Good Morning,

Thank you for giving the opportunity to provide feedback. I am against the land use changes as they will create a lot of congestion on road ways. As it stands with the current townhouse and duplex areas there are way too many cars already parking on the streets. Many units were built with garages and given parking stalls and it is evident that this is not even enough parking. With so many cars parking on the streets has already creates unsightly thoroughfares, dangerous roadways and blind spots at intersections. Any further reductions to parking would be detrimental to the community.

Alyssia Charron  
704 West Chestermere Drive

---

I am opposed to removing the limit on planned lots. I do not believe it will help anyone but the developers. 35% is already plenty of high density/ starter housing. We simply do not have the amenities to support the number of people that this compact housing the developers are proposing. I would still like to see the live up / work Down scenarios that was proposed A few years back before I’d support removing the cap on ‘planned lots’. Thank you.  
Andrea Fleming  
269 west Lakeview Close

---

Good morning,

I have a number of concerns with the Proposed Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw Amendments for Compact Development which I’ve outlined below:

1. Questionable citizen engagement methods - I'm concerned about the engagement methods being used for major decisions like this. It seems that you are making it difficult for me, as a resident, to gather information and provide feedback. The Facebook photo gallery which appears to be the only way to get any sort of information was confusing and really only targets those citizens who are actively using social media AND follow the city of chestermere on facebook. The main link that was supposed to route citizens to more information on the bylaw was broken. When I went to look on the homepage of your website, I also couldn't locate more information. Also - I think there are easier ways for both the City of Chestermere and residents to provide/gather feedback that would lead to more informative and effective decision making for all parties. This bylaw seems like it is being snuck through disguised in a thin veil of citizen "engagement". If you truly wanted to hear from citizens, you'd make it easier.

2. Pandering to developers - From the bylaw proposal "These proposed Land Use Bylaw amendments have been submitted at the request of the development industry, in an effort to reduce housing prices and enable developers to better respond to market demand in the Future
Development Areas." I think it's important to get our own house in order first before catering to the demands of the development industry. Many council members ran on the platform to get more commercial business before expanding residential. They have yet to live up to that promise and instead want to jam more people into Chestermere without having the basic infrastructure in place to do so. Don't allow big business to influence city council to compromise what makes Chestermere a desirable place for many to live: ample space and room to raise families.

3. Safety concerns - fire risk for homes being built closer together. Not to mention that we don't even have a 24/7 hour ambulance to support emergencies in Chestermere. How is this a priority and that isn't? Like I said in point #2, get our own house in order before considering major residential change.

4. Roadways - highway would have to be widened to support more population density, as well as other roadway and intersection considerations. It seems that you're putting the cart before the horse in an effort to appease the developers instead of your citizens.

5. Parking - I live in an area where there was a big townhouse development with seemingly tons of parking. Since folks moved into these townhouses, the nearby neighbourhood streets have been flooded with extra vehicles despite the surplus of parking available. If you propose to limit parking even further, more of this will happen leading to safety issues for children playing at playgrounds and may even require residential parking permits down the road if things get out of hand.

6. The appeal of Chestermere - it seems like we have really lost the thread on the reason that many people that work in Calgary chose to live in Chestermere. Please examine the shared values of your citizens who live here (space, safety, place to raise families) and evaluate whether this is truly in the best interest of the community rather than just putting a few bucks in pockets.

I don't see any of these issues addressed in any of the materials I have seen so far but maybe I have missed something. Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Avery Stodalka
284 Rainbow Falls Way

Hello, we are against the proposed bylaw for Chestermere Compound Plan. We moved to Chestermere due to its current nature or larger lots and More space. If this changes we would consider moving back to Calgary. Please register us against the proposal.

Thank you,
Besima Valentic
90 Stonemere Green

Secondary suites work well where there is abundant parking and considerate tenant behaviour. It does not work well with narrow lots and narrow street widths - sidewalk on only one side. As well, housing prices should be compared with Calgary and not the province as a whole. Chestermere is effectively a
suburb of Calgary - we are closer to the downtown core than most Calgary suburbs. We moved to Chestermere from Calgary six years ago and housing costs were comparable. Chestermere does not need more high density housing which can be little more than a quick buck for developers. We have stacks of two story townhouses behind the Safeway and unfinished ones close to the lab services centre in Kinniburgh. We don’t need more. Chestermere should focus on getting public transit in place by partnering with Calgary Transit. They already have the resources. Has Seniors Cooperative Housing been considered? Many seniors don’t need/want to own real estate. They would prefer a single story home with services such as grounds keeping available. Stairs are not a friend to seniors.

Thanks for your considerations,

Bill Demaer
156 Cove Cres

This would be highly irresponsible. Safety, parking, appearance, property value. Need I go on. Stop trying to give Chestermere it's first ghetto.

Lyndon McLean
244 Cove Court

I say No!
As a concerned Chestermere citizen, please move away from smaller lots For single dwellings. We already have condos and townhomes. For dwellings, they can just move to Calgary if they want smaller lots. We moved to Chestermere for the quality of life and space. Parking would be a nightmare to start with. Families now have their young adults living with them longer due to the cost of living. This is a unique lake community and it needs to keep its charm.

Focus on bringing businesses and activities.
What's going on with this council? Why have you lost the vision?
Don't get caught into the developers requests. Their deep pockets are all but empty promises.
Keep the tax burden away from the homeowners.
Quality over quantity!
Sincerely,

Caroline Godin
224 Springmere Way

I saw the municipality considerations for compact housing development for Chestermere. As a 15+ year resident, these considerations are terrible. The main reason I moved out here overstaying in Calgary was due to the fact that Chestermere offered larger lots and more single-family dwellings. Taking this away and creating more compact residential will drive housing prices down and create more congestion on our roadways in and out of the city.
The townhomes beside The Safeway already are overflowing with cars parked on the streets causing blind spots and an accident waiting to happen, suggesting reduced parking options for compact dwellings in a city that does not have busing seems foolish. Frankly, hearing the direction Chestermere is going is leading me to reconsider whether I will continue living out here.
Charity Mutch
240 Willommere Close Chestermere T1X1S3
Compact Development
Against this proposal.

Hi there,

My name is Daiana Casaldarnos at 180 McIvor terr, Chestermere an T1X-0R6. 4039925244

I am against the proposed changes to land setbacks, increased coverage or secondary suites. I live in a cul de sac that already has a very tight driveway and feels to close. I couldn’t imagine them getting closer.

We came out her although our house is not completely what we would of liked, for us it still had advantages Over Calgary. Please don’t change this. If anything developers should be more responsible for making a change in the community and contributing to parks and amenities which doesn’t seemed to of occurred from what I can see. Let’s hold them to a standard.

Secondary suites is going to far. I agree with diverse housing, just not secondary suites.

Kind regards,

Daiana Casaldarnos

Danielle Audibert
403-607-2403
121 Hart Cove

I am NOT in favour of the proposed future land use.

I vote no.
Do not change the land use bylaw to allow for smaller lots and more compact streets.

Horrible idea.

Thank you,
I am in opposition to bylaw proposals 020-20 and 019-20.
Thank you,
Dave Jaska
181 Lakeview Shores

Not in favour - Planned Lots Bylaw

Definitely not in favour of the new plan. Keep the lots & house size as is because that's why most of us moved out here in the first place. To escape the rat race.
Tired of seeing people parking on both sides of streets & no visitor parking.
Need more commercial businesses, family restaurants other than fast food, better & wider roads etc before more housing.

Definite no!

Deborah Pearson
284 Oakmere Close

I am 100% against high density housing increases in Chestermere.

