshield surveys, but only about half of those will be captured in Heritage policies 2 and 3. Owners may be discouraged from applying if inappropriate development goes in beside them. Talking about residential and the properties on either side of properties under evaluation for designation. A way to protect the investment the City in making in this evaluation. About 90% of properties evaluated are added to the inventory. Gives more certainty to the owner to go through the evaluation.
- Not going to apply to a lot of properties in any year. Have a meeting upcoming to discuss with Heritage Calgary.

Section 4

- About where the tool applies and outcomes. Were applauding what was approved in July 2020. Remember Cllr Carra saying concerns expressed in June of that year could be addressed in the LAP process.
- For where it applies, section 4.1, excludes parcels adjacent to main streets. In recommendations, we are identifying heritage commercial areas, and looking at Heritage from an area perspective. Want seamless transition between commercial area and residential so that there isn't too much



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

development that is not sensitive to the surrounding community. Haven't seen guidelines applied in NHLAP.

- Metrics/Outcomes: now, there are architectural guidelines and vague language. Front yard and side setbacks are important to maintaining streetscapes. When we're talking about 50' lots, it's important to keep that pattern in place. Surrounding jurisdictions have guidelines to maintain this rhythm. Not a problem with adding density to sensitive ways. Want to maintain patterns of scale and massing. Also identifies RCs.
- One important piece, a Heritage area tool is for a block face. The suggestion is to have a Heritage Area district tool where you would not just look at Heritage assets, but also at Heritage sites on the inventory, opens up to streetscapes, parks, industrial, etc. If it's eligible for the inventory, it should be considered and applied. These things should make an area eligible to become a heritage district. An area with 25% or greater Heritage sites could apply. Allows for areas within LAPs with discretionary guidelines that can be applied. People care about where they live and where they travel to. This tool allow us to protect both of these things, and will allow areas to thrive. Mosaic of different communities that are allowed to thrive in Calgary.
- As we are implementing policies to increase density, need to evaluate if we have been successful in protecting Heritage assets.
- Q: How different is this from what's in the Guidebook now?
 - Looking at different Heritage layers (1, 2, 3) now. Also, Guidebook can be revised. Need to consider property rights, and respect those as well. Historically, City has dictated what can be done with trees on public land only. Will need to look at these suggestions closer. Perhaps this is something to which we could allocate additional resources.
 - Could be addressed through our sustainment work on NHLAP.
- Chinatown is doing the Tomorrow's Chinatown cultural plan, which was initiated with a development proposal on a parking lot in the area that didn't reflect the community character. The consideration of the community's feel as it relates to culture and heritage is important.

Urban Forest and Parks

- This the GB give the City an unparalleled opportunity to further the urban forestry targets set out in the MDP. Have wording from MDP be copied into the LAP so that all areas can benefit. Our key points under urban forest were to strengthened policies to protect urban canopy in redevelopment, including incentivizing compliance, promoting and ensuring biodiversity, achieving targets through a variety of initiatives. In some of these amendments, we're including involvement of CAs or looking of other ways of achieving to address limited City resources.
- With redevelopment, see the impacts to natural areas and parks. LAPs and GB need to ensure that maintenance and creation of these spaces keep pace with redevelopment.
- Within amendments, A and B are within the NHLAP.
- Discussion:
 - Worried about creating missed expectations if we recommend things that we can't enforce. For instance, can't protect private trees unless council directs Parks to do something about this.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

- On Monday, there was a NoM on trees on private lots. Done in conjunction with Urban Forestry, with whom NHLAP worked with in their plan. Urban Forestry was comfortable with the wording in that motion, and are looking at ways to address.
 - Looking for a way to move ahead on this protection more decisively.
- Any concerns around funding for this? Mindful of budgetary impacts of trees on public and private lands to address. Let's take offline (City side).
 - Just a note, wouldn't be applied on a citywide basis if it's applied to the GB. It would be a progression as LAPs come online.
 - May be something that needs to be addressed through sustainment due to impacts on other City departments.
 - Perhaps ways to address this without directing resources right away, but having meaningful directions in the Guidebook that help to oversee future development.
- While some of the specific proposals involve public money, there are some that could make use of private investment.
 - From an applications perspective, we have tried to include some things in NHLAP to address this. There is some latitude to push for this in discretionary applications, including species of trees.
 - Perhaps a consideration of using some form of bonus density to achieve?
 - Would caution against this as there is always a balance of bonus density vs being sensitive to the area.
- Regarding bonus density, there is value to it, but density is forever, and the bonusing needs to be forever.

