

Jessica Siriphokham
Planning, Development & Assessment
Mail code #8076
P.O. Box 2100, Station M,
Calgary, AB Canada T2P 2M5

March 19, 2015

Dear Ms. Siriphokham,

Re: The Northern Hills Community Association's Response to Amended Outline Plan for Application LOC2015-0102 (1450 Harvest Hills Dr NE / Harvest Hills Golf Course Redevelopment)

We have reviewed the aforementioned amended application by QuantumPlace on behalf of Cedarglen Homes, which was submitted in response to the City of Calgary's Detailed Team Review (DTR), and feedback from the community and ourselves.

We remain unconvinced that Harvest Hills should even have been included in the MDP area, nor that this application meets all the requirements or goals of the City of Calgary Municipal Development Plan (MDP), particularly based on the opening pages of the DTR comments. We still maintain that it would be nearly impossible for any redevelopment in Harvest Hills to meet the policies of the MDP highlighted in the DTR: 2.2.4; 2.2.5; 2.3.2; 2.3.4; 2.3.6; 2.6; 3.5.1; 3.5.3; and 3.5.4. We were also disappointed that the developer appears to have avoided or dismissed some of the major requests from the City DTR. However, in an effort to help the developer prepare a more acceptable plan, please note some of the areas of major concern for the NHCA with the amended outline plan (notwithstanding those noted in our original response), outlined below.

DTR Response 15: *Applicant shall introduce buffers along all portions of the plan that lie adjacent to existing single detached residential development. A housing form similar to the existing form is also encouraged in these areas. This is supported by the MDP policies; Principles developed by the Applicant group in the pre-application engagement and confirmed as a priority at the initial City open house events. Buffers shall meet City Parks Department requirements.*

The NHCA questions how multi-family housing and condominiums are considered “A housing form similar to the existing form”? The character of Harvest Hills, is that of a golf course community with mid-level to estate homes. Any buildings other than those types do not meet the current character.

In addition, there are two areas in the plan where the like-to-like housing form have not been applied:

1. Across the lake where Harvest Grove Cr is opposite an M-G parcel.
2. At the far northwest corner, where an M-G parcel is opposite the existing R-1 houses on Harvest Hills Gate.

As the M-G parcels have all been designated 80 units per hectare (maximum allowable, as opposed to the minimum d35), this requires remediation.

DTR Response 16: *Reconfigure the outline plan area to accomplish a more conservation-based development plan. This is an ideal site for a conservation based development plan, as there is: significant established vegetation to design around (ie. trees); a conservation based plan will include less roads within the plan area; it will enable more opportunity for low impact development alternatives for stormwater management; **it respects the original ASP intent for the lands to be used as an open space area, it meets the vision of your stated community name “the Parks of Harvest Hills”, and it can provide an amenity to the Harvest Hills community.***

*Conservation based design is important for the retention of trees, which provides a natural and mature buffer between the new and proposed development. **Explore options to ensure site design retains the majority of the established existing trees along site periphery.***

While the developer did work to address this, it was done at the expense of higher density in order to accommodate park space, including a tot lot, tennis courts and homeowner association land, and no promise has been made to retain any trees, as it is subject to grading: “...it is expected that these modifications may allow for retaining **a few trees** located in the proposed buffer areas. Due to the grading requirements for storm water servicing **it is, however, not possible to retain all existing trees in periphery or buffer areas**, and we note that similar attempts have been highly problematic and unsuccessful elsewhere in the city on similar projects, such as in Shawnee Slopes.” (Developer’s response to DTR, page 6, item 16), and “A cut/fill diagram showing areas where cut or fill is less than

*0.3m is provided in drawing G of the drawing package. This plan shows areas with minimal cut/fill that are located in future open spaces. These areas are areas where existing trees may be retained, but **such retention is subject to further detailed study**, after land use, at detailed design phase. **We note other projects have had significant challenges to attempt to retain trees.** Cedarglen wants to retain **as many as technically feasible given all constraints**, but cannot commit to wholesale retention due to drainage and grading. New trees will also be planted.” (Developer’s response to DTR, page 22 item 64).*

The NHCA would like to point out that this proposed development differs in several ways from the Shawnee Slopes development. We feel that just because something was problematic elsewhere, this should not give developers a free pass to use this as an excuse in other development proposals. We understand and trust that the City views each proposal as a unique situation, even if the developers don’t. All efforts should be made to retain as many healthy, mature trees in the urban forest canopy as possible, even if this is at the expense of making lots smaller, changing the orientation of lots or changing proposed building layouts within these lots.