I am appalled that the current governance in Chestermere would even consider this and shows just how deeply corrupted they are when developers can change the rules to suit themselves.

I am disgusted with this council and the managers in the city.

Denver Fleming
269 West Lakeview Close

Good Morning;

I wanted to have my voice heard regarding my opposition to the Future Land Use consideration. I believe what makes Chestermere a fantastic city is the fact we have large back yards, the majority of our homes are single dwelling and that we have very little traffic which keeps my mental health at bay:).

In my opinion, the impact of having multi family dwellings will not only increase our traffic flow significantly (which is currently large enough during rush hour), it will have an impact on our schools, our crime rate and on the beauty, quietness and tranquility our city represents. We have seen how over used our beaches were during this summer, and thankfully we have placed restrictions on them but now, if we go ahead with this proposal, the beaches will be overflowing with residents, our lake will be over flowing with residents boats etc.

In lieu of increasing or changing what we are, we should learn to appreciate it. Chestermere is not broken, lets not change it!

Diana Demeules
152 West Creek Landing

Bylaw 019-20: Land Use Bylaw Amendments for Compact Development in Future Growths Areas
I oppose the recommendation/request:
Bylaw 020-20: Municipal Development Plan Amendment for Planned Lot Development (Proposed Amendment to MDP Policy 3.4.4.4)
I oppose the recommendation/request:

Dianne Mikus
151 Parkmere Ct, Chestermere, AB T1X 1V5, Canada
403-836-5683

Good morning,

My response to all the purposed changes is no. I have various reasons.

There were a bunch of purposed changes, I say no to all Land Use Change, Reduced Setbacks, Parking reduction, Increased coverage, planned lots, secondary suits.

I moved away from Calgary to Chestermere and bought my home here to get away from all this.

Thanks
Dianne

Opposed. Bylaw 019-20

Elaine & Mike Palamar
505 sandy beach cove

Hi,
I would like it recorded that I absolutely oppose the new development proposals. We want Chestermere to remain the desirable option from the city rat race and all these proposals will do is turn Chestermere into a congested rat run with not enough facilities to sustain it!
Gareth Sheppard
58-300 Marina Drive

Hi,

I absolutely object to the proposals in this amendment. We moved to Chestermere last year because of the charm it has. We don't want to be an extension of the Calgary rat race. More commerce is already needed to cope with the increased residential areas not more lower cost residential areas.
Chestermere is a desirable city for desirable folk with low crime rates because it is separated from the big city. DON'T RUIN IT WITH THIS HAIRBRAINED SCHEME!!
Gareth Sheppard  
58-300 Marina Drive

Gillian Sealy  
66 300 marina drive

These land use changes are all terrible and I’m not sure why you are trying to make changes to the land use. People who want small lots with no parking can stay in Calgary! I vote no. These sounds like you are being influenced by builders!

If you want to do something effective- How about you make changes to the no-speed bumps along Marina Drive and in front of city hall! People (Actual residents) have been asking for this for years. Every night people are speeding along and sometimes drifting out of John Peake onto the main road. That’s my repeated input.

Have a good day.  
Gillian Sealy

As a resident of Chestermere I strongly oppose to the newly communicated amendments to the Development Plan and Land Use Bylaws that move away from the large lot single-family homes. We have moved to Chestermere for the feel of the community and the openness of our streets.

I believe there would be a number of down sides including but not limited to the following:
- No parking
- Cramped streets
- Lack of services, schools, and congested roadways

Before any developments were approved we should have had our roadways widened. It is unacceptable that we give the developers any land, before our roads are handled, period.

Thanks,  
Heather Beattie  
303 Lakeside Greens Dr.

Dear City of Chestermere,

I oppose your future land use change proposal.

We live in Chestermere because of the traditional character, with large lots and single-family homes. We do not wish to live in a big city especially in light of the current pandemic, whereby our small, spread-out population is what has prevented us from reaching infection numbers that larger, more densely populated cities have.
We live in Chestermere, as opposed to Calgary, *because* of the larger lots and the spread out homes. What is the benefit to living in Chestermere if all of the subdivisions look the same as those in Calgary, packed together like sardines.

There are not enough businesses in Chestermere to support our current residents. The presumption is that we are close to Calgary and that we can go "into town" to access a hospital, a pool, a hardware store, or an ethnically diverse grocery store. We have one public highschool, 2 grocery stores and 2 main places in the city to get a coffee before work. If we want to go out for a nice dinner, we have to drive into Calgary. Increasing the population will only strain the limited Chestermere institutions further.

There is no public transit. Should the city become larger, this will bring forth the necessity for public transportation. Especially if the increase in population is dominated by lower-income families.

There are already a significant number of families in Chestermere who are in need. There is no reason to increase that number by adding high population density housing.

Holly Sebastian  
748 West Chestermere Drive

---

To whom it may concern.

In regard to the proposed changes land use for Compact housing thus needs to be stopped. Chestermere has changed so much since we moved here in 2006 and most of it not for the better.

For compact housing consideration needs to be taken into account for safety matters, we all see the news where there are fires and once one house is damaged it spreads to others, with compact housing dire could damage a lot more properties and/or loss of life.

There’s also the issue of road infrastructure, it’s already so busy getting in and out of Chestermere, once there’s more people living in the new areas it’s going to be a total nightmare.

There are not enough amenities here so again more people exiting Chestermere to go into Calgary.

I’m guessing you’ve seen comments on social media, there are so many people talking about leaving Chestermere, it’s not good. I truly wish Chestermere could stay the same with no more building - council - it’s not just about money it’s about the quality of life we have here, do not spoil it!

Regards  
Jackie Owens  
364 Rainbow Falls Way

---

I moved to chestermere on 1 april 2020 from brampton onario, the reason is my family is here and they told me that houses and backyard are spacious for kids to play at house or in the front of the house. we can park on the road if we need. i am not in favour of this
Hello, I'd like to repeat my thoughts from Facebook on the proposed new bylaw for developments.

Not in favour. All of these together is too much. One or two might make for more affordable housing options. But ALL together create cramped streets with too many cars and too little green. We don't have the infrastructure to accommodate so much density so fast. Also - I don't like the wording that these options "might" create more affordable housing. Show us the numbers. Sounds more like the developers will get an opportunity to make more money rather than create an equally beneficial housing situation for new residents. I also think residents should be made aware of how involved the developers were in proposing this bylaw.

I'd like to say that affordable housing is good and important but not at the price of our community's health.

I am OPPOSED for both of the following two proposed bylaws:

Bylaw 019-20: Land Use Amendments for Compact Development in future growth areas.

Bylaw 020-20: Amendment to the Municipal Development Plan for Planned Lot Development.

(As they stand, but would like to see what more moderate amendments are suggested)

Thanks so much!

Janelle Sandboe
327 Parkmere Green

Opposed to higher density housing in anyway.

143 Willowmere close

Jason Ruhnke

Hi,

We are very against these changes of moving away from large lot single family homes. We needs to focus on more amenities, more recreation options such as a splash park or swimming pool and more commercial businesses.

