



Banff Trail / Capitol Hill City Initiated Land Use Redesignations

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase One
What We Heard Report – Spring 2018

Project overview

Amendments to the Banff Trail Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) and Capitol Hill portion of the North Hill ARP were adopted by City Council in 2016.

Following these changes and after consultation with the community Council redesignated several parcels in the Community to reflect the ARPs. These changes were to allow for the rowhousing (R-CG) land use in strategic locations.

Council directed Administration to investigate whether the community would like The City to redesignate more parcels to align with the multi-residential areas of the ARPs.

Engagement overview

The Engage Spectrum level for this project was 'Listen & Learn' which is defined as "which is defined as "We will listen to stakeholders and learn about their plans, views, issues, concerns, expectations and ideas." Feedback collected through the City-led engagement program will be used to help inform the report to the Special Policy Committee on Planning and Urban Development, on whether City – initiated land use redesignations should take place.

The City-led engagement strategy was developed to facilitate multiple touch points and ensure inclusivity for all who wanted to provide input and learn about the project. Both in-person and online opportunities were offered for those who were interested in participating.

In-person engagement

An in-person open house was held on Wednesday, April 18 at the Capitol Hill Community Association. At this session, we had project information and City staff on hand to introduce the speak to the project and answer questions about the planning process.

Citizens were also given an opportunity to provide feedback on the potential land use redesignations. We had 138 people attend this session and received 23 completed comment forms for Capitol Hill and 27 completed comment forms for Banff Trail.

Online engagement

An online survey was made available from April 16 – May 6, 2018 on the project website, calgary.ca/banffcapitol. Citizens were provided with the information shared at the in-person open house and were able to provide feedback. We received 47 responses for Banff Trail and 47 responses for Capitol Hill.

How did people hear about engagement?

A communications plan was developed to inform the community about the project and all of our engagement opportunities. Ongoing tactics employed throughout the life of the project have included:

- Project specific website (calgary.ca/Banffcapitol) that shares information about the project and engagement opportunities.
- A project email newsletter, where interested parties can subscribe for project updates. An email is sent out about key project milestones, timelines and upcoming engagement activities. There are currently 249 subscribers.

The following communications tactics were employed to promote participation in our various engagement opportunities:

- Facebook advertisement to area residents
- Postcard mail outs to 2449 surrounding area residents and landowners
- Road signs located at high-traffic intersections sharing event details

What did we ask?

We asked citizens to answer the following questions to gain a understanding of their ideas and concerns related to further city initiated land use redesignations. We had two separate comment forms for each of the two communities.

- Do you want The City to explore more land use redesignations in the community? If yes, please tell us why? If no, please tell us why not?
- Referencing the map on the back of this page, are there any specific locations for medium density low-rise and/or medium density mid-rise that you feel should be redesignated or any locations you feel should not?
- Do you want The City to explore more land use redesignations for all land uses reflected in the current ARP Land Use Plan above? (i.e. more than just medium low-rise/ mid-rise and land uses such as local commercial)
 - Do you want us to consider only Medium Density Low-Rise (M-CG) redesignation?
 - Do you want us to consider only Medium Density Mid-Rise (M-C1, M-C2) redesignation?
- Are there any other ideas or concerns that you would like to share with The City about this project?

What did we hear?

Overall, there was a high level of interest in the project and we received a wide range of input.

Banff Trail

Some of the main themes that emerged through all of the comments were:

- Citizens stated they were generally unsupportive of the idea of more City-initiated land use redesignations for both Medium Density Low-Rise and Mid-Rise.

- Citizens shared concerns about the impact density has on existing infrastructure and parking.
- Citizens stated that they were unclear on the planning process and shared concerns that this process would change the existing community plan.
- Citizens shared concerns around an existing caveat and/or restrictive covenant that exists on some homes in the area,
- Citizens that were generally supportive of City-initiated land use redesignations stated preference towards specific locations
- Citizens that were generally supportive shared preference for this work to be completed in a timelier manner.

Capitol Hill

Some of the main themes that emerged through all of the comments were:

- Citizens stated they were generally unsupportive of the idea of more City-initiated land use redesignations for both Medium Density Low-Rise and Mid-Rise.
- Citizens stated that their community is feeling overwhelmed by the current amount of redevelopment happening.
- Citizens shared concerns about the impact density has on existing infrastructure and parking.
- Some citizens were generally supportive of City-initiated land use redesignations

For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses section](#).

Summary of input

Below is a summary of the main themes that were most prevalent in the comments received. Each theme includes examples of verbatim comments in italics. These are the exact words you used. To ensure we capture all responses accurately, verbatim comments have not been altered. In some cases, we utilized only a portion of your comment that spoke to a particular theme.

Banff Trail	
<i>Theme:</i>	<i>Sample comments:</i>
Citizens were generally unsupportive of the idea of more City-initiated land use redesignations for both Medium Density Low-Rise and Mid-Rise.	<p><i>“No. Let’s see the impact of the most recent land use designations before proceeding with additional redesignations. I liked the previous redesignations but believe incremental change.”</i></p> <p><i>“No, these should be addressed on a one by one basis.”</i></p>
Citizens shared concerns about the impact density has on existing infrastructure and parking.	<i>“No, current designations are causing a parking problem in the community. Increased</i>

	<p><i>density would compound the problem further.”</i></p> <p><i>“No, My main concern about the future development in this area are with vehicle traffic and parking. With the university and lrt so close and traffic routes quite limited we have problems with both parking in the area and getting in and out of our neighbourhood. I think this needs to be addressed. I have not heard anything that would make me believe this is being taken seriously.”</i></p>
<p>Citizens stated that they were unclear on the planning process and shared concerns that this process would change the existing community plan.</p>	<p><i>“A redesignation to this relatively new ARP sets the precedent for new developers to then come into the neighbourhood and further change the ARP.”</i></p> <p><i>“No we just revised the ARP with density, our community needs bike paths and improved walking paths! No more changes.”</i></p>
<p>Citizens shared concerns around an existing caveat and/or restrictive covenant that exists on some homes in the area,</p>	<p><i>“Get rid of the restrictive covenant that is basically out-dated 1952 zoning restrictions”</i></p> <p><i>“Caveats in Banff Trail need to be addressed”</i></p>
<p>Citizens that were generally supportive of City-initiated land use redesignations stated preference towards specific locations.</p>	<p><i>“I believe all proposed redesignations should be considered.”</i></p> <p><i>“Could go higher density on 24th Ave NW ease of Crowchild; Capitol Hill Cr NW, Tye St to 24th Ave, east and parallel to c-train track, Banff Trail Stn, Motel Village, Banff Trail Calgary Transit Corridor”</i></p> <p><i>“All of 24th avenue could be medium density with local shops on the main floor. It would be great if 20th avenue was also zoned for more business, I’d love to see the area revitalized much like 19th street near Kensington road.”</i></p>
<p>Citizens that were generally supportive shared preference for this work to be completed in a timelier manner.</p>	<p><i>“This is a great project, but it is going slow. The development should match the growth of the university and SAIT”</i></p> <p><i>“I would like to suggest city to speed up the process as quick as possible!”</i></p>

Capitol Hill

<i>Theme:</i>	<i>Sample comments:</i>
Citizens stated they were generally unsupportive of the idea of more City-initiated land use redesignations for both Medium Density Low-Rise and Mid-Rise.	<p><i>“No. This is a nice mature community. The change will destroy its character.”</i></p> <p><i>“No. The new ARP was only adopted in spring of 2016. The prior ARP was from 2000 - 16 years earlier. This is far too soon to even consider more amendments to out new ARP. Let The City initiated re-zoned lots get developed first before any more change”</i></p>
Citizens stated that their community is feeling overwhelmed by the current amount of redevelopment happening.	<p><i>“No, not at this time. The number of re-designated sites is exceptional now, now unpresidential in fact. I would like some time to pass, allowing for a re-evaluation of changes so far.”</i></p> <p><i>“No, we do not need to keep burdening this one community with more and more densification initiatives. You've done enough.”</i></p> <p><i>“Would like to see City Council slow down a lot and let the residence adjust to the already "many" builds happening in the area.”</i></p>
Citizens shared concerns about the impact density has on existing infrastructure and parking.	<p><i>“no, I already cant find a parking spot on my street and traffic is already an issue in my neighborhood.”</i></p> <p><i>“No, increasing density in this area will increase traffic which the roads cannot handle. Calgary is NOT a city where bikes can be used all year round and this should not be a reason to increase density when the roads cannot handle the capacity.”</i></p>
Some citizens were generally supportive of City-initiated land use redesignations	<p><i>“Absolutely! The work being done is a great start. Thank you! As we increase density in Capitol Hill, the community and its residents will be able to support more local businesses. It would be fantastic to see the City encouraging more Mixed Use - General District in Capitol Hill”</i></p> <p><i>“Yes, sustainable and planned urban densification is good for the city and should be encouraged around public transportation routes”</i></p>

What are the next steps?

