

## ***“What We Heard”: Brentwood Community Report***

On February 8, 2024, Brentwood Community Association held a community meeting at which representatives of the Brentwood Development and Transportation Committee made a presentation concerning the City of Calgary’s ‘blanket’ rezoning proposal. Feedback forms were made available to the approximately 130 community members in attendance and subsequently through the Brentwood Community Association. To date (March 20, 2024), 46 responses have been received (35.4% response rate); additional feedback received since March 20 has not been incorporated in this report. What follows is a report containing information derived from the feedback forms as well as individual written comments received from community members.

### ***1. Quantitative information on citizen concerns relating to the proposed rezoning plan***

There is a high and significant level of concern among citizen respondents regarding a range of potential impacts of the proposed rezoning plan (see question 2). More than 80 percent of citizens identified a VERY HIGH level of concern about six of the pre-identified potential impacts of the proposed rezoning plan, namely:

- *green spaces*
- *shadowing*
- *trees/tree canopy*
- *parking*
- *building height, and*
- *community character* (see Table 1 for specific percentages).

Table 1. Number<sup>1</sup> and percentage<sup>2</sup> of citizen respondents indicating their level of concern<sup>3</sup> regarding potential impacts of proposed rezoning plan

Potential Impacts	Level of Concern (1 = very low 5 = very high)				
	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)
Green spaces	0	1 (2.3)	0	3 (7.0)	40 (93.0)
Shadowing	0	0	1 (2.3)	4 (9.3)	38 (88.4)
Trees/tree canopy	0	0	1 (2.3)	5 (11.6)	37 (86.0)
Parking	0	1 (2.3)	2 (4.7)	3 (7.0)	37 (86.0)
Building height	0	0	1 (2.3)	6 (14.0)	36 (83.7)
Community character	1 (2.3)	0	2 (4.7)	5 (11.6)	35 (81.4)
Privacy	0	0	3 (7.0)	7 (16.3)	33 (76.7)
Landscaping	0	3 (7.0)	3 (7.0)	8 (18.6)	28 (65.1)
Vehicle access	1 (2.3)	0	5 (11.6)	10 (23.3)	26 (60.5)
Pedestrian access	0	1 (2.3)	7 (16.3)	11 (25.6)	23 (53.5)

1. A total of 43 citizen respondents submitted feedback forms and 3 respondents provided written responses only. Not all 43 respondents replied to all questions. For data above: n = 43

2. Percentage calculations are rounded to the nearest 1/10<sup>th</sup>

3. Impacts are listed in descending order (starting with the highest number of respondents indicating level of concern 5)

When levels of concern HIGH to VERY HIGH were combined, between 93 and 100 percent of citizen respondents identified seven of the potential impacts of the proposed rezoning plan to be of greatest concern:

- *green spaces*
- *shadowing*
- *trees/tree canopy*
- *parking*
- *building height*
- *community character, and*
- *privacy* (see Table 2 for specific percentages).

Additionally, over 83 percent of citizen respondents rated concerns about *vehicle access* and *landscaping* as HIGH to VERY HIGH.

Table 2. Percent of citizen respondents rating impacts by combined levels of concern ‘high’ to ‘very high’

Potential Impacts	Combined Levels of Concern (4 = high 5 = very high)		
	% 4	% 5	% 4 + 5
Green spaces	7.0	93.0	100.0
Shadowing	9.3	88.4	97.7
Building height	14.0	83.7	97.7
Trees/tree canopy	11.6	86.0	97.6
Parking	7.0	86.0	93.0
Community character	11.6	81.4	93.0
Privacy	16.3	76.7	93.0
Vehicle access	23.3	60.5	83.8
Landscaping	18.6	65.1	83.7
Pedestrian access	25.6	53.5	79.1

1. The combined levels of concern regarding potential impacts are identified in descending order.

The three most frequently mentioned ‘other impacts of concern’ that citizen respondents identified were:

- *water and sewer infrastructure*
- *increased density, and*
- *property values* (see Table 3).

Notably, citizens raised a wide range of concerns about blanket rezoning, including issues of access for repair/emergency vehicles, cycling and transit infrastructure, children’s play spaces, and building design. As well, citizens expressed concerns about developers (outbidding citizens for homes, and their influence on City Council), about lack of consultation regarding the proposed rezoning, about removal of the democratic right to comment/object, and about the inequitable effects of blanket rezoning on older communities. Also notable was that every ‘other impact’ that citizens identified was rated as having a very high level of concern (only three respondents rated their level of concern lower than ‘5’; see Table 3).