Jennifer Cuthbertson & Kenneth Lancaster Rainbow Falls
181 Rainbow Falls Heath
Good afternoon,

We moved to Chestermere to live the “town” life and get out of the cramped living of the city. We moved here February 2014 and not even a year later this town was changed to city status, which is mind boggling since we do not have the same amenities as a city. We are against this proposed new development, we moved here for a reason and now you are wanting to bring that reason we left Calgary to Chestermere. Many people in this town are against this idea, Chestermere will begin to lose that close knit community, town feel if you continue with this…it’s bad enough we now have more housing development going in off Rainbow Road. This ridiculous idea is going to bring down the price of homes and will have a negative impact on the current homeowners.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Moore
210 West Creek Mews

Re: Bylaws 019-20 & 020-20

We do not need to have denser housing in Chestermere. We are already losing so much land and views as it is with all the housing being built. The traffic is high and we have no commercial locations especially in Kinniburgh. Chestermere is turning into an over crowded NE Calgary. It is losing its charm and sense of small community. To many lower end homes that are not selling as it is. The streets will be cramped and no parking available as well Chestermere tax payers will definitely not be able to use the beach or even the lake as it will get to crowded. Without the covid prices in effect on the beach we wouldn’t be able to use it normally.

Please do not make this change.

Thank you
Jennifer Thorne
147 Kinniburgh Lane

Good day,

I am writing regarding the proposed land use for compact housing development. In my opinion this is not a good idea for many reasons. Chestermere has been my home for 15 years now and I've seen many changes in that time. Most are good and I still love living here.

However, building smaller homes with lower income just isn't what Chestermere has ever been. You don't have to look far to see what these types of neighborhoods look like after just 10 years. Areas like Skyview and New Brighton are great examples of how quickly they get run down due to lack of pride in ownership.
We don't need to appeal to a greater amount of people. We need to grow slower than our current pace and maintain our small city feel. If I could choose to downsize Chestermere I would.

17th Avenue is already too busy during peak hours of the day. We need to focus on making what we have even better before trying to add more people just because.

In my opinion the land developers can cater to us, not the other way around. We should always maintain our larger yards with single family homes on them. Those types of properties attract the types of people we want. They are mature and educated typically.

This change to land development will come with higher crime and loss of identity in my opinion. Both are bad outcomes.

I am referring to bylaws for:
Reduced setbacks
Increased Coverage
Secondary Suites
Parking Reductions
Planned lots
I am in opposition to all of these.

Kindest Regards,

Jerod McMurray
112 Westcreek Green, Chestermere, T1X0B4

Good afternoon,

Below I have included my feedback on the proposed amendments to Bylaw 019-20 and Bylaw 020-20. While some of the applicant’s requests make sense to maximize land efficiencies, there are some that are unreasonable and detrimental to the Chestermere community that we have come to know and love. As a long-time resident, I hope that you will consider my feedback when making your decisions on the review of these two bylaws.

**Bylaw 019-20 Land Use Bylaw Amendments for Compact Development in future growth areas**

Schedule A.2 appears to be acceptable as presented

Section 4.2 appears to be acceptable as presented

Section 7.14 appears to be acceptable as presented. The bylaw already states that the max is 8m wide and can only take up 75% of the front yard (including walkways, patios, etc) so this appears to say there must be at least 25% grass in the front yard. This promotes curb appeal and aesthetics to the front yard.

Section 7.27 appears to be acceptable as presented
Section 7.31 assuming that permits would still be required for secondary suites. This must be monitored and it should be tracked by the City with # of secondary suites per street limited to ensure appropriate increase in density (more parking, more traffic, more congestion, life safety issues, etc). The bylaw should state a maximum number or % per street and require appropriate additional parking requirements if suites are permitted.

Section 7.37 appears to acceptable as presented

Section 8.1 reducing the number of parking stall requirements for semi-detached or townhouse units seems counter productive. As these are higher density, the appropriate assumption would be that more parking is required. While other communities may have less, Chestermere is a City that has little to no transit requiring citizens to often have more than one vehicle to commute to work, etc. A more appropriate assumption would be that perhaps more parking is required due to the higher density. Taking into account Section 7.31 where there is a request to add secondary suites to R2 dwellings, again more parking would be required. Recommendation is to leave at 2 stalls per unit.

Section 10
The best way I found to review this was to use the Land Use districts – regional comparison document. Chestermere is known for its larger lots and larger homes. In keeping with this theme, there are areas where land efficiencies can be improved as seen by some of the applicants requests. Here are my comments by District.

R-1
Minimum lot size - the proposed changes seem appropriate. Chestermere would continue to be larger than most surrounding communities while giving way to some land efficiencies by reducing the lot size as requested. Minimum lot width – same comments as lot size
Front yard – no changes requested
Side Yard Principal – request is for changes to the standard lots only to go from 1.5m down to 1.2m. This is a difference of 1 ft. and puts Chestermere in line with all other communities. This appears to be acceptable as requested
Side Yard Accessory – the request to go from 3.0m down to 1.0m for corner lots seems excessive. Considering that all other communities are also at the existing 3.0m for side yard corner, it is recommended that this NOT be changes. As well, the standard lot is currently at 1.5m and it requested to go to .6m (5ft down to 3.3 ft) seems excessive. Recommend going to 1.0M for standard accessory which is more in line with Cochrane and Okotoks communities.
Rear yard – there are no changes to the principal building but the accessory building is currently at 1.5m and requesting to go to .6m. Using the same logic in the side yard accessory, it is recommended that the accessory building on the rear yard be amended to 1.0m and not 0.6m
Max lot coverage – currently the limit is 45%. Comparing Chestermere to other communities, it would be appropriate to amend the maximum lot coverage to 50%-55% combined which if it goes to 55% is increasing the maximum coverage by 22%
Parking requirements – no changes requested

R-1PR
Minimum lot size – request is to reduce lot size from 301m2 to 272m2. In comparing to other communities, it would appear that the current minimum lot size is appropriate. Recommendation is to leave minimum lot size as is.
Minimum lot width – request is reduce standard lot size. In comparing to other communities, the current lot size is appropriate and a reduction is not warranted. It is recommended to leave the minimum lot width as is.
Front yard – I’m not sure why the front yard setback is half of the R1 & R1PFD. This appears to be acceptable as requested.
Side Yards Principal – no changes requested
Side Yards Accessory – The applicant is requesting it be changed for corner lots from 3.0m down to 1.0m. This is an unreasonable reduction and much less than any neighbouring communities. Recommendation to leave bylaw as is.
Rear yard – there are no changes requested for the principal building, but the request on accessory buildings from 1.0m to 0.6m is appropriate even though it is much less than some of the other communities. Recommendation to leave bylaw as is.
Max lot coverage – the applicant is requesting a change from 45% up to 60%. This is too much of an increase. It is recommended that it be comparable to R1 which is 50-55% combined. At 55% it is an increase of 37.5%.
Parking requirements – no changes requested

R-1PFD
Minimum lot size – no changes requested
Minimum lot width – no changes requested
Front yard – increase from 3.5m to 6.0m. This appears to be acceptable as requested.
Side yards principal – no changes requested
Side yards accessory – corner lots requested change from 3.0 down to 1.0m. Same feedback as R-1PRL. This is an unreasonable reduction and much less than any neighbouring communities. Recommendation to leave bylaw as is.
Rear yard – only changes are reducing the accessory building from 1.0m to 0.6m which appears to be acceptable as requested.
Maximum lot coverage – no changes requested
Parking requirements – no changes requested

R-2
Minimum lot size – applicant wants to reduce the lot size from 305m2 to 250m2. This would make Chestermere lots significantly smaller than all comparable surrounding communities. This change is not recommended. With the higher density it makes sense to keep the larger lots.
Minimum lot width – the reduction would still have Chestermere having larger lots than most other communities even though it is higher density. This is the desired outcome. This appears to be acceptable as requested.
Front yard – the changes requested are to greatly reduce the front yard setback. This would result in increased street congestion and not be aesthetically pleasing at all. It is recommended to leave the bylaw as is.
Side yards principal – the slight reduction on standard lots from 1.5m to 1.2m appears to be acceptable as requested.
Side yards accessory – the request to reduce the corner lots from 3.0m to 1.0m is not appropriate. There should be consistency with corner lots in keeping with R1, R1PRL and R1PFD. It is recommended that this bylaw NOT be changed.
Rear yard – this appears to be acceptable as requested
Maximum lot coverage – the current coverage of 40% is being requested to be amended to 60%. This seems excessive and much more than surrounding communities. It is recommended that this be...
amended to 50% maximum. By increasing maximum coverage to 50% in it a 25% increase over the existing bylaw

Parking requirements – the current bylaw states 2 stalls are required. The applicant is requesting this be changed to 1.5 stall. With the higher density and following the same rationale as noted in Section 8.1, it is recommended that this bylaw not be changed.