The feedback received through our engagement program will be used The City to inform the report that will be presented to the Special Committee on Planning and Urban Development on July 17, 2018. This report will subsequently be presented to Council on July 23, 2018.

To stay up to date on future project details, please ensure you sign-up to receive email updates at calgary.ca/banffcapitol

Verbatim comments

Content is captured as it was provided by citizens. No edits have been made unless there was personal information or offensive language which is removed with an indication that this has happened.

Banff Trail
Question 1. Do you want The City to explore more land use redesignations in the community? If yes, please tell us why? If no, please tell us why not?
No. Not clear why further land use redesignation is necessary at this point. The current redesignation has just gone through. Need time to assess impact of these changes first. Very concerned about parking and impact of new building on sightlines / light / shadow on houses.
No. The community has to remain a community with single family homes and these homes need to be kept and saved. Why don't The City encourage heritage and re-use. Why do they have to knock old things down. Give people options to upgrade and developers to upgrade / add on to these single family homes.
Yes. City initiated LUD will result in a cohesive and though out development scenario as opposed to individual parcels popping up here and there
Yes, increased density around transit stations and near the University would improve diversity within the area by allowing more housing options (apartments versus single homes) to young professionals and students
Yes, will create opportunities for more variation and diversity in out community
Yes, if you're going to redesignate things, push the higher density further in. Don't make the same mistake again. Banff Trail and university train stations are an important city resource, use them wisely with high density
No, current designations are causing a parking problem in the community. Increased density would compound the problem further.
No. The plan on the opposite side has already increased density more than the residents wanted. The City did not listen to us then
Decrease density to low density (Rita Gainer 2363 - 23 St NW)
No, already badly planned at corner of Capitol Hill Cres NW and 23rd Street NW. Commercial into a cul-de-sac = car traffic
No, leave the community alone as per Caveat 1358 GL
MC-1 and MC-2 s/b M-CG designation
MC-1 and MC-2 at 5-6 storeys creates a "wall" - not a transition.
Redesignate all M-CG as noted on ARP
Yes. More medium density low-rise redesignation for corner lots along 23 St NW, 22 St NW, north of 24th Ave NW

Parking should be addressed first
No. Too big change
No - the ARP is quite new (2016). The land was only recently redesignated and homeowners fought with that redesignation in mind
Yes - remove barriers to development, encourage the transformation of run-down bungalows. At the same time ... No - high quality developers will not be deterred by a bit of paperwork
I am happy with Castle Road, which is already designated MC-1, MC-2
Yes, based on the applications for Motel Village, i.e. 28 storey tower, may need to look at higher density on east side of c-train track, Tye St to 24 Ave NW
What was proposed in this plan looks really good. I am in all favor of this plan.
Yes so that more old houses can be taken down to build more new homes more affordable to more people, e.g. students from university and SAIT
I would like 2 parking spots per unit
I would like The City to charge the developers a fee for infrastructure upgrading in the future (sewer, water, gas, electric)
The ARP has recently been revised and approved by council. The City should partner with the community to develop appropriate non-motorized transportation such as walking and cycling experience
No, we paid a premium to live in this hood and don't want to allow developers to come in increase density and then leave us the long term residents with depreciated property value.
Low density residential, low density rowhouse both are okay. No medium density
We live on *personal information removed* and are obviously concerned with respect to the drastic changes that are planned for our street (medium density mid-rise) and the 23rd St to the East of us (medium density low-rise). So questions 1-3 are difficult to answer. We would like to stay where we are but feel we will likely have to move.
I am not opposed to redesignations up to medium density, low rise. I am opposed to redesignations to medium density, mid rise. I am concerned about traffic in the neighbourhood.
I have no interest in an increase in Banff Trail density. Our neighbourhood is already becoming too dense with the increase in splitting of lots for small single homes and duplex styles homes. Parking is becoming an issue and the idea that increasing the density without any thought into parking makes no sense.
I like my community the way it is, excluding those Brentwood Highrises in red, green, yellow and orange. A blot on the landscape! No more of those.
I'd like the opportunity to have my property at *personal information removed* redesignated. It's a large corner lot with plenty of parking and it should have been redesignated the same as the lots on Morley trail.
If the City would like to explore more on land use re-designations in Banff Trail then a formal letter should be mailed out to the residents in the community ie. same as when you mail out the property taxes and with enough time for the residents to voice their concerns. I attended the the 'drop- in' session at Capitol Hill Community Centre and finds that the staff were nice could not answer any questions fully. Why was there no City Council present at this session? If you are the ones who finalize the decision of these changes? The whole neighborhood on 23rd Street showed up to get our questions answered.
No , my kids school is too full now . the students can not get enough attention. lack teachers.
No as previous stated you are so interested in pdensity that you are creating other problems. You permit rowhousing etc causing problems with parking. When built on a main route one road (19 street) no street parking causing parking problems . Also homes next to these

<p>rowhouse now have no privacy, windows facing adjacent homes look down and directly into back yard of house.</p>
<p>No, and I hate that you've designated my street (Capitol Hill Crescent between the LRT station and 24th Ave NW) as Medium Density Mid-Rise. When these monstrosities start being built, we're going to be forced to sell our home and I hate it. We will either end up smashed between huge buildings that will decimate our lovely yard and garden or we will have to sell and move from our home that we have put so much love and time and money into.</p>
<p>No, enough building in our area. Already too many rented taking up all the street parking. Using the "visitors " parking passes where they reside.</p>
<p>No, everything is fine the way it is. The city should be using money to upgrade train stations and traffic areas like crowchild trail first</p>
<p>No, I do not want the city to explore more land use redesignations within Banff Trail. I have voiced my concern to council over this issue in the past.</p> <p>On your redevelopment plan, you have backed 3-4 storey Medium Density Low Rise and 5-6 storey Medium Density Mid rise against Low density zoning, separated by only an unpaved alley way. There are a large number of heritage bungalows in the area. Although there has been some redevelopment of RC2 housing, the area still consists primarily of the original single storey houses. Even recent RC2 applications typically only consist of 2 storey development and maybe a half 3rd storey towards the back of the house. The idea of this limited RC2 development approval, I assume, was to keep the street scape from looking too altered with new development. These rezoning recommendations will drastically alter the street scape regardless of The City's comment about new developments not being out of context with the existing character of the area.</p> <p>The City should not consider it acceptable to separate a possible 4 storey unit to a heritage 1 or 2 storey dwelling by only an alley way. Ideally, if density of the area needs to be increased, these M-CG, MC-1, MC-2 redesignations should be separated from RC-1 and RC-2 designations by a street. No one will appreciate their alleyway neighbor looking down at their house and into their backyard from their 4th(or more) story unit.</p> <p>Parking and traffic on the streets of Banff Trail is already challenging. There are a substantial amount of rental units in the area providing housing to SAIT and U of C students. These rental units typically house multiple tenants who own multiple vehicles. Parking is at a premium already, especially along 24th Avenue. Traffic cutting through our neighbourhood to beat the light at 24Ave and 19st only adds to the issues. Increasing density of this area will only make parking worse and increase traffic on our roads. There seems little that the City can do to increase parking availability, especially with the intent the city has at increasing density.</p>
<p>No, I have no confidence that the city has done due diligence in planning related to the significant number of high density developments coming up (along 16th Ave at Motel Village and Stadium Shopping area, development at foothills hospital, and the abundant likely projects at North Hill and the old Grace Hospital). All this will have an impact on traffic in and around our neighborhood. When asked about traffic and future plans the city is always vague. Well if you want to increase density you must have more than a vague 5 - 10 - beyond plan for what might happen in the road systems.</p>
<p>No, I think it is perfect for the current resignation.</p>
<p>No, I think the height designations in the 16 and 20 m zones are too high. These buildings change the residential nature of the community. Motel Village needs to be developed first.</p>

