



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]	Trevor
Last name [required]	McInnis
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 Community Development
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 favour



Public Submission

CC 968 (R2024-05)

ATTACHMENT_01_FILENAME

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

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

As a property owner in Windsor Park, I am extremely excited for this to be approved and look forward to seeing all areas of this development plan, especially to see the development of 50 Ave between Macleod Trail and 8st SW, Elbow Dr, Britannia, Macleod Trail to 34 Ave N, and a 50th ave LRT begin and be completed as soon as possible for our communities. Thank you for your efforts with this plan and hope to see it built into reality very soon!



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]

Ruth

Last name [required]

Melchior

How do you wish to attend?

Remotely

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 Community LAP

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 - February 18, 2025.docx

ATTACHMENT_02_FILENAME

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

I submitted a PDF version of this document and did not realize until after I submitted that the yellow highlights may not allow the written font to show through on the PDF. When I open it on my Mac, I can read it but I am not certain how it will be received on a PC. Can you please provide the Committee with the Word document if the PDF does not work? Thank you for your help.

February 19, 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 Policy

Land Use

1. *Development in Neighbourhood Connector and Neighbourhood Local 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 plan-wide site, building, and landscape design policies in Section 2.4, the following policies apply:

c. *Development in Neighbourhood Connector and Neighbourhood Local 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 characteristics that shape how these areas change and grow, including when the community 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

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rm', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ruth Melchior
Director of Development