R-3

Minimum lot size – while it is desirable to have some higher density living in Chestermere, reducing the lot size will not give the desired community feeling. It is recommended to leave the R-3 existing minimum lot size as is

Minimum lot width – as with the minimum lot size, it is recommended to leave the R-3 existing minimum lot width as is. Chestermere widths are already amongst the smallest.

Front yard – it is recommended to leave the R-3 existing front yard setback as is. This is more aesthetically pleasing from a planning perspective.

Side yard principal – with the higher density, it does not make sense to decrease side yard or rear yard for multi-unit buildings. Ensuring more space for these units will give a much better community feel in higher density living. It is recommended that this bylaw not be changed.

Side yard accessory – with the higher density, it does not make sense to decrease side yard or rear yard for multi-unit buildings. Ensuring more space for these units will give a much better community feel in higher density living. It is recommended that this bylaw not be changed.

Rear yard - with the higher density, it does not make sense to decrease side yard or rear yard for multi-unit buildings. Ensuring more space for these units will give a much better community feel in higher density living. It is recommended that this bylaw not be changed.

Max lot coverage – currently sits at 40%. In keeping with the concept of space in our community, it is important that there still be limitations on maximum lot coverage even in high density housing. It is recommended that this align with all other building types in this bylaw and have a maximum 55% coverage. This is a 37.5% increase over the existing bylaw

Parking requirements – the current bylaw states 2 stalls are required. The applicant is requesting this be changed to 1-2 stalls. With he higher density and following the same rationale as noted in Section 8.1, it is recommended that this bylaw not be changed.

Several LUDs suggest the removal of the max 35% planned lot development – this is NOT supported. The reason this is in our MPD is to ensure that high density housing is limited to 35% and supports the community that citizens chose when they moved to Chestermere.

In summary, for bylaw amendment proposals to bylaw019-20 there are areas for better land efficiencies. The applicant and the provided documentation suggests that these changes are being requested to provide more attainable housing. The proposed changes, however, do not give the same message. The proposal is asking for smaller lots and larger homes (increasing max coverage). This suggests the applicant wants the ability to build larger homes on smaller lots, not more attainable homes. While the documentation supports that the changes the applicant has requested are within the Alberta building codes, it does not mean that they fit within the community environment created in Chestermere – just because we can doesn’t mean we should.

I moved away from Calgary 17 years ago because of the density and city feeling, so it is only appropriate to understand that I don’t want our community to be benchmarked with Calgary. It is more appropriate for Chestermere to be benchmarked using Cochrane and Okotoks as these communities are more in keeping with the brand that Chestermere has. Airdrie provides a median but is definitely more of an
extension to Calgary. The Regional comparison document provides additional information, but it is important for Council to remember, we are a unique community and that uniqueness needs to be protected.

In keeping with Chestermere’s culture of a recreational environment and small town feel, there are efficiencies to be gained by making the changes I’ve noted above, however, it is important to keep the feel of our community alive.

**Bylaw 020-20 Proposed amendment to the municipal development plan – planned lot development**

After reviewing the documentation, there are several points that are particular interest to me.

- Removal of the 35% cap on smaller lot, single detached housing within Residential neighbourhoods. This is particularly concerning given the proposals made in bylaw 019-20 requesting smaller lot sizes and increased maximum coverages. The whole intent on MDP 3.4.4.4 is clearly stated in the desire to avoid concentrations of higher density housing in any one area. This was a well thought out inclusion in the MDP and removing it would be counter productive to the plan Chestermere has branded itself on.

- Setting minimum requirements rather than maximums seems to be generally saying the same thing as currently in the MDP so why change it.

I am **NOT in favour of removing the maximum limitation within the MDP**. If there are changes that a developer wants, then it can apply on an individual basis and the Council can deal with appropriately. As noted above, Chestermere has a brand that it has built over many years and these changes will destroy that brand. People live here for the community culture that exists and this drastic change will forever impact the community.

In response to both bylaw reviews, it has been suggested that the changes have been presented to increase diversity and attainable housing within our community. There are many ways to support and encourage these concepts in Chestermere. The proposal by this developer, however does not. The idea that smaller lots with larger coverage will promote more attainable housing is not reasonable. It only supports more densely populated communities – bigger houses on smaller lots – which is not conducive to attainability by any measure. While the costs of lots may be reduce slightly by the reduction in their size, in almost all situations, the developer is requesting from 22-75% increase in the maximum coverage which suggests they want bigger houses on smaller lots.

There are areas for efficiency opportunity for sure, but using the argument for more attainable housing in inappropriate. It is important for Council to consider designated areas for higher density and diverse, attainable housing – ie. Seniors living, higher density (like behind Safeway), etc.), but significantly reducing lot sizes or removing caps on the look and feel of our neighbourhoods is not the way to do it. There is little community benefit in these proposals but significant profitability benefit for the developers.

Kind regards,
Joanne Lemna
285 Lakeside Greens Cres

---

Mayor Chalmers,
I’m sending this email to express my strong opposition to these proposed changes, all of them. I’m not sure why this was introduced and why it’s even being brought forward but it will definitely change the integrity of our community and not in a positive way.

It’s a very bad idea and shouldn’t be considered for our community.

Thank you for your time.

Jody Nakoneshny
115 Oakmere Green

Please add my name to the list of those OPPOSED to this request from the developer

John Popplestone
777 Qualicum Beach Bay

Jolleen Clark
236 West Creek Blvd

Strongly Opposing this!

Hello,

I do not think a high density bylaw is a good fit for Chestermere. We have always thought of Chestermere as different from Calgary, less people, wider streets, larger yards, and larger side yards. This is why we moved here in 2006 as well as the ‘small town’ feel. With allowing smaller lots and smaller side yards, this brings more people to each block as well as more vehicles. If you allow a higher density, in my experience, that also means narrower streets. With smaller homes (usually not front attached) this means more cars will be on the streets - making it hard to navigate down them in a vehicle let alone an emergency vehicle. In the bylaw you can stipulate parking rules but more often than not they are not enforced and those streets become impassible.

If you allow it to go to the next step - zero lot line homes - this impact is even greater. If you haven’t driven through a finished community of zero lot line homes, please do before you consider this bylaw amendment. I don’t feel the average Chestermere resident would agree to this change. It also brings up the issue of house fires. The closer the home to the next, the faster the fire will spread. Zero lot line homes are built differently and require different exterior grade sheathing, non-vented soffits, etc. but I don’t think it takes it far enough with only being 5’ apart. They aren’t built fire proof. If one house is on fire, the odds of either house on either side starting on fire as well is so much greater than keeping them 10’ apart. I don’t feel that risk is worth the reward in anyone’s minds. Yes, its a cheaper home but think of the long term effects.

