



FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act* of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making and scheduling speakers for Council or Council Committee meetings. **Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes.** If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk’s Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk’s Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station ‘M’ 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes. Your e-mail address will not be included in the public record.

ENDORSEMENT STATEMENT ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION, ANTI-RACISM, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND BELONGING

The purpose of The City of Calgary is to make life better every day. To fully realize our purpose, we are committed to addressing racism and other forms of discrimination within our programs, policies, and services and eliminating barriers that impact the lives of Indigenous, Racialized, and other marginalized people. It is expected that participants will behave respectfully and treat everyone with dignity and respect to allow for conversations free from bias and prejudice.

First name [required] Michelle and Wayne

Last name [required] Docking

How do you wish to attend?

You may bring a support person should you require language or translator services. Do you plan on bringing a support person?

What meeting do you wish to comment on? [required] Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Planning

Date of meeting [required] Feb 27, 2025

What agenda item do you wish to comment on? (Refer to the Council or Committee agenda published [here](#).)

[required] - max 75 characters The Chinook Communities Local Area Plan

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required] In opposition

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

We have resided in Parkhill on 38A Avenue SW since 2016. Designating 38A as a connector, on par with the likes of Elbow, 58th and Mission, suitable for "small local focused shops" is honestly laughable. This one block long street with primarily single and semi-detached homes built in the last 25 years or less has extremely limited street parking (the space for which must also be shared with resident's garbage bins 2 days of the week). Access from MacLeod entails a tricky walk up a the steep hill or a perilous drive through what is essentially a parking lot for apartment/condo residents (funniest thing I saw last fall was a semi-truck loaded with building materials stuck at the top of 39th and Stanley, trying to figure out how to back down without taking out a row of parked cars once the driver realized there was no hope of making the multiple, tight turns to get through to Parkhill Street). The possibility of adding a 6 story building which would further obstruct sight lines for through-traffic would only intensify the risk to pedestrians in the area. Therefore we do not support 38A's designation as a connector or its potential for 6 story buildings on the corners as indicated in the plan.



FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act* of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making and scheduling speakers for Council or Council Committee meetings. **Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes.** If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk’s Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk’s Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station ‘M’ 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes. Your e-mail address will not be included in the public record.

ENDORSEMENT STATEMENT ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION, ANTI-RACISM, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND BELONGING

The purpose of The City of Calgary is to make life better every day. To fully realize our purpose, we are committed to addressing racism and other forms of discrimination within our programs, policies, and services and eliminating barriers that impact the lives of Indigenous, Racialized, and other marginalized people. It is expected that participants will behave respectfully and treat everyone with dignity and respect to allow for conversations free from bias and prejudice.

First name [required]	Ruth
Last name [required]	Melchior
How do you wish to attend?	In-person
You may bring a support person should you require language or translator services. Do you plan on bringing a support person?	No
What meeting do you wish to comment on? [required]	Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Planning
Date of meeting [required]	Feb 27, 2025
What agenda item do you wish to comment on? (Refer to the Council or Committee agenda published here .)	
[required] - max 75 characters	Chinook Communities Local Area Plan
Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required]	In opposition



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

Parkhill Chinook Communities LAP Response IPC 02.27.2025.pdf

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

I will be speaking to the contents of the attached letter, but will not need it presented.
Thank you!

PARKHILL COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

4013 Stanley Road SW Calgary, AB T2S 2P5

February 18, 2025

THE CITY OF CALGARY
P.O. Box 2100, Station M
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

Attention: City Clerk's Office

CHINOOK COMMUNITIES' LOCAL AREA PLAN Infrastructure and Planning Committee - January 27, 2025

Dear City Council:

The Parkhill Community Association (Parkhill) has participated in the development of the proposed Chinook Communities Local Area Plan (LAP) since early 2023. We acknowledge and are thankful that the City's Chinook Area Planning team has been very responsive and proactive in their engagement. They remained professional in spite of significant opposition. Team members responded promptly and substantively to inquiries, and each was very knowledgeable in their areas of planning expertise.

We are however; disappointed that they disregarded some critical feedback from community members in favour of broader policy directives, as that has left many in our community feeling like their feedback was ignored. Although we are not planners, we do live in Parkhill and many of us have lived or have family who has lived in this community for decades. We are very clearly not against densification as prior to the blanket zoning designation of R-CG, we were zoned R-C2, with a blend of apartments, duplexes and single-family / infill homes throughout our community.

