Submitted: Mon, 01/19/2026 - 11:22

Delegation information

Committee you want to address
Executive Policy Committee

Agenda item you want to address (number and title)
6. Neighbourhood Growth Investment Reserve

Support or oppose recommendations
I am opposed to the recommendations

Register as a delegation_checkbox
Register as a delegation

Register as a delegation
Via zoom

Submit comments in writing checkbox
Submit comments in writing

Comments
Although I am appearing in opposition to the recommendations for the Neighbourhood Growth Investment Reserve, I am strongly in favor of it in principle. However, I am strongly opposed to the conditions detailed in Appendix 1, B. Funding Source.
For years the GNA has requested that some of the increased tax revenues from the extensive infill in Glenwood be used to assist the community in adjusting to the changes. Our councillor, Brian Mayes, for years has pushed for this kind of compensation at many variance hearings concerning infill development in Glenwood. I am pleased to see that the idea has finally come before EPC. However, the final rule in Appendix 1, B. Funding Source, disqualifies nearly all of the infill development in Glenwood from the program.
Over the last decade or so Glenwood has seen more than 150 lots of 50 ft. width, split in half and two “single family” homes, each with a rentable suite, built on the two newly defined lots. This has resulted in the creation of approximately 450 new addresses in Glenwood because the old homes had a single address and living unit on the 50 ft. lots and now there are four addresses or living units on the same land. The beginning of the Housing Accelerator Fund and the consequent changes in zoning have not changed the kinds of developments that comprise most of the more recent infill in Glenwood.
In many cases, these homes with suites are owned by a landlord and both the main unit and suite are rented. All of them could be operated in this manner. I don’t believe there is any logical rationale for disqualifying these kinds of infill developments from the program. I propose that the condition at the end of be Appendix 1, B. Funding Source, “Secondary

suites are not considered dwelling units for the purposes of this reserve." be removed.

I also believe that some of the extra tax revenue in the proposed NGIR program should be used to create recreational space, not just enhance existing space. As a community of primarily single-family homes on 50 x100 ft. lots, Glenwood used to provide recreational space in back yards. As a result of the "lot-split" infill, many back yards have disappeared. From my house I look down Pilgrim Avenue. It is one of the most heavily infill densified streets in Glenwood. That densification has brought more younger families with children, which is wonderful. However, I now watch those children playing in the street because there are no back yards, and there is more traffic and are more cars parked on the streets. The City needs to commit some land to compensate for the loss of outdoor recreational space to continue Glenwood as a safe and vibrant community.

Public engagement (optional)

I consent to being contacted to participate in potential public engagement related to this matter.
Yes

Personal information

First name
Ray

Last name
Hesslein

Email

Phone

Organization title (optional)
Glenwood Neighbourhood Association