I thank-you for adding that these changes are being looked at for new developments and not existing ones. Does that also mean that someone will not be able to purchase a home, knock it down and build a
duplex or two smaller homes down the road? This will increase the density as well. If this hasn’t been written into the bylaw, can it be looked at?

I’m sure you hear alot of “not in my backyard” when it comes to this kind of change but I don’t know one person in town that would think / agree that these changes are the way to go. If someone wants a smaller home, on the East side of Calgary, the new sub-div going up beside Easthills is full of them. I work in the building industry and I understand the developers / City’s point of view - higher density means more taxes and more return to the developers - but think of the City we are and where we want to go - I don’t feel its that direction.

Thanks   Jolleen Clark

Opposed to :
Reduced setbacks
Increased coverage
Secondary suites
parking reductions
planned lots

Please do NOT change the land use bylaws to allow more diverse residential neighborhoods. Chestermere was built on larger lot sizes. the infrastructure does not support the increase in multi-residential homes. Many of the long term residents moved here because it was a smaller population with larger lots.
The developers seem to have done nothing to support our infrastructure, that has all been falling on the taxpayers.

definitely a NO to changes.

Julie and Blair Supple
248 Lakeside Greens Dr

Opposition of changes to By-laws re: MDP and LUB

Hello Chestermere Council,

My name is Julie Cragg, both my husband and I have been Chestermere residents for over (20 years each), having grown up and with they city I fear that making changes that turn us into a mini Calgary and moving away from what makes Chestermere attractive would be a mistake for those whose live in and love this community. My husband and I chose to stay in Chestermere and purchase our first home here because we love the community and have continued to grow our family and move into other houses in Chestermere and have never felt the desire to look outside here. We find the mix of “multi-family” developments here to be just right, not too little and not to many, having too many of those type of developments looks crowded and is not great for their property values or those of the sounding single family, who wants to see a giant complex with 5 neighbors looking into your home? I know many new
residents that have been our neighbors express that they moved here to get away from the small lots in the city and to able to get a nice home with a nice lot and a small town feel. Please carefully consider not stripping this place of its charm and unique attributes just to satisfy a tax need, what we as Chestermerians want is a beautiful city that is not crowded and where people can come to relax and have privacy in their own backyards. If developments changes course and becomes more dense I will likely be looking outside of Chestermere when we make our next move.

Kind regards,

Julie Cragg
100 Sandpiper Place, Chestermere AB T1X 0V4

My feedback is no to limiting any parking spaces. This is what causes the unsightly property issue - which is a bylaw and seems contradictory to what your considering.

People with triple car garages still end up parking on the driveway or street half the time so these owners/renters will be parking all over and crowd up the already small roads. We are not an inner city with transit out our doors where a vehicle may not be needed and we don’t live in a world where most homes only have one person residing at them. Perhaps they can consider an unground parkade if space is an issue.

Julie Green
165 kinniburgh way

Hi there,
I am opposed the proposed bylaws 020-20 and 019-20.

Full name: Ka Man Ng
Address: 108 Willowmere Close, Chestermere AB T1X1S3

Hello,
I moved to Chestermere from Calgary 3 years ago. My husband and I chose to move outside of Calgary because we wanted to raise our family in an town that was not high density. We wanted a community with less cars on the road and more focus on green space and feeing like we could breath and escape the city.

The proposed changes for “compact development” go against everything we moved here for.

I’ve lived in communities like this before - cars parked on both sides of the streets turning two lane roads into single lanes. Secondary suites where a single dwelling has 4+ vehicles but only parking for one. It doesn’t work. We don’t have the public transportation options to support this in any realistic way. People move to Chestermere to have the proximity to Calgary and the services there without having to live in the big city. I am strongly opposed to these proposed changes.
Hi there,

My name is Kelli Morin - I live at 761 Qualicum Beach Bay in Chestermere. We have lived here for four years now but have had family in Chestermere for over 20 years and have always considered it home. Over the last few years, it seems that our current Council is trying to change the essence of what makes Chestermere such a wonderful place to live.

I am strongly OPPOSED to this new proposed amendment to the current Municipal Development Plan and the Land Use Bylaw.

I find it strange that you are passing a ‘Unsightly Properties Bylaw’ on the same day as also considering amending a bylaw that will make our lovely city unsightly by adding homes on top of homes and changing it to just another cookie cutter new development. People who live in Chestermere appreciate that the lot sizes are bigger than that of Calgary, it gives us a sense of pride that our city values its appearance and resident’s wishes over making a bigger profit off of land development.

Also, having more lower-income type housing might attract the wrong type of buyer/renter. We moved out here from a lower income neighbourhood (Marlborough Park), and I can tell you with 100% certainty that the amount of ‘unsightly properties’ is much higher over there because people just don’t seem to care as much. They don’t have as much invested, and it’s not a priority.

Please stop trying to change Chestermere into just another community that jam packs houses into communities and instead, embrace Chestermere for what it is - a beautiful city that prides itself on being different from Calgary.

I hope that Chestermere Council will take into consideration the overwhelming number of negative responses and clear opposition to this proposed amendment.

Kelli Morin

Hello,

I am opposed to the new land development proposal.

Multi Family dwellings ARE available in Chestermere in the form of Condo’s, townhouses and duplexes.

Adding more condo buildings will add to an already congested and overcrowded City. This will stress our City’s ability to keep up with its ability to run efficiently and meet the needs of the population we already have.

Our roads cannot sustain much more traffic-only two main roads in and out of Chestermere
There is only a single Bridge connecting the east and west side which needs to be re-enforced and possibly re-built

We have limited police and emergency services (for example we have lots of break and enters-vehicles mostly-that cannot be solved. Drug issues-growing and selling, vandalism and property damage)

Multi-family properties may bring in more Property Tax dollars but it also brings more crime, litter, vandalism, bylaw issues and stresses our already limited ability to keep up with city services.

- Chestermere Blvd needs to be widened and/or repaved, the bridge is full of potholes and looks like it is crumbling
- New traffic lights need to be put in at the Chelsea Development coming off/onto Chestermere Blvd
- Gravel roads need to be paved (ie 100 st and Chestermere BLVD with censors for light changes from south and northbound lanes-advanced green would be useful as well turning east bound onto Chestermere bv from southbound 100 st)
- We need our own police service and EMS
- New bylaws need to be formed/improved for Community Standards which means more bylaw officers to enforce them
- Are we getting public buses to help people utilize our business who don’t drive or can’t?

Chestermere needs more non-residential properties. We need commercial Business to help take the tax burden from property owners and help the city thrive and be able to keep up with City Services for the residents that we do have.

Chestermere also needs a descent Recreation Facility (a proper Leisure Center will help with small businesses such as restaurants and stores- as a side bonus). The recreation center have does not and cannot meet the needs of the citizens we already have. People are going to other Municipalities. A real leisure Centre will bring in revenue to the City, draw people from outside Chestermere to the facility which has the potential to support our small businesses that we have and it will create jobs.

Adding more condos will not add value to our city....we need to build a better economic base and be able to keep up with the needs of our City first before adding a higher population .

Regards

Kelly Page
165 Springmere Grove Chestermere AB T1X 0B5

Dear Chestermere City Council,

I am not in favour of the proposed Land Use Bylaw. Many of the families & residents who move to Chestermere come because of the amount of additional space that they can get with their houses & lots for a lower price than a similar house & lot in Calgary. I know that's why my husband and I decided to move out here 7 years ago (And our neighbours have said the same thing as well.)
Looking back, we could have moved to somewhere in Calgary (in the far corners of the city) for a similar price of the home we found here and be closer to our jobs, but we didn't want to be 12 inches away from our surrounding neighborhoods and have a 10 ft. backyard. Instead we came to Chestermere, because we would have a great community, access to the lake and a wonderful backyard with ample space between ourselves and our neighbours.