We are grateful that the LAP acknowledges the importance of preserving park spaces and natural areas, yet we see trees being clear cut to make room for oversized HGOs and remain concerned that there is no clear plan in Manchester for new park space. Stanley Park is overwhelmed during the summer months and residents have a difficult time accessing the amenities due to current crowd size. Manchester densification will just exacerbate this reality. We support the residential and mixed-use development in Manchester, with a few caveats identified in more detail below. As a result, **we are opposed to the LAP as it is currently proposed.**

Our specific concerns include:

1. The lack of firm and enforceable language in the policy sections.
2. The LAP incorrectly identifies three neighbourhood streets (38th Avenue, 38A Avenue and part of Stanley Rd) as Neighbourhood Connector. They are Neighbourhood Local.

3. The LAP allows for up to 6 storey development on streets that cannot handle that level of increased density. Specifically Erlton Court, 38A Avenue, Stanley Rd and 40th Avenue are specific locations where 6 storey developments seem unreasonable and will directly impact the quality of life of surrounding neighbours. We submit that up to 4 storeys would be more appropriate for the existing infrastructure and physical constraints of those streets.
4. We are concerned for our tree canopy as recent HGO Development Permits have come with the following notation: “NOTE: ALL EXISTING TREES INSIDE THE PROPOSED PROJECT PROPERTY LIMITS ARE TO BE REMOVED”.
5. We don't wish to be overrun by Manchester's increased density and would like there to be assurances that exceptions to the Building Scale maps will not be granted in any community covered by this LAP.

General concerns about the use of must, should or may exist throughout the LAP's policy sections. Examples of primary concern are included Section 2.2.1.4, 2.2.1.6 and 2.1.1.

2.2.1.4

Land Use

1. Development areas should:

- i. consider the local built form context;
- ii. be oriented towards the street;
- iii. consider shadowing impacts on neighbouring properties and parks: and,

Site, Building, and Landscape Design

In addition to the site, building and landscape design policies in Section 2.4, the following policies apply:

c. Development areas should:

- i. consider the local built form context;
- ii. be oriented towards the street;
- iii. consider shadowing impacts on neighbouring properties and parks: and,
- iv. provide access to off-street parking and loading areas from the lane.
- d. Entrances or lobbies that provide shared access should be well-marked, be of a width that is consistent with other units along the same frontage and allow for clear sight lines to and from the building.
- e. Where units are located on the ground floor along lower activity streets or lanes, development should be designed to:
 - i. locate amenity spaces along the lane;
 - ii. provide on-site pedestrian routes along lanes to minimize conflicts with vehicles, particularly near access and service areas; and,
 - iii. provide windows with views to the street or lane.

We would argue that in these highlighted instances, the language would be more appropriately articulated as “must”.

Parkhill has recently begun a project to gain approvals to build a Community Garden. The garden has a primary purpose of alleviating fresh food insecurity in our neighbourhood, with a secondary goal of building community. We are “required” to consider sightlines for neighbouring properties and gather signatures from neighbours in support of the project. This appears to be a “must” requirement for a garden and yet, according to the Building Scale map, developers can build up to 6 storeys on 38A Street (currently comprised of duplexes, single family homes and limited 3 storey apartment buildings) with only a “should” level of consideration for shadowing, sightlines or the local built form.

We also do not agree with the Neighbourhood Connector designation for 38th Avenue, 38A Avenue and a small portion of Stanley Rd. If that decision is based upon their proximity to the 39th Avenue transit corridor, we would submit it does not make sense. Stanley Rd was closed off many years ago at the south end of the street as part of a traffic calming initiative due to significant safety and traffic concerns.

Stanley Rd ends on the north side at 38A Avenue, which dead ends to the east and then ends at 1A Street to the west. 38th begins at Macleod Tr and ends at 1A Street. If we compare these streets to Mission Rd, Elbow Drive or 58th Avenue (actual connector roads in our LAP), there is no reasonable comparison or justification for their classification as Neighbourhood Connector. These streets must be redesignated as Neighbourhood Local.

