

On the face, these may be positive goals, however there could be associated capital costs which will be transferred to homebuyers and impact affordability. Certainly, it is foreseeable that the City of Calgary and, through the tax base, the citizens, will be responsible for increased operation, maintenance and life cycle costs (such as increased park maintenance, tree replacement, public art maintenance and replacement costs and so on).

Attachment 2, the Telephone Survey results entitled Attitudes towards Future Parks Concepts, does not address additional costs associated with the Parks concepts and who will pay for those.

The Report itself to Committee and Council indicates there are no operating financial implications or capital budget implications associated with the Report. Both statements indicate further budgetary analysis will occur with implementation plans and four-year departmental plans.

UDI Calgary would propose that from a prudent fiscal position, the referenced analysis should accompany the Policy as it is placed before Committee and Council to more fully appreciate the financial implications of the Policy before – not after – it is approved.

UDI Calgary would ask, if possible, there be further analysis of the financial implications of the Policy, based upon a reasonable scope of the implementation of the Policy.

Alternatively, perhaps include some language in the executive summary or embedded within the Policy to place value on **financial considerations in the reasonable implementation of the policy/guideline.**

Yours truly,
URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE CALGARY



Beverly J. Jarvis
Director of Policy & Government Relations

/bjj