We would also like to ask, if “*the original ASP intent [was] for the lands to be used as an open space area*” (from the DTR response, above), why are developers being allowed to develop large quantities of multi-residential housing here at all? Considering the area encompasses 64.88 acres, why is this development being allowed to plan housing to the extent that only 17.67 acres (including all buffers) remains as open space, with the only *true* “open space” being a park space in the northwest corner (which was not large enough to site a regulation soccer field) and an even smaller space next to the storm pond?

DTR Response 23: *Provide preliminary concepts for any commercial sites and the NAC. Concepts to include information on: site access; built form; density; landscaping areas; amenity areas; parking; any required site buffering conditions; etc. Ensure the ground levels of developments contribute positively to the public realm.*

Unfortunately, the response from the developer to the DTR (page 9, item 23) was “...a market study was conducted by an independent, professional firm. It concluded that commercial uses in the site area were not feasible, as this need was being addressed in larger retail nodes nearby.” The larger retail nodes indeed do service the requirement for big, box stores, but they are neither walkable / easily accessible by transit (see our previous response for information pertaining to the availability of transit), nor do they serve the purpose of a local NAC.

Our understanding of a NAC is that it consists of “**neighbourhood stores, services and public facilities that meet day-to-day needs, within walking distance for most residents**” (MDP 2.2.4 Complete communities; also referenced in DTR); “**a neighbourhood-scale centre providing opportunities for residential intensification and local jobs, retail, services**

and civic activities” (MDP 3.3.4 Neighbourhood Activity Centres; referenced in DTR); or even “*Each NAC should be comprised of an area of approximately 2 to 4 hectares (5 to 10 acres). Each NAC should be a comprehensively planned, mixed-use area consisting of a central amenity space, medium-density multi-residential development, and a non-residential use.*” (2.4 The New Community Planning Guidebook; referenced in DTR).

Stating that these neighbourhood needs could be met by getting into a vehicle and traveling to access them to the north meets neither the spirit nor the letter of the City’s planning goals set out in the MDP. We also sincerely hope that incorporation of a commercial/multi-use area would still include the recreational space, as the developer’s suggestion that this NAC was sacrificed for more recreational space *instead* is worrisome: “*The plan instead focused more on providing recreational space to address the community desire for outdoor recreation options.*” (Developer’s response to community feedback: Page 2, first bullet item; <http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/pd/Documents/Current-studies-and-ongoing-activities/harvest-hills/harvest-hills-Summary-of-Concerns-feb-16.pdf>) The community should not have to choose between recreational space *or* walkable, day-to-day amenities and public facilities.

The developer could easily incorporate a NAC in the plan which would serve not only the intended influx of residents (now 716 units’ worth, instead of the original 692), but those already living within this area of Harvest Hills, and in the south of Coventry Hills. We are not asking for a large, retail development akin to Country Hills Village or Stoney Industrial, as that is not the intent of the NAC. However, there is no reason a mixed-use parcel couldn’t be incorporated in the northeast corner of the plan. This would mean the extra piece of land in the northeast corner that the City wished to be incorporated could be (see DTR Prior to CPC item 11: “*Explore acquisition of The City of Calgary parcel located at the northeast portion of the plan area... This area could be used for community entranceway features or additional developable lands.*”), rather than remaining unused/fallow, and it could also provide some parking for the excess of vehicles which will inevitably result from the high concentration of M-1 and M-G blocks in that corner of the plan. If, as the developer proposes, these blocks may be developed into Assisted Living or Residential Care facilities, this is all the more reason to provide both a mixed use NAC and extra parking for visitors in this area of the plan. This would reduce the intensity of parking that will also inevitably result from not only the density along Harvest Park Rise and Harvest Park Drive, but also the parking that will occur on Harvest Hills Gate, Harvest Hills Drive and along Harvest Wood Gate due to the location of the amalgamated green space area, and the proposed tot lot.