Table 3. Other impacts of concern<sup>1</sup> identified by citizen respondents

Other Impacts	# of respondents	Level of concern (# of respondents)
Infrastructure (water, sewer)	5	5 (3); 4 (1); 3 (1)
Increased density	5	5 (5)
Property value	4	5 (3)
Crime rate/conflict	3	5 (3)
Street/business/transit parking, and access for repair/emergency vehicles	3	5 (3)
Infrastructure (cycling, transit)	2	5 (2)
Garbage/compost/recycling	2	5 (2)
Developers (outbidding citizens for homes; influence on City Council)	2	5 (2)
Schools	2	5 (1); 4 (1)
Removal of right to comment/object	2	5 (2)
Building appeal, design	2	5 (2)
Off leash dog spaces	1	5
Noise/pollution	1	5
Outdoor space for each apartment	1	5
Children's play spaces	1	5
Inequitable effects on older communities	1	5

1. These are responses to the 'Other impacts – please specify' section of question 2

2. Impacts are listed in descending order (starting with the highest number of respondents specifying each impact)

## 2. Qualitative information on citizen concerns relating to the proposed rezoning plan

Citizen responses to question 1, question 2 (sections on 'other' and 'additional' comments) and question 3 from the Feedback form, as well as the individual written comments, were recorded in a Word document. Through repeated review of these data, citizen responses were sorted into 11 broad categories (topics), as follows:

- *general opposition to 'blanket rezoning'*
- *concerns about the role of the City/goal of proposed 'blanket rezoning'*
- *affordability/densification*
- *infrastructure issues: waste management, (storm)water management, schools*
- *property values*
- *crime/conflict*
- *community character/sense of place/quality of life/privacy*
- *what will be built: shadowing, aesthetics*
- *parking*
- *green space/parks/trees/tree canopy/shrubs*
- *suggestions for alternative approaches to blanket rezoning*

These categories are not in any particular order, they are not mutually exclusive, and some categories contain a much greater volume of citizen comment than other categories. In the following Tables, the inclusion of quotes from respondents conveys the full range of concerns and opinions that citizens expressed about blanket rezoning. Each quote (presented in whole or in part) in the following Tables is followed by a number in parentheses which identifies the respondent; however, all responses are presented anonymously. Where the same respondent number appears more than once within a Table, this means that a citizen provided responses to more than one question.

### ***2.1 General opposition to ‘blanket rezoning’***

Citizen responses that were categorized as ‘general opposition to blanket rezoning’ ranged from short, pointed phrases, to more expansive comments about the perceived difficulties with the rezoning proposal (see Table 4).

Table 4. Quotes from citizens: general opposition to ‘blanket rezoning’

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will destroy Brentwood. (22)</li> <li>• I am against blanket zoning of the entire city. I don’t believe such rezoning will result in more affordable housing being available. .... More single family developments would also be good, not all families want to live in condos. (7)</li> <li>• Do not want this to pass. Too large an impact on area. (19)</li> <li>• Inequitable effects of blanket rezoning – need much more nuanced thinking about how to increase affordability [increase in density does not equal increased affordability] (35)</li> <li>• I don’t want blanket rezoning in my community or in Calgary! (36)</li> <li>• In general, I am totally against this blanket re-zoning. The re-zoning does not address environmental, social, or design issues. Over the years, there have been methods developed that achieve designs that address these issues. ... developed and proven designs for multi-family use exist and can be applied to sites that meet proper criteria for such units. ... with this blanket re-zoning, several considerations are missing .... it would appear that this re-zoning approach could be the start of massive deterioration of our social fabric. This proposal is even more ridiculous than the fifteen cent per paper bag charge, and far more serious. (9)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a terrible idea. (29)</li> </ul>
---	---

### ***2.2 Concerns about the role of the City and the goal of proposed ‘blanket rezoning’***

This category of citizen concerns about the proposed blanket rezoning highlights some of the most intense, ‘emotional’ responses received through both the Feedback forms and the individual responses. Many of the responses were lengthy; these quotes are included here to illustrate the high level of concern that the blanket rezoning proposal generated among citizens. Certain of these comments also point to broader concerns about lack of consultation with citizens and democratic processes, citizen frustration, and loss of trust in City (planning) processes. Table 5 highlights citizen concerns about the role of the City regarding the lack of public participation and loss of trust; Table 6 includes quotes from citizens’ responses about the rationale and goal of proposed blanket rezoning.

Table 5. Quotes from citizens: concerns about the role of the City — lack of public participation/citizen involvement and loss of trust

