

Applicant Outreach Summary



Community Outreach on Planning & Development Applicant-led Outreach Summary

Please complete this form and include with your application submission.

Project name: 502 9A Street NE - LOC2023-0055

Did you conduct community outreach on your application? YES or NO

If no, please provide your rationale for why you did not conduct outreach.

First, thank you for the opportunity to revise this summary as part of the application for land use amendment LOC2023-0055.

Outreach Strategy

Provide an overview of your outreach strategy, summary of tactics and techniques you undertook (Include dates, locations, # of participants and any other relevant details)

My outreach strategy included reaching out to the City of Calgary to assess if there was risk in applying for the H-GO land use on the subject property. My understanding through the pre-application process was that the subject site did meet location criteria for H-GO. It was this information that led to my application, at the cost of \$10,000, to change the land use. Given this is a land use change application only, and the site location criteria are satisfied, I was under the impression that this information would be shared with the community via the standard land use application process, which it was. As such, it is my understanding that neighbouring property owners were informed of the application, including the Applicant's Submission. I understand that responses were received as part of the public advertising process. I then revised my Applicant's Submission, dated April 6, 2023, to describe why I am pursuing this land use change. The comments received addressed issues related to project design or interpretation of the location criteria. Because of this, I assessed that any further direct outreach would pertain to topics not material to this application or the location criteria.

Stakeholders

Who did you connect with in your outreach program? List all stakeholder groups you connected with. (Please do not include individual names)

I have spoken with multiple residents in the neighbourhood about the application. Feedback has been positive. Those I have spoken with note that this is the kind of sensitive and hidden density development option this and other communities need to provide to broaden the range of housing options in Bridgeland and beyond.

Oft cited was the predominance of large single family homes in the community currently under development and the somewhat counterproductive "de-risked" path available to those building and selling multi-million dollar homes. In fact, my immediate neighbour has listed a new build at \$1.8M. The current approval process de-risks the development process for large low-density housing (and therefore incentivizes) to encourage that form of housing over what I want to do at 502 9A street NE.



Community Outreach for Planning & Development Applicant-led Outreach Summary

What did you hear?

Provide a summary of main issues and ideas that were raised by participants in your outreach.

Of the people I have spoken with, the main issue raised is why a project like this, that meets and exceeds the goals of sensitive city evolution and development, is privy to a review and approval process wherein personal opinion of respondents can delay the process at all? Those I spoke with noted frustration in the somewhat subjective nature of a process like this when much needed housing choices are needed in the City of Calgary, immediately.

Frustration was also shared that why is it the responsibility of the applicant to educate respondents on technical and objective location criteria? Also, why should an applicant be asked to engage on matters that are not material to the application, that will be handled at the Development Permit stage? These are important questions, as respondents, when engaged, do not limit responses to the matters at hand.

How did stakeholder input influence decisions?

Provide a summary of how the issues and ideas summarized above influenced project decisions. If they did not, provide a response for why.

The feedback has influenced me to edit this Summary. Frankly, I am of the opinion that requiring applicants of clear and city supported land use changes to carry out the outreach in an environment where the rules of engagement are undetermined, is fraught with challenges and risk for the applicant, on a personal level. For an application of this nature, where the site location criteria are very clearly met and the outcome is a change to a viable City written land use district (not a DC), to have the applicant engage in outreach with people who may be motivated to object to the change represented by the application, with hidden or unknown motivations, is unfair. I would much rather talk about an application like this in front of Council and the decision makers, and have the conversations pulled out of community halls and living

rooms, where objections are often proxy arguments for different unshared objections.

How did stakeholder input influence decisions?

Provide a summary of how the issues and ideas summarized above influenced project decisions. If they did not, provide a response for why.

The feedback has influenced me to edit this Summary. Frankly, I am of the opinion that requiring applicants of clear and city supported land use changes to carry out the outreach in an environment where the rules of engagement are undetermined, is fraught with challenges and risk for the applicant, on a personal level. For an application of this nature, where the site location criteria are very clearly met and the outcome is a change to a viable City written land use district (not a DC), to have the applicant engage in outreach with people who may be motivated to object to the change represented by the application, with hidden or unknown motivations, is unfair. I would much rather talk about an application like this in front of Council and the decision makers, and have the conversations pulled out of community halls and living