As stated in our first response, Harvest Hills is a small, residential community, built around a large parcel of open space (the current golf course), with no transit services that easily connect it to the commercial area and regional recreation centre to the north in Country Hills Village. This is important, as the Northern Hills was originally designed as a group of larger, mainly residential, communities clustered around the mainly commercial community of

Country Hills Village (see the Calgary North Phase 1 ASP). This regional commercial area was designed to service ALL of the Northern Hills communities, but they are only accessible to the majority of the residential areas by car. The Northern Hills communities were not originally designed as individual communities, each with their own services (library, recreation and community space), nor were they designed to be particularly walkable, with mixed commercial and employment areas. This was a major design flaw that the LOC2015-0102 plan had the ideal opportunity to correct, for Harvest Hills at least. This proposed mixed use parcel could easily be zoned D-C, to restrict the money marts and liquor stores that the existing community residents did not want to see in any commercial development, and encourage the following community deficits to be positively addressed:

- A medical clinic: the need for this is commercially evident as doctors in Sage Hill have been advertising in our area for patients - they would not spend the money to do this if there was not a need in this area for doctors. Again, if indeed the M-1 area is likely to be developed into Assisted Living or Residential Care, then this is even more reason to make provision for medical care in this community development.
- A facility to address the need for child care services: the need will only increase with the large amount of multi-family housing and the City's request to have housing zoned to allow secondary suites in the proposed plan.
- Community gathering space, such as a coffee/tea shop or family restaurant: not only would this replace the clubhouse (previously the only publicly available gathering spot, now closed), but it would provide somewhere for neighbourhood interactions to take place outside of the summer months. Despite the developer proposing that the buffer zones would provide adequate spaces for residents to interact, we all know these zones become feces-littered spots for irresponsible dog-walkers.
- A small, local grocer/daily needs shop.

Not only would this address the lack of access to local, walkable, day-to-day needs of the community, but it would provide at least some local employment, something that the City itself requested in the DTR.

DTR Response 26: *Reconfigure Municipal Reserve and park spaces to address the Parks Department comments. An active park area, with a variety of uses, constructed within an already established vegetative perimeter, at the community entrance point, in close proximity and well connected to the NAC is the desired objective.*

In addition to the comments above regarding the NAC, we cannot understand the inclusion of a tot lot, as it will bring with it all the parking issues the previously proposed spray park will. Our suggestion is included in our comments to DTR Response 61, below.

DTR Response 28 and 29: *Consider incorporating R-CG land use districts into the plan area. This will allow for higher densities than R-1, lots of flexibility in built form and will **allow for secondary suites** to be developed.*

The NHCA supports the applicant in that secondary suites **are not** appropriate in this proposed redevelopment, unless as a proposal to replace the M-1 and M-G parcels. The proposed density is already well above the requirements and the request of the City of Calgary, which will overcrowd the community as it is.

DTR Response 34: *If private (publically accessible) park spaces are proposed, provide information pertaining to how maintenance and ownership of these spaces will be achieved.*

The applicant has responded that a Home Owner Association (HOA) will be created for this purpose. As a community association, we already deal with the headaches of an HOA in Panorama Hills that only serves a portion of the community. This leads to confusion between residents that are members, non-members, and wish to be members but not allowed, in addition to confusion of who the HOA is and what they do, compared to the NHCA and what we do. Adding an additional HOA that again only serves a portion of the community, will only increase the confusion we must deal with.

We are further concerned that the intention is for large parts of the open space to be owned by the HOA, only in order to reduce the buffer space, which we disagree with, and as they must provide public access to this HOA land, only some residents will potentially pay for the maintenance, but anyone may use the space?

DTR Response 48: *Congestion at EB Country Hills Blvd: As confirmed by analysis an additional EB lane between Harvest Hills Gate and Harvest Hill Way will mitigate traffic congestion during AM peak hour. Include in your report the ROW requirement for this additional lane. Provide rationale in support of your statement that ‘additional lane may not be feasible given the geometric constraints’.*

Thursday, March 17th’s minimal snow event provided the perfect example of why this request in the DTR should not be ignored. The Northern *Hills* are called this for a reason, and the main accesses to/from our communities are via hills. Unfortunately, even the smallest amount of snowfall can cause our community to grind to a halt (usually preceded, and/or followed, by a traffic accident). Last Thursday morning, not only did the 116 articulated bus slide in Coventry Hills causing the major roadway to become blocked off entirely, but the problem with vehicles struggling with the snow on EB Country Hills Blvd caused back-ups well beyond the proposed development.