- .... I understand that the "Housing and Affordability Task Force" did not include representation from the community at large. As a result, this omission raises immediate concerns for me that the city designed this task force purposely in this fashion so that it could ultimately and arbitrarily ram/force through its possible predetermined and yet unknown agenda, or in the alternative simply allow the developers to do whatever they want to do. I hope not. Hence, the proposed meetings with the public may be a "back-door" approach to make those meetings appear as consulting with the public for its input when maybe the city may have already decided what it is going to do once the meetings with the public are finished. This approach by the city does not garner confidence in the process by me or perhaps from others in the community at large. (46)
- My question to you [Mayor and Councillors]: are you [in] fact representing and voting with what your constituents really want concerning this proposal? (42)
- Why has there been no community engagement with this proposal? (37)
- Removal of democratic right to object is unacceptable. Failure to protect citizen rights to object is undemocratic. (35)
- Stress the importance of community involvement and input BEFORE decisions are made. (8)
- Feedback: if construction is proposed affected neighbours can make comments. Only adjacent neighbours are able to make comments and these are not having much impact. Construction is moving ahead anyway and residents are increasingly frustrated at not being heard. (37)
- City council is thinking they are a top down organization and not a bottom up. (15)
- The citizens of Calgary should not stand for top-down city-wide upzoning without adequate community consultation and feedback. The way this upzoning has been pushed forward is completely unacceptable. Almost no one knows about this. (25)
- BREACH OF TRUST! We bought our house 46 years ago with the understanding that Brentwood was a single family dwelling zone. .... It never occurred to us, or many of our neighbours, that uncontrolled zoning would be applied. .... (5)
- When initially purchasing our property we were guaranteed through the zoning that we would remain a single family area. The current Council has no right to arbitrarily change this zoning without the consent of the owners of a property. The Mayor and Council were elected by the people of the city to do what the majority of citizens want, not what the Councils[sic] members[sic] special interest[sic] are. (4)
- Failure to plan for IMPACTS of increasing density on infrastructure, such as storm water management (and other effects), shows lack of understanding OR “putting off” to the future what needs to be planned-for now – totally poor performance of “planners”. Listen to and understand/work with the local citizens who are affected by blanket rezoning – we are the local experts who know what “planners” cannot know about our communities – do not let developers/development damage existing qualities (35)

- Our community is not a blank slate for development. Residents have committed their money, energy and sometimes decades of their life into Brentwood. They invest and stay because they have some security in knowing what can or cannot be built next to them. Nobody anticipated a 3-storey rowhouse with 8 units. Developers come in to make major changes and really don't care about the aftermath. Residents who lose sunlight, privacy, and much of the enjoyment of their properties either have to live with the impacts or move houses. This is wrong! The City of Calgary has Infill Guidelines, Established Area Guidelines and the MDP, all of which stress the importance of "sensitive" and "contextual" development. Unless redevelopment projects adhere to those guidelines and principles their DPs should be turned down. Only when developers see their projects refused will they improve the quality and compatibility of those projects. The community will benefit when redevelopment enhances rather than harms the community. (41)
- .... I currently live in a bungalow in Brentwood and purposely bought in this community as it was already fully established and was the type of community we were looking for to raise our family. I attended the community information session and was disappointed to hear that the recommendations of the task force were accepted without consultation or input from homeowners. (42)
- Strong opposition to the blanket rezoning (30)

Table 6. Quotes from citizens: concerns about the rationale and goal of blanket rezoning

- The goal of the rezoning. It was proposed under the HATF, but there is no requirement for any buildings to be affordable. There does not seem to be any metric by which 'success' can be determined. (41)
- I believe the City has not been honest and transparent about why they're rezoning and the true implications to existing neighbourhoods. The entire rezoning proposal has been a charade filled with propaganda and half-truths. (43)
- I would like to know what and how much research went into deciding on "blanket rezoning, especially when other cities in Canada have failed to provide affordable housing for those people who need it most. Have the levels of government ever come together to develop alternative solutions to affordable housing. Did they review models of housing affordability in our [sic] countries? (34)
- Apparent Rationale for the city proposal: This proposal appears to do nothing for affordability, but does increase density (of housing units and residents), to the detriment of neighbourhood lifestyle and quality of life. The only justification for the proposed rezoning that could be envisioned is to increase city property tax revenue from housing unit densification .... with little or no capital expenditure required. Ergo, a tax grab on the part of the city in addition to the many other tax increases we have seen lately. I have also seen no mention of the federal incentive grant apparently offered to the City in exchange for this re-zoning proposal. Transparency on this aspect is expected. A zoning change of this extent impacting the character of city neighbourhoods should be an election issue. City council was elected to work for the voters, who were never consulted on this issue. There seems to be no broad based community support for this across existing neighbourhoods, therefore this proposal should not be approved without further dialogue and re-design with affected community involvement. (38)

### 2.3 Affordability and densification concerns

In addition to noting the concern that developers can outbid citizens for single house properties, citizen responses call into question the premises on which City based its proposal for blanket rezoning. Both in some of the citizen responses illustrated in Tables 4, 5, and 6 as well as in some of the quotes in Table 7 (below), it is clear that citizen respondents recognize the disconnect between densification and affordability; without some measures to ensure developers build affordable housing, densification alone does not necessarily achieve affordability. Has the City built its focus on blanket rezoning on false premises? Has the City conflated the ideas of densification and affordability? Furthermore, the lack of consideration of cumulative effects of individual development permit decisions, and thus the incremental nature of change effected through blanket rezoning processes, suggests that there will not be widespread concern generated, thereby enabling the City (and developers) to proceed with significant impacts on (older) communities—without citizen input.