There are so many places within Calgary and the outlying communities that have these smaller lots that there is definitely not a lack of choices for new homeowners. And in some situations, I would argue that the people looking for these type of housing options, probably need more access to public transportation, which is not available here at this time.

I would love to see Chestermere remain a vibrant community that differentiates itself from Calgary and the other surrounding communities by having lot sizes that make it worth the drive to live here. Because to be honest, if I was picking between identical homes/lots in Calgary or Chestermere, I would probably pick what would be the closest to my work (i.e. Calgary) & other big city amenities. Make it desirable to live here by having these wonderful homes and lots that people can really look forward to calling their own! Plus, I personally think we will start seeing a trend that as more people are able to work from home and living with the possibility that we may have to stay put in our homes for periods of time (i.e. COVID-19) that people will be wanting homes and yards that they can really enjoy (as they won't be spending most of their day working & commuting). Make Chestermere the place that people want to be for that!

Thanks for your consideration and I wish you the best of luck in making the right decision for Chestermere!

Kristin Dennett
123 West Lakeview Passage

Good afternoon,

I'm for small business, large business and any kind of business that would strengthen our economy and increase our commercial tax base.

What sets us apart is our beautiful city amenities. Before we welcome more people, we need more businesses and more amenities. Otherwise all residents will suffer.

Laurianne Schell
168 Kinniburgh Circle

I am not sure why council is considering increasing the amount of building coverage allowed on residential lots.

Strongly vote no on this. This is not what myself or the residents of Chestermere want.

Thanks,
Laurie Kimpton
Decreasing the size of residential lots in our community raises some questions -

1. Will additional schools be built in unison with the sale of these lots to accommodate the number of families relocating to Chestermere? Starter homes built on the smaller lots are usually sold to young families with children (i.e. price point).

2. Will larger/additional grocery businesses be established to accommodate the increase in population? The current Safeway and No Frills may not be able to keep up with the demand. Some days the shelves are pretty skimpy as it is.

3. Will the roads infrastructure be changed/widened to accommodate the increase in traffic (i.e. limited parking has always been an issue in smaller lot residential areas (as can be seen in the Falconridge, Taradale, Martindale areas of Calgary).

4. Will police and fire protection be increased to accommodate the projected population increase? Fire spread to neighbouring homes increases with homes built closer together.

Chestermere is already a complete community with various types of housing in all price points which makes it more affordable than in previous years. Amenities in our Community are not keeping up with housing construction which pushes residents into Calgary for their recreation, groceries, etc.

The increase in taxpayers within the Community will certainly help with additional amenities, infrastructure and schools but will take some time to raise the funds necessary to keep up with the population boom.

Decisions made today will affect all current residents for some time to come as we wait for the completion of all the phases of construction projects currently in progress.

Best regards,

Laurie McLeod
152 West Creek Pond

My experience has been that regardless of how many reasons you get to not do this, you will do it anyway. You’ve gotten far enough with this to even suggest this to citizens and hopefully there is no back door deals helping this happen. No, we have never wanted this much residential development, we do not need more and the infrastructure that comes with it for taxpayers to carry forever. Stop building, we do not need more homes and even though we will never have more commercial and industrial as a result of our proximity to Calgary, that in itself will make us a desirable small town community....that is why people move here, not the endless development of the same old thing. And then to suggest more homes with even less desirable lots? Please be bigger than the developers and truly decide what “we” want as a community....
Leslie Dilts
308 W Chestermere Dr

I would have to say I am totally AGAINST Bylaw 019-20: Land Use Bylaw Amendments for Compact Development in Future Growth Areas.

The space we have here is one of the best things about Chestermere. I left Calgary for a reason.

I am NOT in support of this new bylaw. No cracker box houses and over population. Lower income homes stacked close together with in-law and rental suites all over... No thanks. That is not what Chestermere is.

Lisa Denyer
484 Rainbow Falls Way

I am OPPOSED to both of the two proposed bylaws:

Bylaw 019-20: Land Use Amendments for Compact Development in future growth areas.
Bylaw 020-20: Amendment to the Municipal Development Plan for Planned Lot Development.

Thanks,

Loren Sandboe
327 Parkmere Green

I do not agree with this development. There is a reason people bought and support Chestermere. If this development goes through, it will not be the same. I don’t want to live in Calgary, dont let it become that!

Lori Berge
817 east chesterfield dr

I am firmly against both smaller lots and reduced parking these changes increase the load on the schools and roads in Chestermere. We need an increase in services to accommodate increased population. Smaller lots will create a ghetto like atmosphere and the accompanying problems just follow naturally.

My name is Louis Howitt
At 230 Westchester blvd

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my concern over the proposed land use changes. I do not support any of the proposed changes.
Reducing setback requirements will just increase density. Increasing coverage does the same thing, reducing green/yard space. Approving more secondary suites leads to the same problem, increasing population density in our community. Parking reductions will also create problems. Parking around duplexes and townhomes is already a problem, so reducing it further is only going to compound the issue. Increasing the number of planned lots is also just going to increase density, which we don’t need.

I understand that these proposed changes will create a wider range of pricing in residential housing. But why does Chestermere need that? We should be continuing with what works for Chestermere, what has been appealing about Chestermere for decades. Let’s keep up with the larger yards, ample parking, better spacing between houses. Why would we want to become the same as every other bedroom community of Calgary? Yes Chestermere is not a “cheap” place to live. No, it doesn’t have a lot of “starter” homes. But you get what you pay for. You know that if you live in Chestermere you get more open space, larger lots, and not a lot of high density housing. Let’s continue to have the majority of our housing to be single family detached homes, without compromising on setbacks, parking, etc. That may mean that Chestermere isn’t the best place to buy your first house. But that’s ok, there are lots of other communities that have lots of high density condos, the first time buyer can start there. We shouldn’t be compromising on some of the things that make Chestermere the great community that it has become. Let’s not be conformists, lets continue being Chestermere.

Respectfully,

Mark Hoveland
292 Rainbow Falls Way

Terrible idea, will drop everyone’s property value.

289 Rainbow Falls
Best Regards,
Mark McDonald

As a resident of Chestermere (213 sandpiper cres) I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed bylaw changes as posted on Chestermere website. Having increased housing density as proposed only benefits developers in long run and negatively impacts the larger community. Thoughtful and well planned mixed commercial/residential developments (ie inglewood, Marda loop) can achieve same benefits, while adding value to community as a whole.

Marnie Glendinning
213 sandpiper crescent Chestermere T1X 0Y4,

Bylaw 019-20 in opposition
Bylaw 020-20 in opposition
Mary Moojelsky  
151 Cove Drive  

In regards to by-law 019-20 I am not in agreement with secondary suites. Due to added congestion on streets due to parking & stress on the road ways due to lack of insight in expanding, the roadway via rainbow road & the lack of a turning light going west on 1A. Revamping the community from it's original outline plan should not be a consideration. Developers should have taken the warnings of economic down times 4 years ago in planning this project.

In regards to by-law 020-20 I am not in agreement with this aside from my earlier statement the stress on the water & sewer infrastructure & abilities to add more households is not feasible. I have seen this same scenario in 1980's & 1990's a revamping mid stream through developing a community that was initially approved only to be a hodge podge of real estate with no conformity.