Additionally, in **section 2.2.1.6 Neighbourhood Local**, public space language of “may” seems insufficient given the City has declared that we have a climate emergency, and trees are the best first line of defense against climate change. At the very least, we believe this qualifies for “should”.

Neighbourhood Local areas are characterized by a range of housing types and home-based businesses.

Neighbourhood Local areas have developed in a variety of ways with character. [redacted] areas [redacted] city was built, existing heritage assets, established development pattern and access to parks, open space and other amenities. The public space may include features such as landscaped boulevards and public street trees.

We would like to see stronger guarantees that our Chinook Community’s mature trees will not continue to be sacrificed for the sake of development.

Manchester Industrial

With regards to the development of Manchester Industrial, as direct neighbours, we are broadly supportive and yet still have concerns. Our primary concerns are that the City will actually improve public spaces (**section 2.1.1 of the Plan**), commit to repurposing the Municipal Impound Lot (**section 2.2.5.5 of the Plan**) on the 39th Avenue transit corridor and confirm that developers will be limited to the scale identified in the Built Form map.

- There are no new “green spaces” identified on the LAP map and the only green in Manchester is currently the “natural areas”, which are not appropriate for outdoor activities. If the City is serious about ensuring adequate green spaces in amongst all of this density, it “must” commit land as Stanley Park is at or above capacity on most nice days.
- The Policy language in section 2.2.5.5 of the LAP regarding the Impound Lot “*Should this site no longer be required for its current impound lot purpose, an amendment to this Plan may be required to incorporate new urban form categories and building scale modifiers that will allow for transit-oriented development*” is insufficient. If the City expects us to densify our neighbourhoods, embrace the idea of transit corridors and fewer cars, they “must” be prepared to walk the talk. The language of “should” and “may be required” is unacceptable and ironically feels like NIMBYism coming from the City. We have repeatedly been told that the LAP has a 30-year view of development in Calgary. With that in mind, we expect the City to review its own land use and change this language to appropriately reflect a commitment to the relocation of the Impound lot, without requiring a future amendment to the LAP.
- The Building Scale map limits development to “up to 26 storeys” and yet an application currently exists for a land use change on the east side of Macleod Tr in Manchester, that proposes a 90m building with an FAR that allows 968,751 sq feet of buildable space, making it 69% of the size of Brookfield Place. The disconnect between a height of 90m, which can easily accommodate up to 30 stories, and the Building Scale map is evident, and we seek assurances that allowances to exceed the agreed upon “up to 26 storeys” will not be granted to developers. This applies to all redevelopment regardless of the designation of up to 3, 4, 6, 12 or 26 storeys. The LAP maps when finalized must in fact be final, allowing residents to have the certainty of knowing what can be built beside them in the future.

We acknowledge that the LAP contains some positive elements, yet until our very real concerns are addressed, the **Parkhill Community Association cannot support** the Chinook Communities Local Area Plan. **We urge the Infrastructure and Planning Committee to not recommend this LAP to City Council for approval in its current form.**

Respectfully,

Parkhill Community Association



Ruth Melchior
Director of Development



FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act* of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making and scheduling speakers for Council or Council Committee meetings. **Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes.** If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk’s Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk’s Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station ‘M’ 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes. Your e-mail address will not be included in the public record.

ENDORSEMENT STATEMENT ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION, ANTI-RACISM, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND BELONGING

The purpose of The City of Calgary is to make life better every day. To fully realize our purpose, we are committed to addressing racism and other forms of discrimination within our programs, policies, and services and eliminating barriers that impact the lives of Indigenous, Racialized, and other marginalized people. It is expected that participants will behave respectfully and treat everyone with dignity and respect to allow for conversations free from bias and prejudice.

First name [required]	Peter
Last name [required]	Collins

How do you wish to attend?

You may bring a support person should you require language or translator services. Do you plan on bringing a support person?

What meeting do you wish to comment on? [required]	Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Planning
Date of meeting [required]	Feb 27, 2025

What agenda item do you wish to comment on? (Refer to the Council or Committee agenda published [here](#).)

[required] - max 75 characters	Chinook Communities Local Area Plan
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required]	In opposition
--	---------------



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

MBCA Letter to City IPC re Chinook LAP - 19 Feb 2025.pdf

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

The Mayfair Bel-Aire Community Association does not support the proposed Chinook Communities Local Area Plan and urges that the Infrastructure and Planning Committee does not recommend the Plan to City Council for approval. Please see our attached letter which sets out our reasons in detail.