Table 7. Quotes from citizens: concerns about affordability and densification

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of affordability justification for the proposal. The city proffers increased affordability as the justification for the blanket rezoning, however no data has been presented to substantiate this position. If a corner house in Brentwood is currently valued at \$700,000 [and] is replace[sic] by 4 units currently selling in NW Calgary for \$600,00 each, where is the affordability advantage. The housing types are not in any way comparable, particularly considering the deterioration in neighbourhood community quality. Neighbouring property values would also be negatively impacted by such development. (38)</li><li>• How will denification[sic] managed by developers address affordability in the short to middle term. Low assessed value properties will be replaced by multiple more pricey units. (8)</li><li>• Infrastructure: our community was not developed for mass densification in existing areas. Traffic flow, parking, and amenities would likely be strained and possibly be a mess. (37)</li><li>• Developers outbidding citizens for single house properties. (34)</li><li>• How are they going to guarantee new housing will be affordable and there won't be a repeat of Montreal where <u>all</u> developers have instead paid a fine or donated land to city? (16)</li><li>• It seems to me there is quite a bit of empty space around this city that could be tackled and built on before neighbourhoods need to be torn up by developers who, let's face it, are out to make money and will not build affordable housing anyhow. All they do is outbid prospective young buyers trying to find a family home and ultimately raise the prices. (43)</li><li>• A recognition that housing affordability is really &amp; truly an issue – along with suggestions that represent better alternative solutions than up-zoning (12)</li><li>• Housing prices are <u>not</u> affordable in these multi dwelling houses (14)</li></ul>
---

- Affordable housing: I've heard mention that the City intends for this blanket rezoning to address the issue of affordable housing. What's happening is that developers are selling these new row houses for about \$580,000. This doesn't meet the needs of those seeking affordable housing. The City has also mentioned trickle-down effects, meaning that as more expensive homes are available those who can afford them move up until eventually affordable houses are available for those who need them. This takes about 30 years. .... How will you guarantee affordable housing? (37)
- The influence [of blanket rezoning] is likely to be incremental, not all at once, and thus not likely to raise widespread concern as it happens. (11)
- This rezoning will destroy the nature of many communities and will not result in lower housing costs. It should be voted down. (25)
- I am completely against blanket rezoning. It's creating density with a sledgehammer where a more nuanced approach is required. R-CG zoning MUST take into consideration existing neighbouring properties and include guidelines that significantly reduce or eliminate overlooking and overshadowing, and retain an element of privacy. Emphasis on contextual is a must. (43)
- How will developers be encouraged to build affordable, cheaper units rather than luxury units? How much density, eg. people numbers, will be permitted on each block? (44)
- No more immigrants unless we can accommodate them. Stop universities in the city from taking foreign students that they cannot accommodate. (36)
- How will you guarantee affordable housing? (37)
- No measures to determine success/failure to achieve stated goal of 'affordability'. Need much more nuanced thinking about how to increase affordability [increase in density does not equal increased affordability] (35)
- A much slower, more measured approach is needed and if affordability is truly what the city is after, I feel they are sadly mistaken that this haphazard, disruptive plan will be the answer. (42)

## ***2.4 Infrastructure issues***

Three infrastructure issues dominated citizens' expressed concerns; waste management, (storm) water management, and school capacity. Table 8 (below) contains quotes from citizen respondents that highlight each of these three infrastructure issues. The City has indicated that issues such as these will be dealt with as bylaw matters but, as informed citizens have noted, these are physical capacity challenges, not matters that may be resolved through bylaw processes.

Additional infrastructural issues raised by citizens are identified in Table 9 (following). Please note that parking infrastructure issues are identified separately (see Table 14).



Table 8. Quotes from citizens: infrastructural concerns relating to waste management, water management, and school capacity

Waste Management

- Waste management: 4 homes on one lot will require a total of 12 black/blue/green bins. Mathematically, there is insufficient space for bins/pick up requirements on a 50 foot lot. As well, sewage waste will be increased 4-fold-? infrastructure readiness? (2)
- No adequate space for up to 24 garbage bins per site (37)
- Existing trash collection system is incompatible with an 8 unit design replacing a single family home. Potentially 3 garbage containers could be replaced with at least 12 containers, potentially 24 bins in the same space! (38)

Water Management

- Storm water management -- older neighbourhoods do not have installed capacity to handle increased storm water volumes that will result from increase in volume of impervious surfaces (i.e. buildings on 60% of property vs. 40% now--in older areas) (35)
- As Alberta's water shortage continues to grow, what impact will uncontrolled higher density have on the water supply requirements? Is infrastructure adequate for water, sewer, natural gas, etc., demands? What about flood mitigation, holding ponds, reservoirs, and irrigation of green spaces, gardens and park land? (44)
- 3-4 days of torrential rain – where will water go if open spaces used for development? Buildings, driveways, roads don't absorb water. Orange bags around drains along roads are no solution. Will the city deal with flooded basements? (6)
- Watershed: adding more hard surfaces to our communities in the form of roofs, asphalt and pavement increases our risk of flooding and decreases the land available to manage the water. The ground is the best place to store water. So much can be done on our land to slow the movement of water while increasing biodiversity and improving soil health, which improves tree and plant health. (37)