Matt Wilde  
261 Crimson Lane, Chestermere

I'm am writing in opposition to the two bylaws in the subject of this email. We moved to Chestermere 3 years ago because we wanted to get away from the city of Calgary and the feeling that it has in the neighborhoods of being more cramped and crowded. These bylaws seem to be making the newer areas of Chestermere start to feel like an extension of NE Calgary and this is something that we feel would be a detriment to our community. We think Chestermere should be AMAZING by branding itself as different and unique - not simply give in to developers' demands to try and squeeze more houses into the same amount of space. Let's try to keep the small-town feel that everyone loves so much in Chestermere where we have room to live and breathe. Thanks for listening.

Matt & Sheryl Wilde and our growing family of kids.

We moved to Chestermere because it is uncrowded. Please do not move away from the traditional character of Chestermere. Making it crowded will ruin the beauty of Chestermere.

Melissa Pierson  
99 - 300 Marina Dr

I am in stark opposition to the amendments to the MDP and LUB. If the council wants to increase density then townhouses and condos are how it should be done. Build up not out - let us not be Calgary.

Morgan Briggs of 203 Rainbow Falls Dr

To whom it may concern,
I am opposed to the amendments to the Municipal Development plan and Land use Bylaw for the city of Chestermere.

Please reach out if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you
Nathan Dasuki
212 Willowmere Close Chestermere

I am writing to say our household opposes the new land use bylaw that is currently being considered by council.

In opposition of Land use bylaw and MDP bylaw.

Patricia and Matthew Rayner
97 Rainbow Falls Blvd

To Chestermere Council,
I am OPPOSED to amending the MDP and the LUB to remove the 35% cap on planned lots. Perhaps the developers should concentrate on infrastructure before the build high density. Twinning Rainbow Road would be a good place to start and is long overdue. It was and is my understanding (the response that I got from the previous Council), that Rainbow Rd. would be twinned by the developer of Rainbow Falls area.

Patricia Brandt
428 West Creek Bay

Paul Graham 121 rainbow falls blvd
My wife and I are not in favor of allowing changes to density of housing as proposed by developers. NO changes period, in future negotiations must take place in advance not after construction has been started. Not Acceptable!!
Regards, P. D. Graham.

I was referring to both no changes for future or existing period. (referring to Bylaw 019-20 and 020-20) No openers period until further study & negotiations to follow any bylaws.

Pedro Perez, 793 East Lakeview Rd.

In regards to increasing the % of Planned Lots, I am against.

To Whom it May Concern,
I believe that Chestermere has great potential to continue to rise in value and desirability. However to continue to climb, I believe it is important for city council keep in mind the importance of maintaining a balanced socio-economic population while avoiding the disruption of the already great dynamic of our city.

As Chestermere already neighbours some of the lowest income communities on the edge of Calgary, it is important for Chestermere to differentiate itself by continuing to attract higher-income residents, and not become a continuation of these less desirable neighbourhoods.

Additionally creating greater division between the edge of Calgary through increased Commercial zoning would also increase value and exclusivity to our city and also something that I think myself and many Chestermerians would appreciate.

I believe that Chestermere is a City that has the potential to be the envy of the Greater Calgary Area, as long as we focus on increasing property values and desirability, but not necessarily through increased accessibility to our home owners’ market through lower priced options.

I hope my honest opinion has been helpful. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Peter Perez

I am writing as I am vehemently OPPOSED to removing the limit on planned lots in new communities. One of the greatest assets in Chestermere is the larger lots which amounts to more green space, more place for visitor vehicles to park in front of homes and more space for kids to play on front of their homes.

Planned lots in new neighborhoods such as in Calgary are crowded, homes with front driveways allow for very little parking when hosting gatherings as driveways seem to be situated right next to the next home. As well the roads also seem more narrow homes appear closer.

I truly feel planned lots only benefit the developer and I doubt this would lead to more affordable housing in the area instead homes will just be on smaller lots and benefit the developer instead.

Regards
Phoebe Moberg
130 Stonemere Green

Hello,

I think a better way to go about this is to assist families to get into home ownership, with programs similar to the one in Calgary called attainable homes.
Thank you,

Racquel Ramsumair
45-248 Kinniburgh BLVD

To Whom It May Concern,

We are not Calgary. We do not want to be packed in like sardines. The new houses in Chelsea are too much like Calgary as it is and should absolutely not be closer than that! Beyond which, Chestermere does not yet have the schools or emergency services needed to support that many new families! Why would you knowingly add that many people to schools that are already at capacity when you know a new school is still several years away?! Or recreation programs- how much more can we fit into our aging Rec Centre? We want to support our local teams and coaches, but there aren’t enough spots for the players who already live here.

Do not change the land use bylaws. Do not cram in more houses. Protect the integrity of our community feel, and think rationally about the educational and recreational needs of our children. Oh, and don’t forget - neither 17th Ave nor Rainbow Road are ready for that much new traffic. We are already going to struggle with the increase from the new communities as they are. What about a new gas station? 3 stations for so many people is crazy. I thought we wanted people buying local. 2 grocery stores and 3 gas stations does not make that an easy ask when lineups are just going to get longer and longer.

We do not want smaller houses, taller houses, skinnier houses, more densely packed houses. We do not want to be Calgary. People move here because it’s close and easy access to Calgary, but has better space than Calgary.

Don’t change the bylaws.

Mrs Rita Klassen
182 Westchester Cove

Dear city of Chestermere council,

My family and I have been residents of Chestermere for six years. We moved here from Calgary because we could get a bigger lot with a house that was not right on top of our neighbour’s house like a similarly priced property in Calgary would have been. This was the deciding factor for moving here and not a suburb of Calgary, Okotoks, or Airdrie.

If this is taken away, it will only benefit developers. Our schools have already had to be reorganized in order to meet requirements for all of the young families out here. Packing in more people without the proper infrastructure in place seems irresponsible. We do not even have a recreation centre with a pool or even a spray park. This will not attract more people to buy in Chestermere.
What about strengthening our business community and and recreation options before expanding single family residential?
If this is about creating affordable housing, then maybe have developers create more apartment rental/retail space combination options. Building houses closer together with smaller lots only decreases the quality of living that is appealing for living here.

Thank you,

Robyn Weatherley
273 Stonemere Close, Chestermere

I strongly disagree with the proposed land use change for more compact development. the desire for land space keeps home values up and that why we live here.

I do not approve this change.

Ryan Cragg
100 Sandpiper Place

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of Chestermere and have been for more than 8 years. The reason our family moved here is because of the luxurious lake community and the larger lot and house options. In my opinion Chestermere should not be diversifying by adding more affordable housing options. People move to Chestermere to get away from the big city and for the luxury of Chestermere. Adding in more affordable options will only make Chestermere less desirable to those that have paid a lot to live here. We should be proud that our houses cost more than the Alberta averages and continue our luxurious way of life on a city scale. I really hope the decision is made to keep our current bylaws how they are and we can continue to live in a city that has beautiful and large homes.

Sabrina Donamo
530 Marina Dr.

In regard to the “considering amendments to the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and Land Use Bylaw (LUB) that would move away from the large lot single-family homes that are typical of Chestermere’s character”.

Absolutely no! We moved to Chestermere for the large lots and houses. We moved her because it WASN'T CALGARY. Please don't do this. If people want cheeper lots, let them move to Calgary or Into a townhome. Making all the lots little tinny matchstick boxes and postage stamps like sizes will make this community look more like the crowded NE area of Chestermere. NO!

Make it a grateful day,
Samantha Cave
Hello,

Regarding the land use bylaw addressed in the attached picture, I do NOT support this.

Kind regards,

Sheema Cote
145 Shoreline Vista

Shelby Andrew, Marilyn Noel & Adam Kumi
284 West Lakeview Dr T1X1S9

We not in favour of this future land change for making houses closer together in Chestemere.