We agree when the developer says that “As noted in the original TIA, the additional lane included in the analysis between Harvest Hills Gate and Harvest Hills Way (now Harvest

Park Drive) is due to background traffic growth...” (Developer’s response to DTR, page 15, item 48), however, this does not mean that it does not need to be addressed, nor that it will not worsen if this development goes ahead. In addition, by not addressing this issue, it is guaranteed to cause more short-cutting through the development to access 96th Avenue.

We would like to understand exactly what *“planning for additional traffic has sought to minimize these impacts”* (Developer’s response to residents, Page 4, first item) has taken place, as the developer has stated they will not be widening Country Hills Blvd, or providing a ROW as they feel it is *“un-feasible”* (Response to DTR, item 48).

In response to their claim that *“providing the ROW requirement for this additional lane will serve no purpose as the lane would only be present between Harvest Hills Gate and Harvest Hills Way (now Harvest Park Drive), with limited benefit”*, as *“There are major constraints external to the site that make this providing this lane un-feasible, namely the two lane bridge constraint on Country Hills Boulevard, immediately east of the site. To the west of the site, Country Hills Boulevard is restricted to two lanes due to the median separating Country Hills Boulevard from Harvest Wood Way. There is little room for an additional lane on Country Hills Boulevard from Harvest Hills Boulevard to Harvest Hills Gate. To the east of the site, Country Hills Boulevard crosses both the CPR railway and Nose Creek. Both of these crossings consist of a bridge 2 lanes wide in any direction.”*, we would like to point out that:

- The developers of The District and the Stoney Industrial parcel were required to widen Country Hills Blvd in order to mitigate traffic concerns prior to build.
- To the west, Country Hills Blvd is currently restricted to two lanes, but there is adequate room on either side of the Boulevard to widen the road.
- With the upcoming development of lands in the Nose Creek Valley to both the north and south of the railway line, the road will have to be widened to accommodate the increased traffic, and the bridge will have to be widened at some point in the future. Providing a ROW along Country Hills Blvd is only consistent with the developer’s and City’s own vision and goals of densification in the longer term.

DTR Response 49: *Intersection of Harvest Hills Drive and Harvest Meadows Way The proposed intersection at this location creates traffic safety issues for vehicles coming in and out of Harvest meadows way as the sharp horizontal curve reduce the sight distance available for drivers. Submit a sight distance analysis for this location and suggest alternate design solutions including roundabout and traffic calming strategies.*

The NHCA is concerned that the applicant has responded by suggesting the solution is a reduction in the speed limit. The current discussion by City Council in this matter is ongoing and a reduction may not apply to a collector road such as Harvest Hills Drive.

DTR Response 50: *Traffic control at Harvest Wood Gate and Harvest Hills Gate The EBL movement during AM peak hour is expected to suffer major delays due to WBR and NBT traffic. Include a signal warrant analysis for this intersection in revised TIA report.*

The NHCA would like to know what happens if anticipated major delays are encountered after development, but the City accepts the applicant's response that a signal is not required?

DTR Response 51: *Short cutting through Harvest Hills Way Suggest additional measures to reduce cut- through traffic to and from the community of Coventry Hills in revised TIA report.*

The NHCA is unclear how crosswalks will mitigate additional traffic from Coventry Hills cutting through the community.

In our opinion, nothing has been done to address the issue of traffic short-cutting through the development, and the addition of multiple bus stops along the proposed Harvest Park Drive only increases our concern for pedestrian safety along this corridor which is an obvious shortcut for residents of Coventry Hills trying to access 96th Ave. With the developer stating that they are not going to widen Country Hills Blvd to accommodate the additional traffic, the issue of shortcutting will become worse than ever.

DTR Response 52: *Intersection Spacing Transportation Planning will support relaxing the minimum spacing requirement for intersection at Harvest Hills Wy and the proposed east/west road running parallel to Country Hills Blvd by 9m (120m required), provided that the revised TIA report confirms that the spacing is long enough so as to not present any queuing or spill back issues.*

Again, the NHCA is concerned that the applicant and the City has underestimated the number of residents and vehicles that will be added to the community. What guarantee does the community have on this analysis being valid once development has commenced?