School capacity

- Has the city considered the impact to public schools in the area? Can they handle large population growth? Churchill is already having overflow problems. (28)
- Schools over capacity – students in their own community can't register in their community school (14)
- Lack of school availability (28)
- Schools: the City is saying that our schools are under-utilized and that densifying our communities will put them to better use. Our schools are actually at capacity with many over. (37)
- What about capacity in the schools when more children are living in high-density neighbourhoods? (44)

Table 9. Quotes from citizens: additional infrastructural concerns

- Utilities: we had water restrictions last summer, we are told we're currently in a drought situation, and we had power shortages during the deep cold in January. How will a large influx of new homes impact the utilities for those of us who already live here? How will you address utility shortages? (37)
- Lack of cycling infrastructure: Most streets in Calgary do not have adequate, SAFE, cycling infrastructure. For example, Charleswood Drive NW has a PAINTED, UNPROTECTED bike lane that is routinely used by drivers as a second driving lane. Although it has access to pathways and would be a perfect route to the University, the unprotected painted bike lane ends well north of Northmount and cyclists are dumped into a 4 lane car infested road down into the university area. This is poor planning and focuses on drivers and vehicular traffic at the expense of all other road users. It's also not a TRUCK Route but the City refuses to enforce the bylaw. This is true for much of the cycling infrastructure throughout the City. If you want to increase density, YOU MUST provide safe, alternative means of transportation. (43)
- Off leash dog spaces (17)
- Will police, emergency services, and fire employees be increased to meet the needs of more residents? (44)
- Lack of public transit. Many streets in Calgary, including collectors like Charleswood Dr NW, do not have public transit and are not close enough to transit to walk. (43)
- Will speed limits be lowered to cope with more pedestrians? What about traffic flow, calming, and volume of cars? (44)

## 2.5 Concerns about property values

Citizen expressions of concern regarding the effects of blanket rezoning on property values included the following statements (see Table 10). Additional comments about property value concerns are found in Table 6.

Table 10. Quotes from citizens: concerns about property values

- How will property value of adjacent single-detached homes not be affected by building adjacent row-houses? Currently new construction has to "fit" with the current surrounding construction. (37)
- I believe this will impact the value of our homes. As high density housing begins to surround us, individual homes will become less desirable and it will impact prices. (20)
- Property values of adjacent sites will definitely be negatively affected (37)
- My property value (23)                      • Property values (44)                      • Value (14)
- .... With the proposed approach of "blanket rezoning", are developers simply "turned loose" to do as they please without having to comply with bylaws, codes, rules,

guidelines, approvals, ordinances, specifications etc. thereby avoiding/eliminating undesirable results such as occurred in the community of Erlton? In conclusion, I am not anti-developers, but I am not a fan of irresponsible developers. I realize and understand that responsible developers have an important role to fulfill, but what they do mut [sic] be compliant with bylaws, codes, rules, guidelines, approvals, ordinance, specifications etc. so as not in any way to devalue or destroy neighbouring assets. (46)

**2.6 Concerns about crime and conflict**

Citizen expressions of concern regarding the effects of blanket rezoning on crime included the following comments (see Table 11; see also Table 15). In terms of conflict, an interesting issue arose during the February 27, 2024 online FCM-organized presentation by City representatives (planners) when a citizen participant pointed out that the required spacing for 12 black/blue/green bins would not allow all bins to be appropriately placed, and the City representative responded by noting that the City was considering allowing the bins to be shared ... can you imagine the potential for conflict among residents of a fourplex over something as mundane as “it’s your turn to put out the garbage bin”?!

Table 11. Quotes from citizens: concerns about crime and conflict

- More people, more crime. Bought in this neighbourhood [Brentwood] to retire, old age. Crime rate. (10)
- The best predictor of future impact is what has happened. Where this has occurred crime has increased, parking is extremely difficult and infrastructure has not kept pace. (18)
- Crime (we left Marda Loop for this reason; it’s unsafe for children). .... We need safe communities where children can play in front of their homes .... (29)
- conflict/crime (13)

**2.7 Concerns about community character, sense of place, quality of life, and privacy**

This category of citizen concerns about the effects of the proposed blanket rezoning proposal focuses attention on another issue that has generated intense uneasiness and worry among Brentwood residents and prompted many comments on the feedback forms and individual written responses. Some of the citizen comments found in Tables 5 and 7 as well as Tables 13 and 15 are relevant here also. Generally, citizens were concerned about interrelated losses of the characteristics that make Brentwood a desirable place to live, about their quality of life, about the sense of place (or, context) of their neighbourhood, and about the loss of privacy from the types of housing permitted through blanket rezoning.