No, please do not allow more medium-density mid-rise redesignations within the residential areas of Banff Trail, including Morley Trail, 24th Avenue and 19th Street. Four-storey apartments are not compatible with existing low-rise single dwellings and would create privacy, shadowing, parking and traffic issues for existing residents in nearby/adjacent low-rise/single-family homes.
No, please do not allow more medium-density mid-rise redesignations within the residential areas of Banff Trail, including Morley Trail, 24th Avenue and 19th Street. Four-storey apartments are not compatible with existing low-rise single dwellings and would create privacy, shadowing, parking and traffic issues for existing residents in nearby/adjacent low-rise/single-family homes.
No, the area is a nice mix as it is.
No, The current plan when built out ruins my family's quality of life. As a resident of Banff Trail for over 27 years this social engineering experiment is a great disappointment. The arrogance of the council and city planners is staggering.
No, urban communities are losing their character. When these new units go in, infrastructure is not upgraded, putting further strain on them.
No. This just was changed a few years ago and doesn't need to be changed so soon.
No. Let's see the impact of the most recent land use designations before proceeding with additional redesignations. I liked the previous redesignations but believe incremental change.
Not until you start putting in traffic calming measures. I am all for redevelopment, but there are many young families in this neighbourhood and the cars speed through shortcutting between 16th avenue and crow child. I watch about a hundred cars a day roll through the stop in front of my house or disregard it completely.
The city is approaching land use redesignation, but is the city also prescribing a certain ratio or mixed range of price of housing stock, like low-income housing? Or mixed range of owned and rented infrastructure. Currently there is a lot of rental housing across Banff trail. Is there a way of managing this doesn't disappear with redesignation and new builds?
there continues to be a shortage of readily available development sites with zoning beyond rc2. This is really creating higher land values than is reasonable and can be adjusted by more supply.
YES
Yes make it all low density residential.
Yes!
I live in the Banff Trail community area. Morley Trail is one of the active streets. It has bus routes in both directions. It's also considered as one of the preferred accommodation zones for university students and professionals. This area was developed back in the early fifties which is overdue for re-development and re-construction. Because all of this, I believe that the street will do better if the land use redesignation is revisited.
Yes, a great variety of land use designations results in a greater mix of community members. Mixed communities are more vibrant and better meet the needs of a whole society.
Yes, Banff Trail is a lovely neighbourhood with direct access to LRT. I think this area deserves high density options to better utilise the existing transit options.
Yes, I believe Banff Trail is the perfect neighbourhood for higher density.
Yes, I would like the City explore land use more. I think the concerns of the residents should way heavily on redesignation decisions versus the lobbying of developers or the donors to Councillors/Mayor. I attended the information session hosted by the City at the Capital Hill Community Centre and left frustrated because the purpose of the event was to check a box - Community event held - Done. The City representatives I spoke to were very pleasant but,

they admitted, that their role was too listen, encourage people to fill out the form and then compile what was written into a report, without any analysis or recommendations.
Yes, increased density benefits everyone with more efficient use of services.
Yes, more density close to the LRT is a good way to grow.
Yes, this is a great area to increase density with proximity to c-train, university and hospital.
Yes. Density is a good thing and necessary in this city. In particular to charities that help create density and families like habitat for humanity southern Alberta.
Yes. Right next to UofC; needs higher density housing
Question 2: Referencing the map on the back of this page, are there any specific locations for medium density low-rise and/or medium density mid-rise that you feel should be redesignated or any locations you feel should not? (ex: only redesignate along 24 Avenue NW) Please feel free to also mark on the map.
24th and 19th. Why is this intersection targeted for development?
Only along 24th Ave NW as we moved to our street for a community feel to have neighbors we could get to know. Not commercial properties
All of Capitol Hill Crescent should be MDMR - it is all easy to access LRT and can do with lower parking and create less traffic. It will create the delineation and symmetry facing Crowchild and allow a little lower density deeper in the community
The entire stretch of Capitol Hill Cresc should be redesigned to mid density midrise as parking is plentiful and only one side of the street is affected. Also, the pocket of low density house in this area should be converted to med density low rise. The land relative to the university should be re-evaluated as well as many residents in this area attend university
No
Push mid-rise down the full length of Capitol Hill Cres and then blend into the community from there
There are no locations that should be designated medium density low or medium rise
It should all be redesignated to low density
No medium density mid-rise!! Medium-density low-rise only 3-storey max
Do not redesignate MC-1 and MC-2 along Capitol Hill Cres, especially with a commercial element. Capitol Hill Cres is a dead end street only accessed through community
Yes as noted in 1 above (corner lots along 23 St NW, 22 St NW, north of 24th Ave NW). More corner lots redesignated like in Capitol Hill
No
On 24 Ave and 22A through to 21 St - for the properties with mailing address off 24th Avenue (versus a street address) keep as med low rise. All street addresses should be maintained as low density residential (R2)
If you redesignate, do it all. Let land owners decide when to sell / develop
Could go higher density on 24th Ave NW east of Crowchild; Capitol Hill Cr NW, Tye St to 24th Ave, east and parallel to c-train track, Banff Trail Stn, Motel Village, Banff Trail Calgary Transit Corridor
It already appears to be perfect. I would not change anything.
The area north of 24 Ave on Capitol Hill Cresc would be ideal for MC-1, MC-2 due to the proximity of the UofC overpass and lrt station
City must remove restrictive covenants from 1955. The first medium density mid rise application was halted due to the restrictive covenant
No

Please see attached. Capitol Hill Cres at Banff Trail Station. No exit for vehicles and the highrise will create massive vehicle issues
See (1)
24 ave is already a difficult road to drive down in the winter. Adding more parked vehicles along with the spill over into the rest of the community only makes a once nice neighbourhood compact. You are taking the appeal away from our quiet neighbourhood.
24 Ave NW is not supposed to be a transportation corridor east of Crowchild. When is the northbound access to Crowchild from 16 Ave westbound to be built?
24th St. & 24th ave,
Absolutely. In the neighbourhoods where our city counselor's live. Throw in a few city planner neighbourhoods in there for good measure.
All of 24th avenue could be medium density with local shops on the main floor. It would be great if 20th avenue was also zoned for more business, id love to see the area revitalized much like 19th street near Kensington road.
Anywhere that is a good route for buses such as Morley Tr, 19th St, and 24 Ave are all ideal for increased density to make better use of existing or potentially new transit services.
At least change the Capitol Hill Cres. NW designation to medium density low-rise.
Both are good ideas.
Castle road and Crowchild
what is the red dotted line supposed to mean. That includes St Pius church and Nick's restaurant. what is being proposed for those areas
Do not designate medium density mid-rise along Morley Trail, 24th Avenue or 19th Street. No, please do not allow more medium-density mid-rise redesignations within the residential areas of Banff Trail, including Morley Trail, 24th Avenue and 19th Street. Four-storey apartments are not compatible with existing low-rise single dwellings and would create privacy, shadowing, parking and traffic issues for existing residents in nearby/adjacent low-rise/single-family homes.
Halifax cr. appears to be an excellent area for further redesignations. morley is another option. the far NW corner closest the the U of C is an area in desperate need of investment.
I agree with the current plan.
I feel that the area beside crowchild should all be medium density mid-rise.
I feel that the medium density mid rise along Capitol Hill Crescent NW should NOT proceed.
I strongly believe that the plan for the medium low-rise and high-rise along 24St from 24 Ave to 20 Ave should not be realized. As I am a home owner that has a back yard facing these massive structure. The impact is huge to my family. Ranging from getting SUNLIGHT for health reasons to the privacy for my children. And then, there is the property value drop. You might not care because this does not your home.
I think all proposed locations should be redesignated for higher density. The lots along Halifax Trail should especially be medium density low-rise considering their location to C-Train access, proximity to downtown, and the large size of the lots.
I think Capitol Hill Crescent should be complete medium density mid-rise.
I would like the city to revisit the development request for the corner of 22 Street NW and 24 Avenue NW. I don't understand how a for-profit seniors home matches with Medium density Low-Rise. Parking for the employees of the seniors home will be a problem as well as parking for the employees. I think this development is a perfect example of when a development should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis rather than a city-wide program. A for-profit seniors living centre doesn't fit with the community. The centre is 'closish' to amenities but not

really and the space should be used for housing families. Moreover, where is a similar for-profit business in the Banff Trail community? Is this the begging of the wedge?
If designated, there should be at least a low-income requirement for developers as the rezoning affects a lot of homes that are rental properties.
Leave the inner streets as residential... not multi residential.
More medium density midrise around university station
No
No
No, I do not want any medium building at all
No, the current plan is exactly what I suggest.
None at this time. Develop what is already planned and ensure traffic and other infrastructure and services are not compromised first.
Only redesignate along c train line.
Please do not redesignate along 24th Avenue NW. Please do not redesignate in areas where the MCG/MC1/MC2 will only separate from existing RC1/RC2 by an alleyway. I would think that the redesignation along Capitol Hill Crescent to the West side of 23rd Street would be acceptable and keeping with The City's intent to increase density at CTrain stations.
Redesigned only on 24ave or where street parking is available or preferably in hillhurst or Kensington
Some
Test
Yes make everything low density residential. All of the recent changes have caused significant unrest in the community which may necessitate engaging the Municipal Affairs Minister to listen to the concerns of the citizens because the Corporation fails or refuses to do so.
Yes. *personal information removed* should be redesignated
Question 3. Do you want The City to explore more land use redesignations for all land uses reflected in the current ARP Land Use Plan above? (i.e. more than just medium low-rise/ mid-rise and land uses such as local commercial) Do you want us to consider only Medium Density Low-Rise (e.g. M-CG) redesignation? Do you want us to consider only Medium Density Mid-Rise (e.g. M-C1, M-C2) redesignation?
a) No
b) No
a) Yes
Yes, focus on medium density and increase mid-rise facing Crowchild
I think density near LRT stations should be even higher
There should be local commercial in front of both train stations to serve the local community (for example daycare, small grocer, liquor store, pub)
I do not want the City to explore any more land use designations that increase density from what it currently is
No commercial
a) Yes
b) No
No
I am open to both redesignations