19 February 2025

THE CITY OF CALGARY
P.O. Box 2100, Station M
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

Attention: City Clerk's Office

**CHINOOK COMMUNITIES LOCAL AREA PLAN
Infrastructure and Planning Committee
Thursday 27 February 2025**

The Mayfair Bel-Aire Community Association (the **Association**) has participated in the development of the proposed Chinook Communities Local Area Plan (the **Plan**) since process inception in early 2023.

There are some good elements in the Plan, but those positives are outweighed by several negative elements in the Plan, with the result that the Association does not support the Plan and urges that the Infrastructure and Planning Committee does not recommend the Plan to City Council for approval.

GOOD ELEMENTS

1. The Plan acknowledges the importance of preserving park spaces and natural areas.
2. The Plan identifies (p. 123) the need to improve traffic and pedestrian safety at the intersection of Elbow Drive and Malibou Road.
3. The Plan proposes substantial residential and mixed use development in Manchester, proximate to the Red LRT line.
4. The Plan proposes development along 50th Ave SW west of Macleod Trail.

NEGATIVE ELEMENTS

1. **Blanket redevelopment and densification** - The Plan contemplates redevelopment at a substantially higher density throughout all Chinook neighbourhoods, not just at their peripheries. The proposed redevelopment is contrary to the Municipal Development Plan (the **MDP**), which states:

Intensification should be accommodated within existing communities in a sensitive manner. ...The City promotes infilling that is sensitive, compatible and complementary to the existing physical patterns and character of neighbourhoods.
(s. 2.2.5)

Objective: Respect and enhance neighbourhood character and vitality.

Policies:

a. Respect the existing character of low density residential areas, while still allowing for innovative and creative designs that foster distinctiveness.

b. Ensure an appropriate transition of development intensity, uses and built form between areas of higher and lower intensity, such as low-density residential areas and more intensive multi-residential or commercial areas.

c. Ensure infill development complements the established character of the area and does not create dramatic contrasts in the physical development pattern.

d. Ensure that the preparation of local area plans includes community engagement early in the decision making process that identifies and addresses local character, community needs and appropriate development transitions with existing neighbourhoods. (s. 2.3.2)

For example, the Plan permits blanket infill redevelopment in all areas of all Chinook communities, allowing built forms to the size and intensification limits permitted by RC-G zoning, which is not “sensitive, compatible and complementary to the existing physical patterns and character of [the Chinook] neighbourhoods.”

As a further example, the Plan permits development to a height of six storeys along most of Elbow Drive within the Plan boundaries (stepping down to a maximum of four storeys as Elbow Drive descends downhill toward the Elbow River). The rears of those six storey buildings would be immediately next to one or two storey houses. This is not “an appropriate transition of development density”; it “creates dramatic contrasts in the physical development pattern”; it creates privacy issues for the existing dwellings; and it does not “respect the existing character” of the Chinook neighbourhoods.

Many of these arguments were put forward to City Council during the Blanket Upzoning hearing, to no avail. Regardless, the scope of higher density redevelopment permitted by the Plan is contrary to the MDP.

The Heritage Communities Local Area Plan (covering communities to the south of the Chinook communities) contains the following policy statements in s. 2.2.1.6 (Neighbourhood Local):

a. Secondary suites are supported where already allowed by the existing land use designation and are not considered a unit in the following policies.

b. Building forms that contain one or two residential units are supported in the Neighbourhood Local, Limited Scale area.

c. Building forms that contain three or more residential units should be supported on parcels with rear lanes in any one or more of the following areas:

- i. Within Transition Zones in transit station areas;*
- ii. On corner parcels; and,*
- iii. Adjacent to or separated by a road or lane from a school, park or open space greater than 0.5 hectare in size with no dimension less than 25 metres.*

d. Building forms that contain three or more residential units in Neighbourhood Local, Limited Scale should be designed to complement the surrounding context and consider the impacts of massing, lot coverage and setbacks on the following:

- i. access to sunlight and shade on adjacent parcels; and,*
- ii. protection of existing, healthy trees or landscaping on the parcel, where appropriate.*

These references to one and two unit dwellings, and the various restrictions on multi-residential units of three or more units, are missing in the Plan. Initially, the draft Plan stated for policy for this subsection:

In Neighbourhood Local areas with the Limited Scale modifier, multi-residential building forms should not be supported within areas shown in Map 3: Urban Form as Neighbourhood Local and Map 4: Building Scale as Limited Scale.

