

CKE Community Association Board Meeting



Date: December 19, 2024

Time: 7:30pm ~ brought to order at 7:37 pm

Location: CKE Hall

Present - (Highlight yellow):

Glen Haslhofer	Debra McArthur	Jessica Kopitar	Alanna Roberts	Sherri Balm
Zonita Haggis	Suzanne Brown	Lance Titchkosky	Jim MacLean	
Rodney Smith	Matthew Watt	Harry Schaepmeyer	Claudia Woolner	

Observers / Guests:

Christa Zaharychuk (NPC - City of Calgary)	Kourtney Penner (Ward 11)	Nagwan Al-Guneid (MLA Calgary-Glenmore)
Cst Michael Colbert	Sonja Sahlen (Ward 11 Office)	Lauren Duiven/Vicki Duiven (Office of MLA Nagwan Al-Guneid)
Jennifer Sherstabetoff (CKE Hall)		

MOTION: to approve the current agenda. Made by Deb McArthur, seconded by Lance Titchkosky. All in favour. None opposed. Motion carried.

MOTION: to approve November 28th Board meeting minutes. Made by Zonita Haggis, seconded by Rodney Smith. All in favour. None opposed. Motion carried.

Calgary Glenmore MLA Report: Nagwan Al-Guneid/Lauren Duiven/Vicki Duiven

- No Report. Unable to attend.

Calgary Police Service Report: Cst. Michael Colbert

- Report shared by email with the Board and the regular attendee list and discussed at the meeting in the absence of Cst. Colbert.
- Chinook Park: A shed broken into and a bicycle stolen and some car prowlings.
- Kelvin Grove: Multiple vehicles broken into in a business parkade and an assault between tenants in an apartment building.
- Eagle Ridge: Nothing reported.

Ward 11 Office Report: Kourtney Penner/Sonja Sahlen

- Report shared by email with the Board and the regular attendee list, with highlights discussed at the meeting in the absence of Sonja Sahlen.
- Verbatim extracts of topics of greatest interest to CKE below.
- Calgary Plan: See minutes from November meeting for a detailed extract.
- Heritage Communities Local Area Plan Reconnect Project:

- The Heritage Communities Local Area Plan (the Plan) is being updated to align with the Council-approved citywide rezoning that allows single-detached homes, semi-detached homes, townhomes and rowhomes across Calgary (see [Rezoning for Housing](#) for more information).
- As a result, specific policies were removed from the Plan to align with this direction. At the same time, Council directed Administration to re-engage in approved Local Area Plan areas on community improvements found in Chapter 3 and Appendix A of the Plans.
- **The Local Area Plan Reconnect project, including the Heritage Communities Local Area Plan, is scheduled to be presented to the Infrastructure and Planning Committee (IPC) on January 8, 2025.**
- The agenda will be finalized the week prior to Committee, please visit [Council and committee agendas, minutes and video](#) to confirm the agenda.
- You can view the proposed updates to the Plan — with the added Community Improvements based on public feedback, the removed policies, a presentation video, and the project FAQ — online at calgary.ca/LAPreconnect.
- Want to share your thoughts? You can participate in the hearing in many ways, including submitting a letter or speaking to Committee. For more information on how to participate and tip sheets, [click here](#). You can register to speak and/or make a written submission right up until the public hearing is closed by the Committee Chair.
- The tentative date for the Local Area Plan Reconnect project to be presented to Council for approval, if recommended by IPC, is February 4, 2025.
- Thank you to everyone who has dedicated their time and provided input throughout the Reconnect of the Heritage Communities Local Area Plan.
- Update on Rezoning for Housing Recommendations:
 - Council directed Administration to draft a Rowhouse How-to Guide (The Guide) that identifies contextually appropriate design strategies for rowhouse developments. With funding secured through the Housing Accelerator Fund, Administration has scoped the project and is in the process of procuring a consultant that will deliver The Guide in 2025 Q3.
 - The Guide will provide direction for rowhouse developments based on Land Use Bylaw 1P2007, Local Area Plans and other relevant policies. The Guide will emphasize the importance of the relationship between buildings, as well as design and material approaches, to create contextual and quality living environments. This includes promoting appropriate design strategies for site design, built form, amenity space, landscape design and servicing. Minimum standards, best practices and climate considerations will be integrated into The Guide to ensure that it best supports Calgarians, applicants and Administration.
 - Engagement will occur in 2024 Q1-Q2 and will focus on rowhouses, as well as other small-scale housing forms such as single-detached, semi-detached and secondary suites. The outputs from the engagement will inform multiple projects, including other recommendations stemming from the Rezoning for Housing Program, such as the Applicant Outreach Toolkit Update.
 - In 2026, Administration will then bring forward an updated Guide. The updated Guide will be developed to align with the new Zoning Bylaw and the Calgary Plan. Its scope will also provide direction on a broader set of built form options and will replace the existing [Backyard Suite How-to Guide](#), [Landscape Design Guide for Small Residential Sites](#) and the [Low Density Residential Housing Guidelines for Established Communities](#) for simplicity and to avoid redundancy in these development resources.
 - Administration will be engaging with Calgarians, industry and community associations on The Guide in the first half of 2025. This will inform the Rowhouse How-to Guide, Zoning Bylaw and multiple other Council directed projects. Administration will come forward with a report to Council, through Infrastructure and Planning Committee, in 2025 March with a further briefing on the implementation of the Rezoning for Housing initiatives.