I (Shelby Andrew) moved out here last August from Calgary, to live with my boyfriend Adam and his mom (until our place in Dawson’s Landing is built) simply to get away from Calgary. Communities in Calgary are so jammed packed together (look at the NE and new communities in the SE for example) There is no space between the homes, there is no parking available on streets, and the safety of having homes so close together is a major fire hazard. Whenever you hear of a fire happening in Calgary now, it’s never just 1 home that is affected, it’s always the ones next to it too because of how close they are together. Why would YOU want that for Chestemere & its residents? We don’t have the amenities of multiple Fire stations like Calgary does, & if god forbid multiples homes did go up in flames - Do you think our Fire Station would be able to handle a multi home blaze? Would other resources need to be called in from outside Chestemere? Probably. Would the time it takes for them to get into Chestemere have a major effect for damage done to the homes? Absolutely.

Marilyn Noel has lived here for over 16 years, when she first moved out here, she wanted to get away from Calgary and its busy life. Chestemere has that small-town vibe and why would you want to get rid of that by putting homes closer together and make it feel more like Calgary? Chestemere is already a one-of-a-kind city. Its spacious, yet everything is within minutes away, our lots are huge & the green spaces and SPACE we have is amazing.

Yes Chestemere is more expensive, property tax wise & just for buying a house in general. But people chose to come here, people chose to spend the money to live out here. WE just bought a house out here for a reason, because of property sizes & land you get for the price you pay. It’s an honour to live out here because it isn’t meant for everyone, not everyone can afford it, and that’s totally fine! That’s why there is Calgary.

You cannot turn this amazing city into a mini Calgary by making properties closer together.
We relocated to Chestermere due to the size of lots and smaller community. Letting these developers come in and Financially BENEFIT from Doubling up housing is NOT right!!! This decreases the value of our home!!!

Question: how many individuals on the board are realtors?????!!!! Is this the reason behind supporting these developers?

We already have been stripped of parking on our cul-de-sacs!!

Now, there’s a possibility of decreasing parking for townhomes?! The average home had 2 vehicles!!!!

This is so not right!! Do not demolish the lake community vibe that Chestermere currently has!

Sheryl Partington
152 Lakeview Shores Court

Hi,
    Sumit Sahota
    154 Topaz gate Chestermere
Vote - No
    I vote no for new house plans and infrastructure Thanks Sumit

Chestermere has an attractive ambience with spacious lots and green areas that sets itself apart from other cities. Despite its growing population it has managed to maintain its small town feel.

We are not in favour of houses being built closer together. The lack of residential parking is already an issue in some areas of Chestermere and this would only exacerbate the problem. More affordable housing options such as condos or townhomes are fine if there is ample parking on site. Without public transportation, it is reasonable to expect each adult in most residences would have a vehicle and there needs to be additional parking for visitors. Parking on both sides of the street is an eyesore and a public safety issue.

We are opposed to the amendments to the Municipal Development Plan and the Land Use Bylaw.

Susan and Ross Johnston
419 Lakeside Greens Court, Chestermere

Tara Moore
152 Stonemere Close

I am opposed to the proposed land use bylaws as I do not think packing more people into already dense areas makes any sense. Chestermere has always had a history of being “outside the big city and living in the country”. Even though we are now a city I don’t think we should lose that distinction. We don’t want to be like a big city. Calgary is only 15 minutes away for those that want to live in cheaper densely
populated areas. Allowing for increased lot coverage, reducing setbacks and changing the planned lots will do nothing to benefit the residents of Chestermere. I would be ok with secondary suites if the other items were retained as is. If you have a large enough lot where you can build a house to accommodate a suite – I am fine with that – but packing more people in with smaller lots, closer together and with reduced parking will just reduce the value of what we already have.

I would rather see an emphasis on drawing more businesses to town and finding ways to support those already here with the population we already have. If you want to become a big city like Calgary than just look into being annexed already and skip the next 25 years of trying to make it on our own before it eventually happens.

Tara Moore

I wanted to say that I think it’s a terrible idea to change the requirements in Chestermere. One of the reasons people live out here is for the quiet, larger lots, the lake not being so busy etc. Building the homes closer to each other and allowing more affordable homes will change the entire feel of our beautiful city. There are plenty of places in Calgary and surrounding areas to obtain these types of homes. We also have a very low crime rate due to our size and the bracket of people chestermere attracts. It’s terrifying to think of our city as just another subdivision style of Calgary and not a different city!

The other concern is also the traffic and roads. It’s already difficult to get in and out of Chestermere during rush hour. Yes twinning and larger roads will help that but it also creates noise, pollution etc for our city which I usually find very quiet and peaceful at night.

The beach and lake is already so over run and busy that as a resident, I can’t take my boat out on a good day.

Just my opinion,

Tiffany McLeod
76 rainbowl falls blvd

I am strongly against going over the 35% cap currently in place. I moved to Chestermere 18 years ago - we were debating between a lot here and one in Somerset in SW Calgary. Each lot was the same price and yet the one here was half again as big. That ended up being the deciding factor to move here. We saw it as more bang for our buck. There are plenty of higher density options in Calgary and I think 35% is enough here.

My husband works in construction in high density areas and cringes at how close together they all are. They are a much bigger fire hazard and as such require extra materials to ensure their safety which then increases the cost. The lack of parking is also ridiculous. Please do not change it!

Thanks

Tracy Hudson
226 Springmere Place Chestermere
I am opposed to all future land use proposals

Restricted Parking
Secondary suites
Increased coverage
Reduced setbacks
Planned Lots

Vanessa Rea
Chestermere Resident
239 Cove Dr

Before we make changes in our zoning bylaws we need to address 17th and provide some services for the residents who already live here.

I am opposed to these changes.

Wendy and Brian Hiebert
247 East Chestermere Drive

To whom it may concern:

I vehemently oppose this land use change that is being considered.

Using the idea that on average Chestermere homes cost 25% more than Alberta is at best misleading, and at worst, completely dishonest. Measure our house prices against the closest house market, and you will find that our houses are on average 20% less expensive than Calgary, which is where the comparison should be based, and at that point, does not at all fit into the narrative of there being a dearth of affordability in Chestermere.

This idea that we need to increase the amount of density in housing will result in MacKenzie Towne type "master planned" neighborhoods that initially seemed great, but now in the fullness of time, are congested, dirty, overpopulated and overgrown messes.

We are and will continue to be a bedroom community until our eventual annexation by Calgary. Chestermere has ample high density housing, and we should be attempting to STOP development in Chestermere as at this current time we're already outgrowing our already stretched thin infrastructure, law enforcement and fire protection services.

With continued growth and increased density, we will again spend more money on police and fire infrastructure, which already take up the lion's share of our tax budget.
My suggestion is to continue finding improvements and cost savings as you have been so successful in doing in the past, and please stop this pointless and destructive behavior of constantly trying to curry favour with developers. The only people who win that game are the developers, certainly not the hard working people of Chestermere who are already living here.

Kind regards,
Wesley Weiss
152 Cove Drive, Chestermere, Alberta

Hi there,
I am opposed the new bylaws 020-20 and 019-20.

Ying Chiu Ng
Owner of 108 Willowmere Close

Hi there,
I am opposed the new bylaws 020-20 and 019-20.

Yuk Lin Lui
Resident of 108 Willowmere Close

Hello,
I wanted to email to inform that I am in favor of the 1.5m side yards and the front drive garage. The other options congest streets and make the community look unclean.

Thank you,
Jen Devolder
101 West Lakeview Point