In the final draft now presented to IPC, the Plan merely states:

Multi-Residential development is only supported in the Neighbourhood Local, Limited Scale areas in a grade-oriented form.

This is yet another example of how the Plan does not align with the MDP, and through successive iterations has drastically deviated away from any recognition of preservation of the existing character of low density neighbourhoods.

Finally, it is no argument to state that residential neighbourhoods remain designated as low density under RC-G. The 2024 bylaw amendment which replaced R1, R2 and other low density designations with RC-G, drastically increased permitted density and built forms. It is at the least sophistry, and at the worst Orwellian double-speak, to suggest that RC-G is low density comparable to R1/R2 which preceded it.

2. **Elbow Drive community corridor** - The Plan correctly identifies Elbow Drive as a community corridor, but then contemplates a degree of development and traffic measures which will result in traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and other users of Elbow Drive.

Elbow Drive already operates at close to capacity during morning and evening rush hours, and on weekends. The Plan (p. 105) contemplates traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds, which will exacerbate existing congestion.

Adding the proposed amount of densification (up to six storeys along most of Elbow Drive within the Plan area) will itself result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicles and pedestrians accessing and using Elbow Drive, which will further exacerbate congestion.

In addition, the other changes discussed below also exacerbate the congestion and safety issues.

There are already substantial problems with pedestrian safety along Elbow Drive, most recently highlighted by a crosswalk fatality (at 61st Ave) which occurred in November 2024. With the increase in density contemplated by the Plan, and the consequent likely increase in the number of vehicles using Elbow Drive, the risks to pedestrians will increase.

Finally, while s. 2.5.6 of the Plan proposes a policy for community corridors such as Elbow Drive of a “two to four storey street wall”, Map 4 (Building Scale) of the Plan permits development to a height of six storeys along most of Elbow Drive within the Plan boundaries (stepping down to a maximum of four storeys as Elbow Drive descends downhill toward the Elbow River). The Plan does not even comply with its own policy prescription on this point.

- 3. Modes of transportation** - The Plan repeatedly emphasizes the need for cycling infrastructure, including along Elbow Drive and Macleod Trail. Any conversion of motorized vehicle lanes to create cycle lanes will further increase congestion and reduce safety for all users.

At the least, no cycling infrastructure should be created by conversion of existing roadways.

But, at a higher level, the City’s and the Plan’s focus on cycling is an unrealistic objective. To state the obvious, Calgary is subject to poor cycling conditions including snow cover from November to April – half the year – making cycle difficult and dangerous for all but the most intrepid. While cycling might be a viable transportation option in more temperate cities and countries, it is unrealistic to expect that cycling can displace motor vehicles as the primary mode of transportation for most Calgarians.

Calgary is also a primarily suburban city. Many trip patterns (whether to work, school, children’s activities, or shopping) require motor vehicles, not bicycles. Public transit does not currently provide a viable alternative to motor vehicles for most suburban trips, and it is not financially feasible or realistic to assume that public transit will ever be able to substantially displace private motor vehicles as the primary means of suburban transportation in the Chinook communities.

Bicycles will never be more than a fringe mode of transportation, used by a very small segment of the population, and it is unrealistic and improper for the Plan to assume otherwise.

4. **Restrictive Covenants** – Section 4.2(r) of the Plan acknowledges that some parcels in the Plan area may have restrictive covenants registered against title, which might include restrictions limiting development to one or two unit dwellings. The Plan then states:

Where the restrictive covenant is not in alignment with the goals and objectives of this Plan, The City of Calgary supports the direction of this Plan.

This is a futile statement of intent, and a broad disconnect between the Plan and reality. Restrictive covenants are a valid planning tool, used not only by many land owners and developers, but also by the City itself. Restrictive covenants are a statutory land planning tool pursuant to s. 48 of the *Land Titles Act*, and have been repeatedly upheld as valid and enforceable by Alberta courts, including recent cases by the Alberta Court of Appeal.