DTR Response 57: *For all publicly accessible private open space/buffer areas, Parks recommends ensuring a minimum width of 10m is maintained. This will provide a minimum amount of space to accommodate landscaping and pathways should grading conditions permit. Parks has specific concerns with the buffer open space on the back of lots adjacent to Harvest Hills Way that is labelled as 8m in width. As this linear open space provides very little functionality and is extremely narrow there is concern that the space could become a haven for undesirable activity. In keeping with CPTED principals, Parks recommends widening it so that an appropriate level of functionality/visibility can be achieved.*

Despite more than one request in the DTR for a **minimum** of 10 m buffer space between existing and proposed lots, the amended plan still has buffering of only 8m in some areas. Changing these areas to “publicly accessible private (HOA) land” does not negate the reasons why this buffering should be at least 10m. The NHCA agrees with Parks with regard

to “*this linear open space provides very little functionality and is extremely narrow there is concern that the space could become a haven for undesirable activity.*”. There have been several complaints in the past year to the NHCA about undesirable activity taking place in the laneways in nearby Harvest Wood Gate and Way, which we took up with CPS. We can see how this would be easily transferred to nearby buffer areas, which would provide dark, secluded areas which are even more attractive for undesirable activities, as they are less easily patrolled by local law enforcement than the laneways.

We feel that the applicant’s response (Response to DTR, Page 20, item 57) of “*However, the minimum width is only 8 m due to lot depth requirements, road alignments and other constraints.*” does not sufficiently explain the reason for this decision of reduced buffering width, particularly along Harvest Park Drive, as lot depths along Harvest Park Rise appear to be shallower than those on Harvest Park Drive. The developer themselves stated, “*Buffers were reintroduced in both the north portion of the plan area behind the proposed R-1/ single detached housing units that front along Harvest Park Rise and Harvest Park Drive by re-designing the residential product to fit on shallow lots.*” (Developer’s response to community feedback, page 4, second bullet item), so it is perfectly feasible that shallower lots could be designed along Harvest Park Drive as well, to accommodate the 10m requirement between these new lots and the existing lots on Harvest Grove Close.

In addition, we feel if the response by the developer to the DTR of “*...a minimum width of 10 m for buffers is not feasible in all locations and we note that the buffers are now non-City land. These lands do not need to meet Parks requirements as requested by the City.*” (Developer response to DTR, Page 24, item 70) is indeed the case, we would like to be advised what else designating these green spaces under HOA control will mean with respect to other City requirements.

DTR Response 61: *Parks data shows high demand for playfield facilities in this region of the City. Investigate the provision of a major/minor soccer field dimensioned at 100X120m or a major soccer field dimensioned at 90X120m. Parks recommends locations with high visibility from the street and an on-street parking supply. Locations where multiple types of functionality can be achieved (ie. soccer, playground, other uses) should be explored.*

The Northern Hills Communities including Harvest Hills are very deficient in playfields. Due to the number of currently vacant school sites, makeshift soccer fields are abundant. However, the residents of Northern Hills currently drive their kids all the way to Confederation Park to play league baseball. If the intent of the MDP and densification is to reduce the travel time spent in cars, adding additional population that will also have to commute to Confederation Park seems to be a failure. A thorough analysis should be considered for this area if baseball diamonds, and a basketball court could be accommodated.

DTR Response 64: *The City is interested in tree preservation within this site as a majority of the trees are healthy/worthy of retention and as they soften the interface between existing and proposed residences. Provide detailed information on areas where tree protection/retention is possible and update the tree inventory to show which trees can be potentially retained. Provide detailed information including the species and quantity of trees within each “tree protection area.”*

We are again concerned that this issue needs to be adequately dealt with before it is sent to CPC, and not at DP stage. The developer has stated repeatedly (Response to DTR, page 6, item 16 and page 22 item 64) throughout their response to the DTR that they cannot guarantee any trees are saved, and has repeated that other projects have had issues with saving trees, which does not bode well for their intended commitment to this.

The applicant has only acknowledged the initial 70 issues that the DTR requires to be addressed prior to the Calgary Planning Commission. The NHCA is concerned that some of these issues were dismissed, ignored, or not addressed in the response. The NHCA is concerned that if the land is redesignated as requested by the applicant, we will continue dedicating extensive volunteer resources as the project proceeds, with the next 65 issues required before reaching City Council, and subsequently into the Development Permit process.