4 Commercial / Industrial concerns and suggested amendments

Section 2.4

- Referred to neighborhood commercial. Comment refers to Land Use section, item D. Speaking as BIA director, this section is a concern as there are neighborhood commercial areas where parking is limited, where sometimes drive-thru is required. It also serves delivery. Tim Horton's has indicated to us that they would get 30-40% more revenue from a drive thru versus walk-in location. The other element is that there has been judgements made by the planning authority where decisions on developments being made in anticipation of this rule being applied in a speculative manner. If the City is honest in trying to support the local in local businesses, don't think it is appropriate to dictate how businesses can succeed without making any accommodations. Support this section of the GB with caveats
 - One clarification is that this comes directly from the MDP in terms of restricting drive-thrus on main streets.
 - There are other categories in the GB that allow for vehicle oriented uses. In NHLAP, we asked about where people thought vehicle-oriented uses would be appropriate. Examples of how this was applied is along Edmonton Trail. Think we have categories that capture and help to achieve what you are getting at here.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

Industrial transition areas

- Sections 2.7 and 2.8, concerned about area in Mayland Heights and several other areas for light industrial. Concern is that the GB was light on direction for industrial connection or industrial connector. The Mayland industrial as it relates to Mayland Heights. You have Max Bell transit station, which is 1.1km from residential. But there are provisions related to industrial general, uses and transition that don't talk about how to incorporate additional categories regarding neighborhood flex. 19 Street NE could be an industrial connector where neighborhood flex principles could apply. On page 61, need to enhance language around enhancing pedestrian experience for connectors between transit and residential through industrial. Look to CPTED principles. Enhance experience and safety.
- Franklin Industrial has not had the benefit of public realm improvements, and there are institutional amenities that could benefit from this.
- Question: is this like a new UFC? How does it differ from our Industrial Transition categories?
 - We will look at this internally to see how the GB currently speaks to these issues.
 - NHLAP talked about this a bit within Greenview Industrial specific to pedestrian and wheeling. Will follow up directly about this.

5 Restrictive covenants

- See previous discussion regarding RCs.

6 Statutory vs. non-statutory

- Talked a bit about the RCG question before. Would like to raise this for more discussion again.
- Much discussion on stat/non-stat. Some people will say it doesn't matter one way or another. We have discussed this a fair bit, and the arguments against the GB being stat are clear. Overall community planning model – when you have a GB and it is like the criminal code, it is a strong implement that stops all conversation. If you have to do LAPs for 15 communities in a year and a half, maybe you need a stat GB. If you believe in collaborative community planning where the community is involved in depth to define itself along with the experts, having a statutory plan that brooks no disagreement goes against that particular model. The MGA says that if a GB is stat, everything it says needs to be reflected in the MDP and vice versa, and GB and LAPs need to reflect one another as well. Want the flexibility to use the GB as a guide and not have a full stop to conversation if something desired is not addressed in one of the set UFCs.
- LAPs decide specific policies for specific locations. They should be stat and should have huge strength in maintaining and changing communities. LAPs have to be consistent with the MDP. Arguments over levels of grey hold things up and don't produce value.
- SDAB pays more attention to stat plans than non-stat, regardless of whether they should. If I'm a city planner considering an RCG application in an area with low density residential applied, it's hard for me to argue against it because of the GB being stat.
- Looking for more granularity. Section 2.8 suggestions would help people embrace the guidebook and the LAP process. Want the ability to assign where RC1 and RCG should go within LAP process. Mentioned earlier that RCG has been applied mid-block in tasteful way, have heard the opposite as well. Would like the ability for communities to assign where this goes.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

- Can we map up within mature communities where density should go based on where community members assign where would be most appropriate.
- Some communities have expressed concern that RCG should not be included in same category with R1 and R2.

7 Other amendments The City is considering

- This section was not discussed due to time limitations.

8 Closing community concerns

- Community: There has been a lot of activities compressed in these 5 weeks to May 5. There are sentiments within the community that this has not been enough time, heard from CAs. What can be done to ensure success, and what does timing look like. Is there a willingness to extend this process with council's permission and take this to the broader community to give communities across Calgary to get everyone on board for this.
- City: Regarding to what we have been asked by council, we have also been working within tight timelines. For May 5, our intention is to report back to PUD. We have contracted out the official VVWH report from the public hearing. We compiled the themes we heard and have shared with the groups attending the workshops. As per council's direction, we have been having sessions to try to better understand public hearing feedback. We will present the VVWH report from the public hearing, a VVWH report from the engagement workshops including the workbooks from the sessions, and a report including recommendations based on what we heard. On our radar are stat/non-stat, single detached among others. One question with continued engagement, it was always intended that GB would be a living document. If it moves ahead as a non-stat document, it's easier for us to make changes going forward. Would like to get a decision from council as soon as possible about whether this should go as a stat or non-stat document. Intent with NHLAP if non-stat GB is to pull in GB policies not included to expand it to be able to cover all as a stat plan.
- Community: is there a chance where when you write the final report, would you invite the community leaders here to review the draft report? Also, is there the possibility to report to this group regarding the changes before you present them? Also, we could offer up one person for our group to help with the amendments.
 - Looking at a report back session for April 29.
 - Community: One of the challenges is that the deadline for submissions is before that report back. Would like the opportunity to review the changes in order to make an informed submission. Important for the communities to have it included in the published agenda.
 - We will take this back and see what is possible.
- Regarding amendments to be made to council, will administration be putting forward other groups' amendments, or putting together your own to put to council?
 - We will share amendments suggested by others, but will be presenting our own amendments to council.
- We received a notice for a townhall from Cllr. Carra dated May 3. Is that a City engagement process, or just the councilor providing his view of what he sees?
 - Just Cllr. Carra offering an opportunity to his constituents to learn more.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021



Guidebook for Great Communities

Community Leaders Feedback – Meeting Notes
April 20, 2021

- Still want to discuss further the RCG in R2 communities issue. Still a lot of concern regarding this issue. Will follow up offline.



Guidebook for Great Communities

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard – April 2021