To the extent that restrictive covenants limit development to one or two unit dwellings, the failure of the City to recognize these development limitations results in the Plan's goals diverging from reality, with the result that the Plan's goals are unachievable.

Mayfair and Bel-Aire have a variety of restrictive covenants, all of which limit construction to a single family dwelling. The blanket RC-G zoning imposed on what was R1 residential zoning in Mayfair and Bel-Aire is thus not achievable. The designation of Elbow Drive as a community corridor with zoning for six storey buildings along Elbow Drive in Mayfair and Bel-Aire likewise is not achievable, and for the Plan to propose otherwise results in the Plan being a statement of fantasy rather than a useful and achievable planning policy.

Britannia and Elboya also have restrictive covenants, so similar considerations apply there as well.

MANCHESTER DEVELOPMENT

As briefly stated earlier, we consider it a good element of the Plan that the Plan envisions residential and mixed use development of Manchester. Development of new housing and other mixed use developments addresses the need to increase housing supply, without destroying the existing character and nature of established residential neighbourhoods in the Plan. This is also consistent with the MDP, which states (s. 2.2.2):

Underutilized commercial and brownfield sites near the Primary Transit Network should be redeveloped over time, where feasible, as mixed-use and/or employment intensive sites.

We note two problems, however, with the proposed plans for Manchester and Manchester Industrial.

1. **City Impound Lot** - The Plan acknowledges the possibility of conversion of the City's vehicle impound lot at 400 39 Ave SE (s. 2.2.5.5) for transit-oriented development, but neither recommends that the City relocate and repurpose the impound lot for this purpose, nor includes the impound lot parcel in any proposed redevelopment plans. The City is missing a great opportunity here.
2. **Lack of Green Space** - Given the substantial higher density re-development proposed for Manchester and Manchester Industrial, there is very little green space (whether park or other natural space) contemplated. This is a significant planning oversight. There is very little green space proximate to Manchester and Manchester Industrial west of Macleod Trail – Stanley Park is the only large park, and it already is approaching user capacity limits. The non-operating Springbank Landfill, located in the southeast corner of the Plan area, could be developed as a large park and green space for Manchester residents. That one area would not be enough, on its own, but could be part of a greater assortment of parks to serve the residents of Manchester.

THE PLAN PROCESS

The process to develop the Plan was less than satisfactory, for the following reasons:

1. From inception, the process was based on several explicit assumptions that contained and channeled the development of the Plan, such as that each community should be a complete community with a diversity of housing choices, that there must be year-round mobility options including cycling and “wheeling”, that climate risk is of over-arching concern and as a result we must all aspire to a Net Zero future, and that the Plan should seek to achieve “equity” (meaning, equality of outcome) in each community.
2. The process for and resulting selection of community representatives (in addition to the community association representatives) was not transparent.
3. Terms of Reference to participate in the development of the Plan included agreeing to Chatham House Rule, prohibitions against any recording (including even photographs of slides in presentations), and a refusal to share contact information such that representatives could communicate with each other outside the City-controlled meetings. These procedural limitations gave the whole process a contrived, controlled air.
4. The Plan fails to recognize changes occurring during the Plan development process:

- At the time when the Plan process commenced, then-existing zoning identified most residential areas within the Chinook communities as single family (R1) or semi-detached/duplex (R2). The Plan does not take into account the blanket upzoning to RC-G; it ignores this substantial baseline shift in zoning density and permitted built forms. To comply with the MDP, the Plan should have identified and preserved prior low density zoning.
- The Plan in several places refers to the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board and its Growth Plan (s. 4.2(g) and Appendix B). Given the dissolution of this Board, the Plan should be corrected accordingly.

We would be remiss if we did not acknowledge the professionalism of the City's planning team assigned to the development of the Plan. Communication by the team was prompt, frequent and effective. Team members always conducted themselves in a professional manner, including when engaged in sometimes-heated discussions about various aspects of the Plan. Team members responded promptly and substantively to inquiries, and each was highly knowledgeable in their areas of planning expertise.