Our previous submission questioned the inclusiveness of Harvest Hills within the MDP boundaries as we do not believe it meets the requirements. We understand the applicant purchased this land in good faith based on the boundaries of the MDP, but it is important to refer to the Municipal Development Plan / Calgary Transportation Plan 2013 Monitoring Progress Report and assess if this application and the Harvest Hills community are in line with the goals based on the Core Indicators. It would appear to us, that this Land Use Amendment would increase the negative impact in time for the 2017 report.

Core Indicator 1: *“The MDP encourages development within the developed area of the city to make the best use of our existing land, reduce the cost of City services, to locate residents closer to where they work, shop and play, and to make walking, cycling and transit more attractive to reduce the need to drive to meet daily needs.”*

This application will add more people that are required to get in their cars for work, shop and play, and daily needs.

“To continue progress it will be important to add population in the Activity Centres and Corridors identified in the MDP. The Developed Area includes Centre City, Inner City, Established, Standard Industrial and Industrial – Employee Intensive Typologies, and all

Activity Centres and Corridors within these areas as defined by MDP Map 1 – Urban Structure.”

Map 1 identifies that Harvest Hills does not have an Activity Centre or Corridor as required by the MDP. Using the assessment system in the report, we believe this Core Indicator would rank a -2 for this Land Use Amendment.

Core Indicator 7: *“In conjunction with providing Primary Transit service levels (10 minutes or better frequency, 15 hours a day, seven days a week), creating new, compact mixed use developments within walking distance of the PTN will make transit more accessible to more people. This in turn will result in increased ridership and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion on our streets. The indicator is a test of progress toward both implementing the PTN through capital and operating expenditures and attracting residents and businesses to locations near the PTN.” “The recommended minimum density threshold to support Primary Transit service is 100 residents or jobs per hectare within a five minute walking distance of a Primary Transit stop or station.”*

Harvest Hills does not currently meet this requirement, nor will it with the development. Should the Greenline be completed by 2025, the west side of Harvest Hills will be within walking distance of Primary Transit and will meet the PTN requirement, but not those in this application. We believe this indicator would rank a -2.

Core Indicator 10: *“Land uses (e.g., home, employment, schools, retail, etc.) that are further away from each other result in longer trip lengths, leading to more traffic on roadways, more vehicle kilometres travelled and hence more greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. A denser, more compact urban form with a greater diversity of land uses will result in shorter trips, which can be done by walking, cycling and transit. Shorter trips by car will also reduce overall GHG emissions. This indicator is currently underperforming. The car is still the most common travel choice city-wide. This is illustrated by an increased auto mode split (+2 per cent) while the percentages of sustainable modes (walk, cycle and transit) decreased over the same period. These results are contrary to the 2020 Sustainability Direction target and the MDP/CTP target.”*

The report already recognizes that the target of the MDP is for more people to walk, cycle and use transit, but instead usage of those modes has been decreasing. These modes are not currently feasible for this community and the Land Use Amendment would further increase the negative results in our opinion. We believe this would rank a -3.

Core Indicator 11: *“This indicator provides a good indication of whether people are living in locations that benefit from the services within Activity Centres and Corridors, including retail, personal services and the Primary Transit Network. This indicator thus measures the success of the MDP/CTP and other City policies in encouraging people to live near strategic growth*

areas.” “The MDP proposes a more compact urban form by locating a portion of new housing and jobs within higher intensity, mixed-use areas that are well connected to the Primary Transit Network. Amongst other functions, these Activity Centres and Corridors will act as priority locations for a greater variety of housing choices, higher density residential and employment concentrations outside of the Centre City, and local opportunities for employment and daily retail and service needs.”

As mentioned with Core Indicator 1, MDP Map 1 - Urban Structure does not display Harvest Hills as an Activity Centre or as a Corridor and therefore this application fails this indicator and we believe this would rank a -3.

The NHCA has spent the past decade lobbying our politicians that the Northern Hills communities were not developed to be self-sustainable, resulting in spending a great deal of time in our cars for daily needs. It is unfathomable that the City of Calgary is considering adding even more people to the community so we will continue to dedicate the resources as required in hopes to make the Northern Hills a ‘complete community’. We do not see how this amendment will improve the quality of life or improve our community in any way.

Sincerely,

Rick Lundy
President

David Hartwick
1st Vice President

On Behalf of the Board of the Northern Hills Community Association

c.c. Jim Stevenson, Councilor, Ward 3