Table 12. Quotes from citizens: concerns about community character, sense of place (context), quality of life, and loss of privacy arising from the blanket rezoning proposal

- My concern is with the proposed development along John Laurie Blvd between 14<sup>th</sup> St and Brenner Dr. I have lived in Brentwood and Charleswood for 41 years. I’m 48. I have

a family now where I grew up. The John Laurie pathway has been a hub for the community. It's a connector between the NW communities. It is access to Nose Hill. It's a bike path. It's a dog park. It's a place to meet neighbours, greet friends, learn to bike, go for walks, jogs etc. It's a place to enjoy a sliver of green in an inner-city neighbourhood. Humans need this green space. If we are needing affordable housing, there are better options. This area is why people want to live here. Future development will only over-crowd, de-value a mature, treed neighbourhood that gets its value from nature, birds, animals, people, space, & nature. This is a haven and a slice of nature. Don't overbuild here. This is not the answer for more housing. (31)

- We bought into this community 5 years ago as it is mainly single homes and bungalows. For this we are now paying more than double the city taxes, now you want to destroy our communities. Are we going to be refunded for damaging our community and what it is like? (32)

- Failure to consider long-term implications of blanket rezoning on quality of life of existing property owners is unacceptable. Development industry should not be permitted to destroy contextual community/neighbourhood character – build like types of homes in same areas, don't totally mash-up the housing styles. (35)

- Leave our community the way it is. (36)

- I think that allowing developers almost free hand in building houses will result in a hodge podge of aesthetics in communities and the buildings erected. (34)

- A house is the biggest investment most of us will make in our lifetime and we need to be fairly secure in the knowledge that our choice of community reflects our lifestyle preferences. There are many, many multi family dwellings in Brentwood and several more being built as I write this. The Northland Mall redevelopment, several streets in and around Brentwood Mall, the townhouse development at Shaganappi Trail and John Laurie Blvd have all been, originally or recently, designed and built with this purpose in mind. None of them are a four-plex unit all with secondary suites dropped into the middle or end of a block of single family homes as this “blanket rezoning” would allow. There are many beautiful neighbourhoods in this city that have been properly planned and built from their conception to include a section of single detached homes, streets of duplexes, blocks of row housing and an area of apartment buildings. There is a symmetry, cohesion and architectural beauty in areas like McKenzie Town, Currie Barracks, Panorama Hills. It's not a hodge podge mess of what this rezoning could do in some neighbourhoods both old and new. You could even say that neighbourhoods like Brentwood, Dalhousie and Varsity were properly designed in their time and built to include single family homes, duplexes, rowhouses and apartment buildings which they all currently still have. (42)

- With this blanket re-zoning, several considerations are missing, such as: lack of privacy for single-family units next door to the re-zoned unit. (9)

- I think the fact that Brentwood was recently named as Calgary's top community, 2 years in a row, says it all. Please let 60+ years of zoning precedence continue to stand. (23)

- With this blanket re-zoning, several considerations are missing, such as: Lack of privacy for single-family units next door to the re-zoned unit. (9)

## 2.8 Concerns about what will be built: shadowing, aesthetics

For many citizens, the question of what will be built in the Brentwood community is a vital issue. Principally, responses to this question focused on issues such as shadowing and aesthetics (see Table 13). Other Tables (5, 6, 7, 12, 15) also contain citizen comments that pertain to the nature of their concerns about what will be built in their community.

Table 13. Quotes from citizens: concerns about what will be built

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What will be allowed to be built in neighbourhoods? (32)</li><li>• Will rental units be interspersed with owned homes? (44)</li><li>• Building design, building appeal. (46)</li><li>• Leave Brentwood R-C1. (40)</li><li>• Shadowing – increased building height results in shadowing of adjacent one storey bungalows. Resulting shading will reduce bungalow owners’ ability to enjoy their own property &amp; reduce direct sunlight necessary for solar panels, lawns, gardens, flowers. (2)</li><li>• Possible excessive shading on unit next door. Likely limited unit layout options available with such a restrictive available space. (9)</li><li>• Shading: a large building on the south side of a home will put it in constant shade which can impact mental health not to mention plant growth. This is a big concern for those who grow food on their properties, which is becoming more and more common. (37)</li><li>• Community Layout: new communities are designed with sections of row houses, areas of apartments, and areas of single houses. They are planned intentionally and have flow to them. The addition of rowhouses into existing neighbourhoods can create areas of congestion. (37)</li><li>• I read the City’s plan for housing projects designed for Indigenous people. I feel this may ‘ghettoize’ some areas, as they will be designated for Indigenous tenants with families for cultural ceremonies and smudging to take place. How will the City plan for these projects? Where will they be located? How many? (44)</li><li>• Older communities such as Brentwood will be hugely impacted by this rezoning. I can’t imagine having a rowhouse or multiplex unit built beside our home. If that happens we will be forced out of our neighbourhood by the Mayor &amp; City Councillors. (39)</li><li>• High-density rowhouses can increase fire danger. • Transient neighbourhoods where temporary renters live can deteriorate more quickly. Tenants don’t tend to take care of properties or care about their neighbours in the community to the same extent as homeowners.</li><li>• Landlords of rental units must maintain and watch over their properties to an adequate standard. (44)</li><li>• Set Back: Many of the new builds are very close to the street, the set back is far too shallow on the majority of streets/roads where these are built (for example 19th in the Capital Hill area). The noise, dirt, and pollution from passing vehicles is a health and safety issue. (43)</li></ul>
--