While we disagree with many of the assumptions and policy directives built into the plan development process and the Plan (and all other completed and in-process local area plans) at the City's direction, we acknowledge that within those constraints and subject to those assumptions, the City's Chinook team performance exceeded our expectations.

CLOSING

Despite some good elements in the Plan, the Association does not support the Plan and urges that the Infrastructure and Planning Committee does not recommend the Plan to City Council for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYFAIR BEL-AIRE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION



Peter Collins
Director, Planning & Development



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act* of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making and scheduling speakers for Council or Council Committee meetings. **Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes.** If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes. Your e-mail address will not be included in the public record.

ENDORSEMENT STATEMENT ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION, ANTI-RACISM, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND BELONGING

The purpose of The City of Calgary is to make life better every day. To fully realize our purpose, we are committed to addressing racism and other forms of discrimination within our programs, policies, and services and eliminating barriers that impact the lives of Indigenous, Racialized, and other marginalized people. It is expected that participants will behave respectfully and treat everyone with dignity and respect to allow for conversations free from bias and prejudice.

First name [required] Michael

Last name [required] Read

How do you wish to attend? In-person

You may bring a support person should you require language or translator services. Do you plan on bringing a support person? No

What meeting do you wish to comment on? [required] Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Planning

Date of meeting [required] Feb 27, 2025

What agenda item do you wish to comment on? (Refer to the Council or Committee agenda published [here](#).)

[required] - max 75 characters Chinook Communities Local Area Plan

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required] In opposition



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

Chinook LAP, EBCA Letter to IPC.pdf

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

Infrastructure and Planning Subcommittee: Meeting Feb 27, 2025

Re: Chinook Communities Local Area Plan

To: Members of the Infrastructure and Planning Subcommittee

Concerns with the Chinook Communities Local Area Plan

On behalf of the Elboya Britannia Community Association (EBCA), we are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed Chinook Communities Local Area Plan (LAP). The planning process commenced in December 2022, with the proposed final version released on February 14, 2025. EBCA has actively participated in this process, with representatives on the Working Group from the outset, engaging in public consultations and contributing to the evolution of the plan.

We would like to extend our appreciation to the City's Planning and Engagement staff for their professionalism, expertise, and openness to our ideas and suggestions throughout this process. However, despite our involvement, we have significant concerns regarding how the LAP addresses low-density residential areas, which directly impact our community.

Alignment with the Municipal Development Plan (MDP)

Local Area Plans are guided by the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), particularly its directives on land use, as outlined in Section 1.1.1 Key Directions for Land Use and Mobility:

- 1. Achieve a balance of growth between established and greenfield communities.*
- 2. Provide more choice within complete communities.*
- 3. Direct land use change within a framework of Activity Centres and Main Streets (Nodes and Corridors).*
- 4. Link land use decisions to transit.*

Key principle 3 is reinforced in Section 2.2.1 "focusing most intensification to defined areas provides more certainty to the development and building industries and makes redevelopment more predictable for existing communities by lessening the impact on stable, low-density areas."

EBCA fully supports these MDP directives. We recognize the necessity for well-planned, thoughtful growth in our community. We believe growth should align with the MDP's guidance; concentrated in nodes and corridors while respecting and enhancing neighborhood character as outlined in MDP Section 2.3.2.

Concerns with the Chinook LAP's Approach to Low-Density Residential Areas

Under the Chinook LAP, all low-density residential areas are designated as "Neighbourhood Local". Excluding Manchester and MacLeod Trail, this designation covers approximately 80% of the LAP's land area and lots. It includes virtually all its residents. This is where we live. Our homes and neighborhoods are at stake.

Lack of a Meaningful Plan for Neighbourhood Local

Despite the MDP's guidance, the Chinook LAP provides no substantive plan for Neighbourhood Local areas. Moreover, there was no public engagement on this critical aspect.

Public Engagement Process

Neighbourhood Local was not a topic in the initial public engagement sessions. We anticipated that it would be addressed as a key discussion point later in the process. However, on June 4, 2024, we received an email from the Chinook Plan team stating:

“Since Council has decided (through the Citywide rezoning) where small-scale homes including single-detached homes, semi-detached homes, townhomes or row homes are appropriate, this is no longer a topic that we will engage on within the local area planning process.”

Not only was there no opportunity for engagement, but we were also explicitly prevented from discussing it.