City of Calgary NPC Report: Christa Zaharychuk

- Report shared by email with the Board and the regular attendee list, with highlights discussed at the meeting.

- City seeking feedback through the annual External Partner Survey. Members so inclined to complete the survey prior to January 5, 2025.
- Various grant opportunities noted in the Report, including a community standards fund with a deadline of January 26, 2025.
- Various workshops and training noted in the Report, including a “Discussion with the Mayor” event on January 22nd at the Cardel Theatre in Quarry Park. **Deb had indicated an interest in attending.**

Monthly Hall report: Jennifer Sherstabetoff

- Jen had received a request about a rental for most of the summer from the Cerebral Palsy organization, as they needed access to a larger space for their program. The Board was very supportive of this and at a reduced rental rate as per the motion in the November minutes.
- This required some communication with the City to change the short duration use of the Community Hall for a Park and Play session. The City was expected to be fine with this.

Treasurer's Report: Matthew Watt

- Report shared by email with the Board.
- Cash balance increase of basically unchanged from prior month.
- Cash and near cash funds: \$237,000 (\$187,000 in chequing and additional \$50,000 in a redeemable GIC that is designated as a cash reserve)
- One-year term expiring GIC expiring in March (not included in the \$237,000 above): \$50,000
- Unspent casino funds not included above with restrictions on use: \$92,000
- Total funds under control: \$379,000 (\$187,000 readily available and the balance subject to certain restrictions).
- *Note: The earlier minutes reflected a misunderstanding about whether the \$50,000 redeemable GIC was included in the cash total, such that the prior minutes understated the financial position of the Community Association.*
- Had agreed in at the November meeting to add a new \$50,000 one-year GIC and to shift the \$50,000 GIC expiring in March back to regular funds upon its expiry. Logistics were such that this didn't happen prior to the December meeting. **Matt and Zonita to address this.**
- As per the discussion at the November meeting, Matt had wanted to hire someone on a temporary basis to address some old prior period reconciliation book keeping issues with accounts. He will be going with an accounting firm.

MOTION: Motion to approve the Treasurer's Report. Made by Jim MacLean, seconded by Lance Titchkosky. All in favour. None opposed. Motion carried.