- We're very concerned about the increase in lot coverage, increased building height, and changes in setbacks, particularly on corner lots. Having a small, modest bungalow we will be absolutely dwarfed by what could be built next to us after living here for 30+ years. (45)

## ***2.9 Concerns about parking***

Citizen respondents rated parking as one of their greatest concerns. Comments about the proposed reduction in parking requirements included the following (see Table 14).

Table 14. Quotes from citizens: concerns about parking

- Parking: Most adults in our area own cars. 4-plexes might well result in at least 8 vehicles, impacting street parking, traffic flow in family neighbourhoods, emergency services access, owner/visitor/home repair parking. (2)
- Every lot needs at least 1 parking space for each unit constructed on the plot of land. (12)
- Inadequate street parking for the unit density proposed. Guidelines call for one parking place per unit with a suite. Many, if not most households have two vehicles; therefore parking requirements are totally inadequate. This problem has manifested itself in communities already impacted by the housing density change (e.g. Capital Hill). Neighbour relations are negatively impacted. (38)
- Parking: Even if you're lucky enough to live on a public transit route, have safe cycling infrastructure and ride everywhere, you still may require or want a vehicle. Therefore, parking must be taken into consideration. Allowing developers to reduce parking under the premise that this somehow makes a dwelling more affordable, is laughable. There is absolutely no metric or proof that any alleged savings will be passed onto purchasers or renters. If street parking is the only option, that's where people will park. How will the roads be adequately plowed in the winter? What about congestion and pedestrian safety? What about charging if your vehicle is electric, or if a block heater is required when it's 35 below? If the City insists on going this route then they must do the following:
  - Invest in better public transit for ALL Calgarians;
  - Invest in better multi modal forms of transportation – cycling infrastructure, pedestrian friendly infrastructure ; and -
  - Implement permit parking on ALL streets in ALL neighbourhoods. This will get a lot of vehicles off our streets and into garages that are currently being used as a storage lockers. (43)
- How will snowplows operate on streets with many parked cars? Where can residents move their cars if they live in a snow route? (44)

## ***2.10 Concerns about green space/parks/trees/tree canopy/shrubs***

Citizen respondents expressed the highest levels of concern about green space, trees/tree canopy, parks and shrubs (landscaping) being affected by the blanket rezoning proposal. In part, this level of concern was generated by the city's identification of a potential Land Use change to R-CG in areas along the greenspace/park just south of John Laurie Blvd, running

from Brenner Drive to 14<sup>th</sup> Street. Table 15 contains comments about this issue as well as the potential loss of green space and trees/tree canopy due to development. See also Table 12.

Table 15 Quotes from citizens: concerns about green space/parks/trees/tree canopy/shrubs

- The current and future zoning of the land north of the Conrad Drive back alley is unclear. Why is this current confusion not dealt with by our mayor? (6)
- Will there be development on the southside of John Laurie Blvd. This is unclear. (7)
- John Laurie park development. (15)
- Don't take our greenspace! Stop this from happening. Don't touch our green space. (22)
- Outdoor space for each apt [apartment] (9)
- Leave our green spaces alone (36)
- Children's play spaces. (44)
- Tree canopy – larger buildings covering 60% of the property will compromise mature tree canopies in inner city neighbourhoods, ie trees will be removed or root systems destroyed during building. As well, bigger buildings with more sidewalks, driveways, patios will create a pavement paradise, resulting in more run-off in heavy rains, leading to stressed storm sewers and flooding. (2)
- Natural areas: while this discussion places no monetary value on our green spaces, they are one of the most important parts of our neighbourhoods. They build community, offer opportunity for exercise, and access to nature improves mental health. Green spaces are invaluable and once we lose them, we won't get them back. (37)
- Tree loss: the tree canopy is vital to our neighbourhoods. It provides shade and keeps the heat down, which is getting more important as our summers get hotter. The trees clean the air, they provided habitat for non-human friends and manage water. (37)
- How will you meet the environmental goal of increased tree growth or [sic] 9% by 2026? Calgary is already behind most other major cities and more dense building means less space for trees. (37)
- With this blanket re-zoning, several considerations are missing, such as: Lack of space left for trees and shrubs; Lack of patio or related outdoor space for each unit. (9)
- The city of Calgary rezoning map shows the green space between houses from Bannerman to Barrett Dr is lost to rezoning. As well, the area south of bike path to houses or alleys between Brenner and 14 Street are designated for rezoning severely impacting green space. HUGE CONCERN!! (16)
- This will destroy Brentwood. Green space is untouchable. R-1 is important. (22)
- Landscaping/snow removal: 4 live-in owners on one lot leads to questions about snow/lawn/litter management, which impacts neighbourhood characteristics. (2)
- Lack of outdoor privacy impacting adjacent existing housing as well as new unit housing. This is another cause for neighbourhood conflict caused by design considerations placing