No
Yes - commercial on Capitol Hill Cres across from LRT can be mixed (1st floor commercial, 2nd and up residential). Marked on map change to medium density low rise, based on surroundings
No
Local commercial is currently discretionary on lots close to c-train station. This should be codified in an "M" type designation
Yes. To make the area more vibrant and upgrade the local commercial
No we just revised the ARP with density, our community needs bike paths and improved walking paths! No more changes.
No
See (1)
No redesignations, current land use is good.
Again, ensuring that any new builds do not remove access to affordable housing stock, and rental properties.
All for designations based on people's input rather than meeting some arbitrary City revenue generation strategy to increase density so tax revenues can be increased.
Consider only Medium Density Low-Rise redesignation.
I think that the current plan is a good start and should be revisited for further areas/densities after 3 years.
Honestly, Euclidean zoning is excessively un-necessary and has lead Calgary into the sprawling city that it is today along with things like parking minimums that have decreased the quality of life of Calgarians due to less walking opportunities throughout the city. Seeing an end to these zoning practices would be ideal in my eyes.
I believe all proposed redesignations should be considered.
I believe the current Land Use Plan reflects the community, and already optimizes that current traffic patterns and services provided to the community.
I don't think we should be going above medium density low-rise in the residential neighbourhood. Local commercial should be going into Motel Village.
I like the increase in density. I think a few more commercial options near the LRT's would be nice.
I think all redesignations should be explored on a case-by-case basis rather than a city-wide program. Certainly, more low density residential or rowhouses are needed and can be made to look very nice are tearing down an original house. I think there is also more room for local commercial on 19th Street and 20th Ave.
I think there is lots of high rise density around Brentwood mall. I think we have done our part for densifications
I want to consider no changes
Little bit more commercial mixed in
Low rise is best in my opinion.
low rise low density redevelopment is already occurring... why does the city need to be more involved
Medium Density low rise please.
mid rise and commercial designations would allow for more mixed use opportunities
No more redesignation., we are a family community which you are trying to change.
No, keep the one as it is right now.

No. Enough changes already. Already too many changes...it's becoming a cement city ... not a neighbourhood...
Not sure why the City of Calgary thought Banff Trail residents were interested in ruining our quiet neighbourhood with high density buildings. The sewage system is not capable of handling the increase in density that you are describing.
Only consider Medium Density Low Rise and Local Commercial
Only some
Please consider only Medium Density Low-Rise redesignations in the areas listed above (Morley Trail, 24th Avenue and 19th Street).
See above, development is good. My biggest concern would be the shade created by high-rise developments.
See above.
Seriously? These are very self serving questions. How often do you want the City to kick you in the groin? Would you like the groin kicking to be more frequent? How much do you enjoy the groin kicking intensity?
Yes
Yes I think a mix of land uses makes for a more interesting and vibrant community.
Yes, MCG, MC1, MC2 should all be considered specifically close to the LRT.
Question 4. Are there any other ideas or concerns that you would like to share with The City about this project?
Share with community this designation is necessary / desirable also intended timeframe of changes
Improve 24 Ave intersection to improve traffic flow out
Mirror planning south of 24th to north of 24th. Community is a big resource for the University and has good road and transit infrastructure
Residential parking within the area should be re-evaluated
Caveats in Banff Trail need to be addressed
All re-zoning should be City initiated so the value can be passed on to current owners instead of developers taking the risk on re-zone. Get rid of the restrictive covenant that is basically out-dated 1952 zoning restrictions
The City should leave this area alone
The traffic from mid-density mid-rise in and out of Capitol Hill Cresc north of 23rd Ave will be untenable. Too much traffic in an area which was not designed for that amount of traffic
Badly planned information night. Nobody knew anything about the CAVEDT 1358 GL. I was at the two preceding information nights and none of my concerns were heard. *inappropriate comment removed*
Leave the mid-rise for existing commercial areas. You can't put 6-storey buildings in a residential area without severe disruption to current residents. That is the reason for Caveat 1358GL !!
Parking should be addressed first. Will the sewer system in this area be able to handle the higher density? How will all the electric cars (in the future) be able to plug-in if there is not enough parking? Will the electric system be able to handle all the electric cars and homes?
Could The City think about the dramatic population increase?
A redesignation to this relatively new ARP sets the precedent for new developers to then come into the neighbourhood and further change the ARP. We want to maintain the family residential integrity of our neighbourhood

Many properties in BT have restrictive covenants on title limiting # of dwellings. How realistic is it to change land use if they can't be developed?
Like to get more details what limited range of support commercial are allowed
City Admin should carry through to re-designate lots, especially east from / across from Banff Trail Stn, rather than wait for seniors or developers to apply, undertake serious expenses and processing delays of 7-9 months of work to get this plan going. Otherwise, we're just seeing current RCG2 lots underdeveloped for infills, and RC-1 lots not developed as per their new M-C1, M-C2, M-CG designations
These inner city communities are full of elderly residents, many of who have lived there for decades. They are leaving the community, sometimes forced out by the inability to maintain a house but also by alarming increases in property taxes. So: why not designate within each land use redesignation plan, some density housing for seniors. Seniors who have lived in that area for (say) <10 or whatever number of years should have priority to stay in that community by having access to this "community senior's housing" that is not on a busy street but in a quieter area to continue enjoying their friends and neighbors in a familiar place that they love
This is align with what I have seen in other cities. It's much easier for younger families to live closer to city with all required amenities. I don't want to apply for land use changes if The City already can made the changes. I would like to leave this with good hands of City planners than me making decisions
This is a great project, but it is going slow. The development should match the growth of the university and SAIT
The areas that have been redesignated, but not rezoned, are very confusing to potential buyers, sellers and developers. Please rezone or leave as currently zoned
Improve design criteria for medium density!
1358GL Land Titles
There is a certain arbitrariness about the re-designation process, which we obviously do not like. In the present time and near future we would like The City to more carefully explore by laws with respect to property maintenance, yard waste and so on. We have seen a clear deterioration to the past few years caused by the fact that some of the new owners are less interested in maintaining their properties. We were told we can complain. However, the problems are City initiated and caused and some increased attention would be welcomed.
I note that you call CANMORE PARK 'North Capitol Hill Park on the map and it is not in green. Are you planning to change the designation? I will fight it all the way.
All the proposed land use dedesignation plans will bring more people into our community, flooding our already over-loaded publicly owned infrastructure and services, including schools, health clinics, libraries, parking spaces, etc. Until a model is presented that illustrates how the City will allocate additional resources to our community to sustain the needs of increased population, I oppose to any plan that solely serves to add people to a mature residential area.
Already said. Move the construction to a different neighbourhood now.
As it is adjacent to a C-Train station, why isn't Houndsfield Heights being re-designated to medium density. Wonder why that is? The city's planning department wouldn't be biased in favour of high income individuals would they?
At City of Calgary open houses prior to the 2016 ARP being finalized, City staff spoke mainly with Community Association board members and ignored regular residents such as us. After an hour of waiting for a turn to speak with a City representative, we mentioned to the Engage staff that we had not been able to speak with anyone. They did not offer to help, merely saying that was too bad and they were sorry. We left with no information other than what was on the boards (same as on the website). I was hoping to attend a more robust meeting on

April 18; however, it has also been watered down to a 'drop in' event that will hopefully have enough staff to speak with everyone who needs information.
Be sure some of the mid rise area near the LRT and the UofC is set aside for affordable housing.
Be sure it has enough parking because even with a train or bike to work people will have at least one car for personal use.
Build more rental apartments downtown and stop trying to ruin our neighbourhood with project that do not make sense even on paper.
I live on castle rd and my main concern about the future development in this area are with vehicle traffic and parking. With the university and lrt so close and traffic routes quite limited we have problems with both parking in the area and getting in and out of our neighbourhood. I think this needs to be addressed. I have not heard anything that would make me believe this is being taken seriously.
I love all the small parks in and around this area, don't get rid of them
I think the park between 20th street and Tye St just south of Halifax Crescent along the LRT line should be replaced with medium density mid-rise. The park feels unsafe and is common for illicit behaviour. I would like to see something more useful be done with this space.
I think there is too much uncertainty on the pace and likelihood of approval of land use changes. there are so many costs and fees associated with inner city development that many builders are uninterested in pursuing redesignations.
I would like to suggest city to speed up the process as quick as possible!
It appears all of the public consultation has been nothing more than just face time with the community rather than seriously listening and acting on the legitimate concerns raised by citizens impacted by the decisions
More commercial zoning! Students need cafes! Maybe a restaurant?
N/A
No
No. I think this is a great project by the City. Keep up the good work.
None
Parking will probably be the biggest limitation.
School capacity to be revisited and if necessary, add higher floors or add extra buildings.
Stop do it ,I do not want my community becomes too crowded and chaos.
The city should have done a better job consulting the landowners long before now.
The communication around this particular stage is horribly confusing. What exactly are you asking? When I've reached out to our representative we were told by her assistant that nothing was going to change (from the R1 designation) so what does all this mean? Has the area been redesignated or not?
There needs to be better access to 16 Ave westbound from 19 St. northbound.
This is my first interaction with the City on planning issues. I have written a planner, attended an information session, spoken with my councillor and now completed this survey. In all four interaction, I have left feeling like I wasted my time and the decision has been made. It's a terrible feeling when I believe a poor decision is being made which will have a long-term impact on the financial health of my family and my neighbours. I mentioned these feelings to a planner at the community meeting. Unfortunately, his response was 'I appreciate your feelings. Please fill in the on-line survey.' I'm not upset with him. I understand he also has limited power to influence. So, I'm left asking, who has the influence?

TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC! That is my single biggest concern. We need some traffic circles and other traffic calming measures like extended curbs, posted speed limits, etc. The existing problems will only get worse with more development so lets tackle it now.
with increasing density, increased bus service to the C-train would be useful
Yes, I am concerned that economically accessible housing will disappear from the community with new infills and construction. As a renter I am constantly seeing invitations for my landlord to sell my building to be knocked down for infill building. There are a ton of renters between Banff Trail and Capitol Hill and essential to young professionals and university or college students in proximity to the vibrancy of the city. Needs to ensure that development spans socioeconomic access.
Yes, I would like to know how the City will be compensating for my losses if the changes go through.
You ask for our input and in most cases we have found out the decision has already been made. Tired of getting form letters from alderperson's assistant replying to nothing that was referenced in letter.
CAPITOL HILL
Question 1. Do you want The City to explore more land use redesignations in the community? If yes, please tell us why? If no, please tell us why not?
No I like it as is.
No, not at this time. The number of re-designated sites is exceptional now, now unpreidential in fact. I would like some time to pass, allowing for a re-evaluation of changes so far.
No, what is already designated is density enough. The designated "mid-rise and low-rise" projects should not become the norm.
No, we do not need to keep burdening this one community with more and more densification initiatives. You've done enough. Go pick on another community for now. These communities of Capitol Hill and Banff Trail should not be expected to solely absorb the next 1/2 million residents making Calgary their home. Spread the "love" out a little why don't you?
Absolutely not, existing residents are slowly but surely losing their privacy, parking, traffic, noise as it is already
No I think the current designation keeps the community with a good balance of parking, traffic, single units, duplex units, parks and commercial space.
There seems to be some transitions of medium density, mid-rise to low density. Could these be more of a transition using med-density low-rise?
No this is sufficient. It appears that the sewer department, traffic department, parks department and low cost housing were not involved. This is a dream for developers but not good for people who live here. I agree with increasing the density as long as the other elements are also addressed, preferably first.
No, these should be addressed on a one by one basis.
No, I bought my house in 1992, a peaceful low density area. Not it's crowded and noisy. I feel like I am being pushed out, too much density.
No, considerations should be done on individual basis when applied for. Density is already increasing as lots of "splits"
Yes, sustainable and planned urban densification is good for the city and should be encouraged around public transportation routes
No. This is a nice mature community. The change will destroy its character.

Yes remove the designation of medium density mid-rise (14th St / 23rd Ave NW) and restore the original low density residential designation. You guys are proposing to destroy the character of the neighbourhood!!
No, correct designations are causing a traffic and parking problem in the community. Increased density would compound the problem
Yes. Densification is a good idea for the community and c-train accessibility is convenient
When I moved here 17 years ago I realized the area was moving to infill housing on 25' lots. I was ok with this. Having lived as a child and as an adult in row housing (including in Calgary), I am against this neighbourhood being converted as shown on the back. I have lived in medium density and townhomes (row houses) in Europe - they were better designed than here. More space, better parking, more walking friendly
No
No. The new ARP was only adopted in spring of 2016. The prior ARP was from 2000 - 16 years earlier. This is far too soon to even consider more amendments to out new ARP. Let The City initiated re-zoned lots get developed first before any more change
People who paid a premium for R1 property with views of parks and to be in a low density area should not have their property devalued by land use designation
Yes. I think increasing density in key loventions is important. Parking is an important issue that must be addressed. All M-CG and MC-1 or MC-2 buildings should have enough on-site parking and visitor parking
I am completely comfortable with medium density low rights being added. Mid rise seems out of keeping with privacy in the backyard, and I am not supportive of that.
Absolutely! The work being done is a great start. Thank you! As we increase density in Capitol Hill, the community and its residents will be able to support more local businesses. It would be fantastic to see the City encouraging more Mixed Use - General District in Capitol Hill (and Banff Trail) that
I am strongly opposed to city-initiated redesignation in this area. Since my street and house would suffer major impact from a nearby Mid-Rise, I want to be able to study any proposed development and its impact, not just suffer whatever a developer proposes.
I believe the low-density rowhouse zoning should be expanded in Capital Hill (especially along 18 Ave and 19 Ave). Many of the properties are already being used as low-density rowhouses but the secondary suites are illegal due to zoning. If the zoning is changed, more of the owners would be able to get the development permits to update these suites and make them legal. This area is popular to rent due to the proximity of SAIT and the University, as well as walking distance to the LRT. By changing to zoning to RC-G it would make for safer rentals.
I don't think enough attention has been given to parking while increasing the density of the population. Has there been any provision for local car parkades or payment for street parking passes?
I want The City to consider higher density redesignations along 20th Avenue especially for non-corner lots. I think M-CG, M-C1 and M-C2 redesignations should be considered.
I would like to see some medium density low-rise and medium-density mid-rise areas redesignated to R-CG to reduce height and density.
it would appear as though plenty of thought has been given to this re-zoning. Enough talk - let's move forward. Looks good.
Low density row houses seem to be compatible with existing community, and could be expanded outside of corner lots if size allows. Seem to be some opportunity to expand potential local commercial along main routes of 24 and 20 avenues
No

No
No - already too much new building which is not yet utilized . Suggest waiting one to two years to evaluate effect of current developments on community. A number of development are ongoing but as far as i know not one has been completed or occupied yet.
No - I am happy with my redesignation
no (see comments in other response)
No, current approved land use changes are destroying the character of existing neighborhoods, Increased housing density 24 proposed town-homes across the street from me are inconsistent with the single family residences across the street. The very large garbage contained for the 24 units is an eyesore and appears to be poorly located and designed to reduce skunk, coyote and other rodent from the park accessing. Parking and traffic problems galore given the current snow removal strategy in the wintertime will be very chaotic for all residents. Limited emergency vehicle access.
no, I already cant find a parking spot on my street and traffic is already an issue in my neighborhood.
No, I think you will ruin these intercity communities with higher populations. The streets are busy enough. With these plans for higher density along 14 Street, it would become a nightmare for traffic.
No, I understand the smaller bungalow on a 50 foot lot is a thing of the past but I think if 2 houses go onto each lot that doubles the amount of density. I am concerned about traffic and parking. Parking is already an issue with increasing density and SAIT students. I also have concerns about water/sewer infrastructure. A lot of builders are slapping up low quality housing on the corner lots and but charging like its a custom home. I can see homes that are only a few years old with stucco coming off and finishes deteriorating.
No, increasing density in this area will increase traffic which the roads cannot handle. Calgary is NOT a city where bikes can be used all year round and this should not be a reason to increase density when the roads cannot handle the capacity.
No, the neighborhood is already crowded enough without adequate parking and alley access. In addition the new low density rowhouses under construction do not seem 'low density' - they are so close to the neighboring houses that there is no privacy and egress is a major issue. My impression is that the redesignations are coming from developers and the city who just want to make more money off of selling houses and getting property taxes than maintaining a safe neighborhood with adequate infrastructure.
Please do not allow more medium density redesignations as this will significantly change the character of the neighborhood and hamper the current community feeling. I am also concerned about safety with increased medium density housing as there are two schools in the neighborhood and medium density is more likely to attract renters who may pose a risk to our children walking to and from school.
No, there is enough traffic and parking congestion as is.
No, traffic congestion and parking already an issue. Hopefully the city has taken the parking issue into consideration.
No. It is already moved too quick. Unfair when briar hill etc communitys closer to downtown still rc1 and capital hill Banff being rcg or mcg and school already overloaded
No. Rowhouse and medium density low-rise is appropriate for the neighborhood.
No. The land use re-designations currently under discussion will all serve to bring more people into the community, which is already crowded. Please go visit the public schools in the

community, you will find crowded classrooms. Go visit the health clinics, libraries, and other publicly owned places, you will find that resources are already being stretched.

No.

Since 2016 , there is no significant change in economy and population of city, what is the rationale keep pushing high density population area? We already increased from RC2 zone. I do not see any reason to push higher density area. Only multiple units builder can get benefit , not the residents.