Planning Report: Rodney Smith

- **1044 78 Ave SW-Development Permit DP2024-04236**
 - New single detached dwelling
 - Appeal to SDAB held on December 19, 2024
 - Doug McNeill attended and made submission on behalf of CKE Community Association (Rodney Smith also in attendance)
 - SDAB reserved its decision.
- **8224 and 8228 Elbow Drive SW – Development Permit – DP2024-05001**
 - New dwelling unit – 12 units with 12 basement suites (24 units total)
 - This has been revised from previous plan in incorporate the adjacent lot.
- **8039 Elbow Drive SW – Development Permit – DP2024-07032**
 - New dwelling unit – 6 units with 6 basement suites (12 units total)
 - Significant opposition from neighbours

- **1043 Kildonan Cr SW – Development Permit – DP2024-06722**
-Addition to rear of house – single detached dwelling
-Project plans shared with Report
- **8031 Chardie Rd SW – Development Permit – DP2024-06857**
-Home occupations – Class 2 (Personal Trainer) – 3 years
- **7211 Kananaskis Dr SW – Development Permit – DP2024-07069**
-Relaxation for air conditioning unit – projection into side setback
- **7331 Keewatin St SW – Development Permit – DP2024-07587**
-Home occupation – Class 2 (Consultant) – 18 months
- **7828 Calla Donna Pl SW – Development Permit – DP2024-07484**
-New single detached dwelling on existing foundation
-Project plans shared with Report

Social Report: Suzanne Brown

- No Report. Unable to attend.
- Reminder that Cheers and Beers is on February 8th and that there's a need for volunteers.

General Discussion:

- Concern expressed by resident: A resident presented a question/concern to the Board as follows:

"...I am reaching out with a question regarding the CKE Community Association's involvement in the court challenge reportedly filed against the City concerning updated rezoning rules coming into effect. Specifically:

1. ***Is the CKE Community Association formally part of this legal challenge? If so, what was our C.A.'s submission?***
2. ***If so, how was the decision made to participate? Was it a decision made solely by the board, or was the broader community consulted? If there was consultation by the board, was an unbiased and comprehensive approach used to gauge community sentiment? For example, a prior survey distributed in the community took a perspective that may have influenced responses toward a specific conclusion.***

I am also concerned that this approach, coupled with the evident bias of certain board members who are actively involved in the Restrictive Covenant campaign across our communities, does not accurately reflect the broader sentiment of the community.

When the CKE C.A. uses its platform to advance a particular political stance, it risks alienating and misrepresenting other voices in the community who do not share the same views."

Board Response: The CKE Community Association has had no involvement in the court challenge instigated by certain citizens (the Robert Lehodey legal challenge noted in this link: <https://calgary.citynews.ca/2024/12/11/calgary-blanket-rezoning-court-challenge-returns/>). The CKE Community Association was not a party to the court challenge. The CKE Community Association has not contributed any amount to the funding of the court challenge or otherwise provided any support for the court challenge. Neither the CKE Community Association nor any member of the Board has ever had any discussions with any of the proponents of the court challenge about possible involvement of the CKE Community Association with the court challenge. In fact, there has never been any discussion by the CKE Community Association Board about the possibility of providing any letter of support or otherwise becoming involved in the court challenge in any form whatsoever. Put simply, there is no

factual basis for any belief that the CKE Community Association is involved in any way in this court challenge or that our Board even discussed possible involvement.

Turning to the concern about potential “evident bias” of certain of our Board members, the Board had responded to a similar concern about certain of our Board members privately about a year ago, so we will largely repeat that response again in our minutes in the interest of transparency with the broader CKE Community.

Two current members of the CKE Community Association Board (Jim MacLean and Rodney Smith) and one former member of the Board who has recently moved from CKE (Doug McNeill) were involved significantly in the private resident CKE initiative respecting Restrictive Covenants.

That involvement mostly pre-dated their involvement with the Board, as the critical mass of work on that initiative (i.e., resident engagement, engaging legal counsel, preparation of the website, preparation of the form of the Restrictive Covenant and execution of the Restrictive Covenant by the signatories in Kelvin Grove) had been done before the summer of 2023 and prior to them joining the Board. For context, the choice whether to participate in the Restrictive Covenant initiative was an individual choice of landowners. It was not a CKE Community Association matter per se, given that the Board has always remained neutral on that issue.

The composition of the CKE Board reflects the overall diversity of CKE, including a diversity of perspectives on this particular issue. We have some members who have executed the new Restrictive Covenants. We have some Chinook Park residents whose homes are subject to the old Restrictive Covenants that were created when that neighbourhood was initially developed. And we have some members who chose not to sign the new Restrictive Covenants.