four (potentially eight) units where one unit currently exists. Green space considerations are totally inadequate for residents within the new development as well contributing to neighbouring conflict. (38)

- Tree Canopy: The City will not meet its targets for tree canopy coverage. Allowing rowhouses and townhouses to cover such a large percentage of a lot in addition to all the concrete pathways, steps etc., removes mature trees from a property. The City should implement a tree bylaw requiring a certain number of mature trees to remain on any property – private or city owned. (43)
- Loss of privacy (especially with having eight potential neighbours rather than one), increased noise, and loss of yard and trees, are of particular concern. (45)
- Strong opposition to development along green space on North side of Conrad Drive, extending from Brenner Drive to 14 St. (30)
- stop removing park lands and other green spaces – know that research shows the immense value of these areas for human and non-human health and well-being. (35)
- All greenspace and parks throughout the City, currently zoned R-C1, should be rezoned to S-SPR to ensure that they're not allowed to be developed in the future. (43)

### ***2.11 Suggestions for alternative approaches to blanket rezoning***

As noted above, Brentwood citizens expressed many concerns about the effects of blanket rezoning on their community. Additionally, however, many citizens took the time to identify alternative approaches to the proposed blanket rezoning approach by which to achieve the goal of affordability (see Table 16). Please note that, for the purpose of ensuring clarity here, portions of some quotes presented in Table 16 appeared also in previous Tables.

Table 16. Quotes from citizens: suggestions for alternative approaches to blanket rezoning

- In general, I am totally against this blanket re-zoning. The re-zoning does not address environmental, social, or design issues. Over the years, there have been methods developed that achieve designs that address these issues. As a suggestion, perhaps a re-zoning plan could be established that only applies to sites that meet specific criteria that provide or allow for the required (sensible) design considerations. By this I mean that developed and proven designs for multi-family use exist and can be applied to sites that meet proper criteria for such units. .... (9)
- I request that the greenspace on the south side of John Laurie Boulevard NW running between Brenner Drive and 14 Street be rezoned to **S-SPR**. It is a well-used public greenspace and with rumours of development I want to see it protected as it is. (37)
- .... While increasing access to affordable housing is important, there are better alternatives. (37)



- A much slower, more measured approach is needed and if affordability is truly what the city is after, I feel they are sadly mistaken that this haphazard, disruptive plan will be the answer. (42)
- If the City insists on going this route then they must do the following: Invest in better public transit for ALL Calgarians; Invest in better multi modal forms of transportation – cycling infrastructure, pedestrian friendly infrastructure; and Implement permit parking on ALL streets in ALL neighbourhoods. This will get a lot of vehicles off our streets and into garages that are currently being used as storage lockers. (43)
- I am against blanket zoning of the entire city. I don't believe such rezoning will result in more affordable housing being available. Suggest selective rezoning and builder incentives would produce a better result. If builders are paying less for the land, *voila*, housing will be less expensive. And there are other incentives the city could offer (permits, tax, etc) that would result in less expensive housing being the end result. (7)
- Suggest a system in which a set percentage of new units be affordable or meet affordability criteria – actually S/B provincial requirement. (8)
- Request a plebiscite. (13)
- Downtown development?? There were several buildings sitting empty. (14)
- Build your high density in new areas to be developed. Convert underutilized towers downtown into apartments, condo's[sic]. (15)
- The City of Calgary has designated certain communities (I think 12; Marda Loop, East Village etc) for these specific purposes. We need safe communities where children can play in front of their homes, utilities that can handle loads, accessible parking, and low traffic coupled with adequate green spaces. Affordable housing is achieved through low cost land acquisition, larger scale developments for cost economies, reallocated spending for upgraded transit, business diversity (i.e. non-downtown core) that provides all basic needs and businesses accessible within reasonable distances, reducing need for major public infrastructure upgrades. Upgrades have been studied to cost tax payers 4x as much vs building new when opportunity costs and outages are accounted for. (29)
- All greenspace and parks throughout the City, currently zoned R-C1, should be rezoned to S-SPR to ensure that they're not allowed to be developed in the future. (43)

---