Speaking for our family, we would say please no - not at this time. While we don't object to higher density - through our own (still unsuccessful) efforts to downsize to a pleasant townhouse option in or near this community - discovered that new developers currently seem stuck on maximizing their profits by building only large sq. foot units on each parcel of land - usually in the form of large apartment or 4-plex units. They leave virtually nothing in the way of green space, and cram the units in extremely close together. Side windows are almost non-existent so homes are dark - and made all the more depressing by the current decorating trend which is to create units that resemble square office cubicles they then paint in sterile hues of grey. Might I suggest that developers (and those in the city who set guidelines) need to please consider how to achieve higher density while still allowing units to 'breathe' with access to adequate patio / garden space and lots of daylight. Moreover - the rapidly expanding, aging demographic will soon be demanding smaller, affordable inner city bungalow-style housing, duplex, or co-housing options (with shared gardens and green spaces) that are not dark, sterile, corporate looking bunkers, but warm inviting homes with generous windows - for basic mental health! It is time to look at what will offer individuals and families the best quality of life, not simply what maximizes profits for the developer - although we dare say, the developer who figures this out will likely gain more over the long term as their concept/property will be much in demand! Thank-you :)

Speaking for our family, we would say please no - not at this time. While we don't object to higher density - through our own (still unsuccessful) efforts to downsize to a pleasant townhouse option in or near this community - discovered that new developers currently seem stuck on maximizing their profits by building only large sq. foot units on each parcel of land - usually in the form of large apartment or 4-plex units. They leave virtually nothing in the way of green space, and cram the units in extremely close together. Side windows are almost non-existent so homes are dark - and made all the more depressing by the current decorating trend which is to create units that resemble square office cubicles they then paint in sterile hues of grey. Might I suggest that developers (and those in the city who set guidelines) need to please consider how to achieve higher density while still allowing units to 'breathe' with access to adequate patio / garden space and lots of daylight. Moreover - the rapidly expanding, aging demographic will soon be demanding smaller, affordable inner city bungalow-style housing, duplex, or co-housing options (with shared gardens and green spaces) that are not dark, sterile, corporate looking bunkers, but warm inviting homes with generous windows - for basic mental health! It is time to look at what will offer individuals and families the best quality of life, not simply what maximizes profits for the developer - although we dare say, the developer who figures this out will likely gain more over the long term as their concept/property will be much in demand! Thank-you :)

the resource to support the community is be definitely not enough . Currently in one kindergarten class, there are 30+students and only two teachers. Other schools are 25students /2teachers.

Parking will be horrible as well.

Why was 17a st singled out for row housing?

yes
Yes, as I believe a mix of housing options from low density to medium density makes for a more inclusive neighbourhood.
Yes, I think there is opportunity to create more density in this neighbourhood.
Yes, I would like to see more low density rowhouse in the community. This would help increase the number of secondary suites and supplement the popular rental market in the area due to the proximity of downtown, SAIT, UofC, and foothills hospital.
Yes. I would like to see mixed use (Local Commercial and residential) development designations along 20th Ave, 14th St and 10th street. Commercial optionality should be considered in the "medium density low rise" and "medium density mid rise". the density of the neighborhood is increasing it would be good to see more local commercial.
Question 2. Referencing the map on the back of this page, are there any specific locations for medium density low-rise and/or medium density mid-rise that you feel should be redesignated or any locations you feel should not? (ex: only redesignate along 24 Avenue NW) Please feel free to also mark on the map.
No
No, just back off for a while. The growth developer driven with little regard for neighbors. We don't want designated areas to be re designated before the ink on the existing ARP dries.
No
I don't think anywhere in this community the redesign should be allowed
I think the low density row housing facing all the streets (corner lots) should remain only as single units or duplex units, not row housing
Yes, see east / west of 14 Ave, north of 21 Ave
17th Ave, east of 14th St is marked as medium density-lowrise. 4-5 stories will shade all the houses on the north side.
Only on 20 Avenue NW
Medium density low rise only along 20th Ave, some on 10 St & 14 St, I would prefer none
There should be zero medium density low-rise or mid-rise near 14 St. 14th Street cannot handle any additional traffic volume!!
The route along 14th Street should be redesignated and implemented before more infills go in along the street
Do not support the changes
Yes see previous comment. Multiple safety issues including no hazardous waste removal !?!? From existing site
There are no locations that should be re-designated medium density low or mid-rise
Blocks separated by an alley behind "low-density rowhouse" should also be redesignated the same
Get rid of the row house designation on the streets. They should stay single family or duplex (side x side infill)
None - density zoning is already too high too soon. There is no vision in a cancerous out of control growth
a) I like the proposed M-CG and MC-1 / MC-2 zones, especially along 14 St near 24 Ave NW
b) I don't like the redesignation of MC-G in the 10 St / 23 Ave NW corner. That should be low density residential consistent with other properties nearby and backing onto the Confederation Park
21 avenue between 14 and 13 shouldn't be medium mid rise. Too tall for that block, too much shading. Stick to mid rise on major streets and intersections.

23rd Avenue and 14th street should not have been re-designated by the city. Isn't too late for common sense to prevail and return to original designation!
around the schools should be limited to low or medium density only to allow for a more family-oriented environment
As owner of 1836 17 ave nw, I fully support the rezoning on this map. Thanks
Do not allow Mid-Rises along 14th St NW. The surrounding streets are attractive tree-lined ones and should not be spoiled like this.
do not redesignate anything along 20th avenue to low density rowhouse. retain low density residential zoning (see comments in other response)
I don't feel there should be anything over 4 stories. It doesn't fit in with the area and practically forces close neighbours out as their property becomes dwarfed and get no sun.
I don't think that there should be any additional medium density mid-rise redesignations done and I would consider removing the current medium density mid-rise locations that are north of 20th Ave. I also don't think that there should be any more medium density low-rise redesignations beyond what the map shows.
I don't want any further redesignation.
I feel that the medium density mid-rise along 20th avenue should NOT be mid-rise and should be low rise row homes at the very most. There is an issue with parking and traffic on these avenues as it is.
I have questions about the medium density mid rise on the current city parks location: If I understand correctly, the designation is because the size of the space is sufficient to put something taller located in the north east section, allowing for transition to lower height lower density towards the outside to integrate with existing housing. Provided this is the approach it could work without destroying the community feel. I am concerned that the roads are insufficient to accommodate additional traffic. We have a lot of pedestrians use the road for walking to/from the pathway system, including young people on bikes. And as it stands, two cars typically cannot pass each other along 16 or 16A. But widening to accommodate more traffic would not be something the residents would embrace. Would encourage you to consider, should such a development proceed, to look at providing access by converting the current alley along the green-space into a roadway for local traffic, with fencing (and trees to minimize impact on view for current residents) separating from the green space.
I think it would be appropriate to consider redesignation along 20th Avenue between 10th and 14th Streets to M-CG and/or M-C1/M-C2. I think the R-CG designations along 20th are a good start but restrict meaningful development especially on non-corner lots.
I think there should be more medium density low-rise and medium density mid-rise options along 20th ave and 24th ave between 19th St and 14th st.
I would like to see mixed use (Local Commercial and residential) development designations along 20th Ave, 14th St and 10th street. Commercial optionality should be considered in the "medium density low rise" and "medium density mid rise".
I'd like to see the medium-density mid-rise on both sides of 21st Ave between 13th and 14th St redesignated R-CG; also the medium-density mid-rise on the east side of 14th St on both sides of 22nd and 23rd Ave. The reason is the same as above--to reduce height and density. Height is a particular concern on 22nd and 23rd Avenues east of 14th St because those sites are at the top of steep hills, so the height impact will be exaggerated.
If designated, there should be at least a low-income requirement for developers as the rezoning affects a lot of homes that are rental properties.
Minimize redesignation in all areas until builders consider new options (as above).
no
No

No further re-designations suggested
No issues.
No medium density along 25 th avenue this is a narrow residential road
No more than what is on the table now. We think the city has maximized the space available.
Redesignation for medium density low-rise should not intrude on side streets (should not wraparound and bleed into residential neighborhoods). Medium density mid-rise is unacceptable on 20th avenue. It would interfere with light, gardens, and destroy evergreen trees and destroy sightlines. Developers such as RNDSQ Mount Pleasant only had to make the front face nice, now the residents beside and behind get to look at an awful industrial style. If there is low-rise allowed, developers should be forced to make the 360-degree view look good in every direction.
See above comment.
some
The designation of medium density mid rise on the current city lot 16 st 25th Ave. should be redesignated to medium density low rise or row house. These are perfect for our community based on those currently being constructed, but the addition of a higher building will be out of sync in that location and strain road already challenged to accommodate local traffic. Commercial belongs along the main routes, 24, 20 avenues, where a medium density mid rise would be appropriate.
There shouldn't be more medium density re-designation on 20th ave unless street parking is restricted to residents. It is currently impossible for me to park in front of my own house on week days, and I can only imagine the problem getting worse with higher density.
We are strongly opposed to any and all Medium Density mid-rise or medium-density low rise development along the indicated area on 14th Street NW
We do not want any population density increase . We want to keep current situation. It is enough for now.
We do not want to increase in density
What provisions have been made for additional parking requirements on 20th? This year with the snow, 20th was a nightmare. Additional cars parking and the additional traffic generated by medium density housing needs to be better addressed/communicated.
Yes, I would say designate one street for medium density low-rise and create a little village with eating area etc. No need for medium density mid rise. Build a mid rise on the old Sears location and make that area for higher density.
Yes, the medium density low-rise and mid-rise along 20th avenue, 10th street and 14th should all include main street retail, restaurant and/or office space on the main floor. This community wants to support more local business!
Question 3. Do you want The City to explore more land use redesignations for all land uses reflected in the current ARP Land Use Plan above? (i.e. more than just medium low-rise/ mid-rise and land uses such as local commercial) Do you want us to consider only Medium Density Low-Rise (e.g. M-CG) redesignation? Do you want us to consider only Medium Density Mid-Rise (e.g. M-C1, M-C2) redesignation?
a) Yes
a) No
b) No
Neither - this community will lose its clean with both options and less potential to drive down house prices for current owners