With that overarching context, it is important to recall that the mandate of the CKE Board is to address a very broad range of matters that affect CKE as a whole. These include our finances, social events, services and programs for community members, overall governance, how to increase memberships and interest and involvement within CKE, maintenance of and improvements to the Community Hall and rental of the Community Hall, as well getting general updates from the City, our Councillor’s office and our MLA’s office that may require some action on our part. In other words, the mandate of the CKE Board extends well beyond the Heritage LAP, the City’s subsequent blanket rezoning by-law and any concerns that might be raised by residents as individual developments are proposed in our Community.

Any suggestion that members of our Community who are willing to volunteer their time to help improve CKE should somehow automatically be disenfranchised from serving on the CKE Board because their personal views on one particular issue are different than a preferred view of a subset of residents on that issue is very problematic for us.

If one were to apply the same logic, it would follow that anyone who disagreed with the Restrictive Covenant initiative should similarly be disqualified from serving on the Board because their position on that single issue was different from the significant subset of residents who signed the new Restrictive Covenants or were already subject to one of the old Restrictive Covenants in the western part of Chinook Park.

The net effect is that the Board does not believe that a resident’s personal beliefs about Restrictive Covenants or rezoning dictates whether a resident may or may not serve on the Board of the CKE Community Association.

The Board acknowledges that the personal preferences of an individual Director on a particular issue could be a problem: (i) if those views were disruptive to the ability of the Board to assess an issue objectively and to fulfil the Board’s mandate for the benefit of our Community; or (ii) if the applicable individual(s) were to have undue influence on the decisions of the Board. This is a matter of Board dynamics that could arise with respect to any particular issue, though, and high-functioning Boards are

able to manage any such potential issue in its very early stages in a way that enables a Board to work well together. In this regard, it is very important to note that all decisions made by the Board following the 2023 AGM (and the involvement of Doug, Jim and Rodney on the Board) have been on a consensus basis, which we believe reflects that we are a high-functioning Board.

In this case, the applicable individuals were very open about their involvement in the Restrictive Covenant initiative in the interest of transparency. However, they have made no attempt to encourage the Board to become involved in either promoting the Restrictive Covenant initiative to residents or becoming involved in the administration or enforcement of the new Restrictive Covenants or the old Restrictive Covenants in Chinook Park. In fact, several Directors present at the December meeting expressed surprise that the allegation of bias had been made at all based on their interfaces over the last 18 months with the Directors about whom this suggestion was made.

For clarity, it is also important to note that every submission that the CKE Board has made with respect to any planning type matter has reflected the unanimous position of the CKE Board with respect to the applicable submission after due consideration by all Directors of the relevant issue and its implications for our Community.

To suggest that the applicable Board members have conducted themselves with “evident bias” without actually knowing how they work with the other members of the CKE Board is not a fair comment about either those individuals or the ability of the CKE Board to work together collaboratively to advance the interests of our Community for the benefit of our residents collectively.

It is important to note that all Directors have had full opportunity to comment on a draft of these minutes and the response to the stated concern, such that the discussion of the concern in these minutes is the response of the Board.

MOTION: Motion to adjourn the meeting. Made by Jim MacLean, seconded by Deb McArthur. All in favour. None opposed. Motion carried.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:40 pm. Minutes taken and completed by Jim MacLean.

Action Items		
What	Who	When
Continued investigation with City about engineered walkway status.	Christa	As feasible over time. (Just retained here so that it's not forgotten.)
Consider available information of relevance from the City's Community Association updates module when preparing e and print newsletters.	Zonita/Lance	Ongoing
Confirm with the Cerebral Palsy organization the willingness to have them use our Hall for their summer program at a reduced rate.	Jen	Shortly after meeting.
Reach out to City to advise them about the rental of the Hall over the summer to the Cerebral Palsy organization, which would conflict with hosting a short duration Park and Play session in the summer.	Jen	Shortly after meeting to give City the opportunity to find an alternative site.
Add a new \$50,000 one-year term GIC given pending March expiry of the current one-year term GIC. (Current expiring one-year term GIC will see those funds returning to general funds after expiry.)	Matt and Zonita	When practicable