Insufficient Planning Framework

The only reference to Neighbourhood Local in the proposed LAP is found in Section 2.2.1.6:

“Neighbourhood Local areas are characterized by a range of housing types and home-based businesses. Neighbourhood Local areas have developed in a variety of ways with characteristics that shape how these areas change and grow, including when the community was built, existing heritage assets, established development patterns, and access to parks, open space, and other amenities. The public space may include features such as landscaped boulevards and public street trees.”

This 69-word paragraph is not a plan. It merely describes current characteristics and does not outline a strategy for growth or preservation. The only actionable statement is: “Neighbourhood Local areas are characterized by a range of housing types and home-based businesses.” This is not a plan but a general description.

A plan, by definition, is “a set of things to do in order to achieve something, especially one that has been considered in detail in advance” (Oxford English Dictionary). The current LAP fails to meet this standard.

Request for Revisions

Given these concerns, EBCA urges that the IPC rejects the Proposed Chinook Communities Local Area Plan as is and instruct the Administration to:

1. **Ensure a comprehensive and transparent public engagement process** that includes meaningful discussions on Neighbourhood Local designations and their long-term impact.
2. **Develop a clear, actionable plan for Neighbourhood Local areas** that aligns with the MDP's principles and respects community character.
3. **Reassess the blanket designation of Neighbourhood Local** and explore alternative approaches that provide certainty and predictability for residents.

We appreciate your time and consideration and hope to work collaboratively with the City to develop a more thoughtful and inclusive plan for our communities.

Respectfully

Corran Hockey, President, EBCA

Dana Lougheed, Director, Planning & Development - Elboya, EBCA

Michael Read, Director, Planning & Development - Britannia, EBCA



FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act* of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making and scheduling speakers for Council or Council Committee meetings. **Your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes.** If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk’s Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk’s Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station ‘M’ 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available in the Council or Council Committee agenda and minutes. Your e-mail address will not be included in the public record.

ENDORSEMENT STATEMENT ON TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION, ANTI-RACISM, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND BELONGING

The purpose of The City of Calgary is to make life better every day. To fully realize our purpose, we are committed to addressing racism and other forms of discrimination within our programs, policies, and services and eliminating barriers that impact the lives of Indigenous, Racialized, and other marginalized people. It is expected that participants will behave respectfully and treat everyone with dignity and respect to allow for conversations free from bias and prejudice.

First name [required] Jessica

Last name [required] Karpat

How do you wish to attend? In-person

You may bring a support person should you require language or translator services. Do you plan on bringing a support person? No

What meeting do you wish to comment on? [required] Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Planning

Date of meeting [required] Feb 27, 2025

What agenda item do you wish to comment on? (Refer to the Council or Committee agenda published [here](#).)

[required] - max 75 characters Chinook Local Area Plan

Are you in favour or opposition of the issue? [required] In favour



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

Chinook Communities LAP - QPD Position Feb 17 2024.pdf

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

February 17, 2025

Calgary Infrastructure and Planning Committee
Calgary City Hall
800 Macleod Trail SE
Calgary, AB T2G 5E6

Re: Proposed Chinook Local Area Plan (LAP) at IPC

Dear Infrastructure and Planning Committee,

On behalf of our clients, we would like to express our support for the Chinook Communities Local Area Plan (LAP).

We support the general intent of the draft plan; the policies in the plan will create unique opportunities for diverse residential options, sustainable commercial and retail spaces, innovative industrial development and vibrant green spaces which will enhance the lives of residents, employees and visitors to the Chinook Communities area.

The draft LAP proposes accommodating growth around Major Activity Centres, transit station areas, Main streets, and other important corridors through the draft urban form and building scale. This aligns with the objectives of the Municipal Development Plan to “to build and diversify urban activities within activity nodes, by locating a portion of new housing and jobs within higher intensity, mixed-use areas that are well connected to the Primary Transit Network”.

We would like to thank Administration for their dedicated efforts in creating this plan. We urge members of the Committee to vote in favor of the draft plan and forward it to Council for consideration. Thank you for your regard as you deliberate on the proposed Chinook LAP.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Karpat", is written in a cursive style.

Jessica Karpat, MEdes, RPP, MCIP
Principal – Planning, QuantumPlace Developments Ltd.