No. I think aside from my comment to question #2, the redesignations in the ARP Land Use Plan are ok.
More commercial? Also, I feels if you are asking about specific redesignations you should state that or give examples!
No
No
No land use redesignations
a) No
b) No
a) More local commercial to encourage more pedestrian traffic like in Kensington along 10th St and Inglewood
b) More local commercial along 10th St
a) Minimum low-rise
b) Definitely no mid-rise.
Probably best to go back to planning school. Suggest you contact David Villeneuve planner in Bangkok, Thailand. He knows how to plan communities to serve people
I do not want the city to explore any more land use designations that increase density from what is currently is
I am for both M-CG and M-C2 redesignation to increase population for Capitol Hill and Banff Trail to reduce automobile usage
a) no, no, no
b) no, no, no
No - too much density already too fast. The neighbourhood is deteriorating rapidly, no more trees, no vision, no plan. Just a lovely older neighbourhood being stripped of its beauty and community
Again, ensuring that any new builds do not remove access to affordable housing stock, and rental properties.
As above
As stated above, encouraging local commercial is key to making Capitol Hill a more walkable and livable community. While 16th Avenue has a great deal of commercial amenities, it is not a pedestrian friendly streetscape where people want to spend time. Encouraging commercial growth along 20th avenue, 14 Street and 10 Street NW will make Capitol Hill a more complete neighbourhood.
Broadly speaking, I would like to see fewer M-C1 and M-C2 designations, in favor of designations with less density and less height.
I don't think restrictions should be placed on the redesignation considerations.
I would like to see more local commercial options along 20th ave between 19th St and 17th street.
please do not do any redesignation in our neighborhood in next twenty years. Current 2016 edition is enough for the next twenty years
Make it all low density residential!
M-C2
Mixed use zoning of commercial/residential on the main roads for any medium density low-rise or medium density mid-rise (e.g. M-C1, M-C2).
No
No
No

no (see comments in other response)
NO enough already. The M-CG on 20th Ave and 15th Street has been finished for well over a year and still not sold...
No I do not want the City to explore more land use redesignations. No I do not want the City to consider medium density mid-rise redesignations. I do not want the City to consider any more medium density low-rise redesignations. Instead I want the City to focus on keeping housing affordable in this area to keep families out of the suburbs.
No issues.
NO MORE than what is already on the table. PLEASE not medium mid rise anywhere.
NO.
No. Leave it up to developers to suggest projects that the community can review before a redesignation.
ONLY consider medium density low-rise and ONLY on 16th Avenue.
Only low rises should be considered along 14 Street. You will ruin these neighbourhoods with too much development.
only M-CG
Outside of main routes would prefer that zoning be medium density low rise. Along 20,24 introduction of mid rise and some commercial would be acceptable.
some
We do not want any .
Would suggest medium density low rise be limited to along main routes. Likewise for local commercial. Within blocks perhaps it could be acceptable to look at more low density row house designations.
Yes. I do not think council has given enough thought to traffic congestion. Whether local traffic or the ability to commute to downtown- the city needs to address traffic flow better. I should be able to fly downtown given the reduced volume of workers downtown and my commute time remains unchanged over the last few years.
Question 4. Are there any other ideas or concerns that you would like to share with The City about this project?
Population density is being increased but no amenities are being added. Unlike Banff Trail, Mt Pleasant or Tuxedo - Capital Hill has few amenities we can walk to (few shops, coffee houses, parks, etc.). This community is becoming a drive thru only with no place to park. Please control City Administration from approving Relaxations contrary to the ARP.
Single family dwellings are becoming a difficult home to purchase in this area. More new single family "detached" would be welcome. Would like to see City Council slow down a lot and let the residence adjust to the already "many" builds happening in the area.
Traffic, noise, transiency, more human conflict, more pollution, increased crime, lower quality of life. Enough!
Why is the city pushing so hard to redesignate this community? What about all the other neighbouring communities. Why are they not on the City's radar??
Parking is a concern if more low density rowhouse and medium density land use is approved / allowed.
Yes, as a Realtor give me a new zoning ID that I can market. Ex RCG. It's hard to sell a R-1 or R-2 with "potential".
I'm confused about the need for this open house? We've had lots of townhouse / row houses going in on 24th Ave / 20th Ave, looks great!

<p>I think this plan only covers 1/4 of the concerns. 1) storm sewer system is inadequate - should be upgraded before you increase the density (16 St & 17 Ave has flooded 3 times) 2) If you increase the population you should increase the park area. A pocket park (1 lot) would provide park space for seniors and small children, south of 20 Ave between 19 and 14 St. 3) We need to retain or build small, inexpensive housing and one story for seniors and students. 4) 16 St (south of 20th Ave) has increased traffic and will get worse when density is increased. Needs traffic calming.</p>
<p>Parking is a major problem. Not only is there not enough parking for residents but SAIT overtakes the community.</p>
<p>As population increases we need more park / green spaces. Not everyone can go to the mountains on the weekends.</p>
<p>The impacted communities should have a say, like a direct yes or no vote. I feel I have no say, despite emails and phone calls from the last majority of my area. The medium density low rise developments went through anyways</p>
<p>Medium / low-rise and mid-rise takes away opportunity for individual developments. p.s. appreciate this opportunity, truly</p>
<p>Good job keep it going</p>
<p>Where is there safe emergency vehicle for the proposed development in circled areas(14th St / 23rd Ave NW)? The density is way too high causing traffic and multiple parking problems</p>
<p>The City should leave us alone</p>
<p>a) I'm tired of SAIT students parking on my street</p>
<p>b) I'm tired of illegal secondary suites</p>
<p>c) I'm tired of shoveling snow (by hand) from 22nd Ave NW hill and from 13th St NW hill so cars can get up the hills in winter. With all the extra density where do people park especially in winter?</p>
<p>d) With the row houses where do little kids play? The row houses don't have yards! Is the City's intention to move away from single family homes ?</p>
<p>e) Can the sewage system handle the additional flow?</p>
<p>Capitol Hill is now a malignant out of control growth - so ugly and sick</p>
<p>Infrastructure in these areas are not designed to support the added density. I'm not interested in paying for those "upgrades". R1 purchased at a premium for a reason</p>
<p>The City should publicize the plans to widen 14 St in the future. What are setbacks of proposed developments?</p>
<p>*There also needs to be a light added to the poor sightlines of the marked pedestrian crosswalk at 24th Ave and 15th Street, crossing to the pathway beside Confederation Park. A dangerous pedestrian crossing with East Bound traffic coming over the hill at speed unable to see the X-ing until over the hill and speeding down to make the light at 24th Ave and 14th Street.</p>
<p>Yes, I am concerned that economically accessible housing will disappear from the community with new infills and construction. As a renter I am constantly seeing invitations for my landlord to sell my building to be knocked down for infill building. There are a ton of renters between Banff Trail and Capitol Hill and essential to young professionals and university or college students in proximity to the vibrancy of the city. Needs to ensure that development spans socioeconomic access.</p>
<p>All the proposed land use dedesignation plans will bring more people into our community, flooding our already over-loaded publicly owned infrastructure and services, including schools, health clinics, libraries, parking spaces, etc. Until a model is presented that illustrates how the City will allocate additional resources to our community to sustain the needs of</p>

increased population, I oppose to any plan that solely serves to add people to a mature residential area.
Also strongly opposed to commercial development on 14th Street just north of 21st Avenue (between 21st Ave and 22nd Ave NW).
Always be sure the development has sufficient off street parking so our neighborhood can remain friendly.
Better and more extensive engagement with community before any future changes. I feel consultation on the last change was poor and now my property values have likely gone down
Evergreens should be a requirement, not just 'trees'. There should be at least one tree required per unit. And developers should have to make rowhouses and medium density buildings blends architecturally into the neighborhood (ie., who allowed the awful apple green coloured apartment building near 10th St? If I lived there I'd be angry at having to look at that huge block of apple green and have all the natural light in my house influenced by that colour). More architectural controls please. Also - another reason for no mid-rise or low-rise in residential zones is having parkades destroys the community vibe, meeting neighbors etc, because people park and go through the back to their house with no interaction on the street.
I am concerned about the hazardous waste site on 23rd Avenue N.W. and the potential negative impact further development (as currently proposed) will have on the neighborhood
I am concerned that entire blocks on the south side of 24th Ave and on both sides of 20th Ave are designated medium density low-rise or mid-rise. If those stretches are filled with buildings of the maximum density and height, they will change the character of the neighborhood. Redesignating some of those stretches to R-CG would help. I am all in favour of increased density in the city core, but not at the risk of losing the character of some of these wonderful older neighborhoods.
I have a number of concerns with the re-zoning plan, which I have summarized below. Please contact me if you require any further clarification.
<p>1. PROPERTY VALUES WILL BE NEGATIVELY AFFECTED:</p> <p>The property value of my newly built home (infill duplex) will be negatively affected if 20th avenue and surrounding area is allowed to be developed with taller buildings, multi-family buildings, row-houses, and secondary suites.</p> <p>Summary of factors that will negatively impact property values:</p> <p>1A. COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND “FEEL” – DENSE RESIDENTIAL VS. LIGHT</p> <p>Capitol Hill is currently a fairly quiet, pleasant community, with a “neighborhood” feel - This is one the main reasons I chose to purchase my home in the area. The general area is currently undergoing a transformation, whereby the '70's era homes are being torn-down in lieu of infill-duplex style houses. This ongoing transformation is in support of the existing style and feel of the community. A rapid increase in density, where taller and longer buildings are constructed with a more commercial appearance, will result in an entirely different character and feel of the community. A duplex among a sea of tall row-houses, will be devalued by the market .</p>

1B. CHANGES IN OWNER VS RENTER PROPORTIONS AND OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS

Increased density generally results in an increase in renters over owners, which is a negative factor in the market's assessment of property values. Renters generally do not upkeep their property as well, have an increased frequency of move-in/out, and are typically in lower-income brackets. Furthermore, high-density housing generally attracts single or married adults, as opposed to families. Whether some of these factors are fair or not, the reality is the market places lower values on homes that are surrounded by renters, and existing homeowners like myself are at the mercy of such valuations .

2. FURTHER NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO THE COMMUNITY

In addition to the general negative impact on property values that the re-zoning plan will have on the newer single-family and duplex homes in Capitol Hill, the community will also experience changes that will impact both property values and the community's character and livelihood in a specific way:

2A. INCREASED TRAFFIC

The increase in density will result in increased congestion on both the roads and laneways. There is already a space premium for on-street parking, especially given the nature of the bus-route on 20th avenue. Allowing for row-houses and secondary suites will create further parking issues. Furthermore, road traffic will also drastically increase, especially on 20th avenue which is likely to become more of a thoroughfare for commuter traffic between the NW and downtown. Likewise, the lane-ways will experience increased traffic. These laneways (e.g. between 19th and 20th Avenue, between 18th and 17th Streets), are already riddled with pot-holes, mud, and requires constant requests to the City for repair and re-grading. This wear and tear will exponentially increase with the new development plan. On a related note, the City recently re-designed the public-transit routes to no longer offer a direct bus-route from 20th Avenue to downtown. This was a poor choice in the first place, as it results in inefficient means of utilizing public transit for commuting, and the issue will only be exacerbated if residential density increases.

2B. INCREASED NUISANCE OF REQUIRED CITY SERVICES

The increased density will result in an increase of required city-services; namely garbage and recycling pick-up. The lane-ways will show a significant increase in city-provided bins, which will be an eye-sore as we sit in our back-yards and look out our windows. The length and frequency of garbage and recycling pick-up will also increase, resulting in more noise and annoyance.

2C. INCREASED BURDEN ON CITY AND 3RD-PARTY INFRASTRUCTURE

Related to the previous point, an increase in density will also result in an increased burden on city and 3rd-party infrastructure, such as power, sewer, water, natural gas, electricity, and other utilities. This increased burden will likely necessitate upgrades in the aforementioned infrastructure, and thus result in a spike in construction activities. As the proposed development plan takes hold, and new higher-density buildings are being constructed, there will be an ongoing nuisance of these construction activities in the form of outages, noise, road closures, and pollution. Furthermore, the burden on the local school system may also increase.

Thank you for utilizing my input for the future development plans of Capitol Hill. Please contact me if you have any further questions or new information to share.

personal information removed

ref 1) C. Whitehead, E. Sagor, A. Edge, and B. Walker. Understanding the Local Impact of New Residential Development: a Pilot Study, April 2015. London School of Economics.

Available at:

http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/63390/1/Understanding_the_Local_Impact_of_New_Residential_Development.pdf

ref 2) A. Skaburskis. Housing Prices And Housing Density. School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen's University. Published in the Canadian Journal of Regional Science, PP455-488, ISSN: 0705-4580. Available at: <http://cjrs-rcsr.org/archives/23-3/Skaburskis.pdf>

I realize there was a notice about a single date at the community association (ap 18) but don't recall anything else. Certainly no direct communication to impacted residences. I would suggest more opportunities are explored. I appreciate the survey opportunity.

I think that R-CG designation along 20th Avenue was a step in the right direction but is too restrictive especially for non-corner lots. I think M-CG, M-C1 and M-C2 designations should be considered.

I would like to consider increasing the density of this area so we can justify more transit options along 20th ave and 24th ave.

Capitol Hill feels like an island surrounded by many busy roads. i.e. 24th Ave, 19th St, 16th Ave and 14th St and 10th St.

I would like to see an effort to reduce traffic through the area by encouraging more density and local restaurants, pubs and shops. Kensington road is quite busy between 14th St and 10th street, but the traffic moves much slower and is more pedestrian friendly. My belief is that if we create more commercial spaces with higher density residential that we can reduce the speeds that people travel through our lovely island and make it more pedestrian friendly.

I hope this help!

Increased density can lead to increased conflict as people who are not used to thinking about neighbours transition into the community. Is the city considering adding information/orientation sessions for new home owners in these areas?

What about properties that are rented out? How can the city encourage landlords to proactively encourage their tenant to be respectful, positive members of the community?

Just that the observations we have shared so far, appear to apply in several inner city communities and so we hope for a slow-down in all development until major shifts are made in the kinds of buildings offered (as explained above.) Thanks again for listening :)

Keep any further high density projects in the downtown core. Capital Hill is a nice inter city area and it is good for families and the older population the way it is.

Mid rise medium density with retail or commercial on main.

Mixed use designation of commercial/residential on the main roads (20th Ave, 14th St and 10th street).

n/a

No - *personal information removed* is doing a fine job!

No issues.

No.
Our community is being pushed too much for overdevelopment . Who can get the benefit? Not the residents, we are just victims, could we investigate who is pushing those overdevelopment?
Please ensure traffic is addressed. And sewage and water and all that that jeopardizes this hundred year old community from thriving. I agree that increasing population density in this area makes sense yet I do not see the plan to increase density intelligently thus far. This map feels short sighted addressing only the need for homes.
Should development proceed on the current city parks lot (which I think would be welcome to many as the Roads trucks who use this as a base are loud and notorious for cutting through the community), the main concerns would be to ensure the use on the exterior of the space be designed to integrate with remainder of community, transitioning to high buildings with higher density away from current residences. As well, commercial should be placed away from existing residences - set back within the development. Then the biggest impact will be increased traffic, which I think could be accommodated by providing access to those residences through a road constructed in place of the existing alley adjacent to the green space behind the residences on the east side of 16 street.
Thank you for working with Capitol Hill to make it a more vibrant and sustainable neighbourhood!
The incidence of car breakins and prowlings have increased dramatically in the past few years,what is the city prepared to do about that ? More low cost housing,increased threat ?
there is always going to be a traffic issue - especially when we increase density. How are you dealing with this?
Townhomes for sale (not rent) (med density-low rise) would attract downtown professionals, where mid-rise would attract a high turnover student population and ultimately decrease liveability for those of us who chose the neighborhood for its family friendly adult population. There is already a number of student house parties in rental units in this neighborhood which is disruptive and they do not care for their properties. Already mentioned, there currently is very limited parking on our street, and speed bumps were implemented (at our expense) to deter and slow traffic.
Why is density being increased?
Why is there such a push to crowd neighborhoods north of 20th Ave? There are many recent developments built that are sitting empty, unable to find renters or buyers.
Some people still want to have large yards and gardens and single family dwellings while living in this neighborhood. Let them continue to have that option without the neighborhood being completely changed by developers who don't even live in the neighborhood. The more redesignations the city does the less affordable this type of neighborhood becomes to families which will completely erode the positive community centered character of the neighborhood.