



**TOWN OF CANMORE
RECORD OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
Public Hearing**

Council Chamber at the Canmore Civic Centre, 902 – 7 Avenue
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 at 9:00 a.m.

This document contains the written submissions received in response to the notice of public hearing for the following bylaw:

Removing Tourist Homes as a Use in Various Land Use Districts

- **Bow Valley Trail Area Redevelopment Plan Bylaw Amendment 2025-02 – Removal of Tourist Homes**
- **Teepee Town Area Redevelopment Plan Bylaw Amendment 2025-03 – Removal of Tourist Homes**
- **Revised Land Use Bylaw Amendment 2025-04 – Removal of Tourist Homes**

Submissions are sorted in alphabetical order. If you are viewing the electronic version, please use the bookmarks feature to scroll through the document.

This record of written submissions was compiled by Ben Stiver, Municipal Clerk, on March 11, 2025.

From: [Info](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Written request to address the public hearing.
Sent: 2025-03-10 6:29:10 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mayor Krausert, Council and the good people of Canmore,

We would like to say that we are speaking from the position of possible ignorance, therefore, the intentions of the by law changes don't seem to be laid out in the 'Land Use Bylaw Amendment Circulation' in a way that explains their impact. We did contact the Mayor and his assistant, but have been told that neither will enter into further correspondence with us, having politely asked a few simple questions. This is left us struggling to find out detailed information about changes to bylaws and rezoning of parts of Canmore. It is refreshing to have a public hearing. The land use by law amendment circulation, seem to be a "work in progress" document, with many items being crossed out.

We believe that many of these By-Law changes are not having the effect which the council is looking for. As an example. Some of our neighbours who live in their homes full time but are zoned for tourist accommodation, are now being asked to pay additional tax. To meet this new tax bill the residents are having to take on short-term rentals, while they are out of town to cover this. The alternative is to give up the right to accommodate tourists, a privilege which was paid for on purchasing their condos and which is becoming a valuable asset which few wish to give up. Relinquishing the ability to do short-term rentals, could affect the value of their home by tens of thousands of dollars.

Having more than 20 years experience in the vacation rental space and with contacts all over the world, we can say that the introduction of taxation and bans on vacation rentals, has little or no effect on the housing situation. Hotels lobby politicians in an effort to eliminate their competition. The politicians who have failed to build enough houses then have a great scapegoat in vacation rental homeowners. Approximately 4% of Canmore properties are tourist homes hardly making any changes relevant to the housing situation. Sadly in both Vancouver and Toronto, the introduction of additional taxes has not seen a reduction in the homeless or people seeking accommodation close to the town centre.

It seems that many civil liberties are being eroded by some of the bylaw changes in Canmore. All residents will now be monitored as to when they are in or out of town so that the new out of town tax can be imposed on non-residence. Along with apps for monitoring dog walking and parking within the town Canmore council can quickly build up a very detailed picture of peoples movements and the activities in which they partake. Many of these bylaws have been passed without public consultation and in some situations the council seems to lack the ability to ask for help on specific subjects they are not familiar with.

We hope that following the public consultation on the land use bylaws, a more detailed document explaining exactly what these changes will mean in plain English will be published before any action is taken.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to make comment.

Best wishes
Richard and Dallas Colwell

=====

From: [Bob Fang](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Amendments to Short-Term Rental Bylaws in Canmore
Sent: 2025-02-26 1:55:31 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of Canmore Town Council and Clerk,

I am writing to express my strong concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the short-term rental (STR) bylaws that are set to be discussed at the upcoming public hearing on March 11. As a business owner in Canmore, I am deeply troubled by the potential prohibition of STRs in certain districts within the town of Canmore, as this decision could have significant negative consequences for our local economy, tourism industry, and broader community.

Short-term rentals play an essential role in attracting visitors from around the world to Canmore. These travelers contribute not only to accommodations but also to restaurants, retail stores, recreational activities, transportation services, and countless other businesses throughout the town. The economic ripple effect generated by STRs benefits not just Canmore residents, but Albertans and Canadians alike. Tourism is a cornerstone of our local economy, and any measures that restrict or prohibit STRs will undoubtedly hinder growth and prosperity in our region and our province.

By limiting STR operations, we risk deterring tourists who rely on flexible accommodation options during their visits. This would result in fewer visitors coming to Canmore, Banff and the National Parks, leading to reduced revenue for local businesses and potentially forcing some to close their doors permanently. Moreover, such restrictions may discourage investment in properties and deter entrepreneurs looking to establish new ventures tied to tourism—a sector that has long been vital to our community's identity and success.

While I understand the importance of balancing residential needs with tourism demands, outright prohibitions on STRs in certain areas seem excessive and counterproductive. Instead, I urge you to consider alternative solutions that address concerns without stifling the livelihoods of so many individuals and businesses dependent on tourism. For example, implementing regulations that ensure responsible operation of STRs could strike a fair balance between supporting homeowners' rights and maintaining neighborhood harmony.

Canmore's charm lies in its ability to welcome people from all walks of life while fostering a vibrant economy rooted in hospitality and adventure. Restrictive bylaws that limit short-term rentals threaten this delicate equilibrium and jeopardize the future of Canmore, Banff and Alberta's prosperity.

I respectfully ask that you reconsider these proposed amendments and engage further with stakeholders—including business owners, residents, and tourists—to develop policies that support sustainable growth for everyone involved. Our collective goal should be to preserve Canmore's status as a premier destination while ensuring it remains a thriving place to live, work, and visit.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this perspective.

Sincerely,

Bob

From: [Ashley Frost](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Re: Removing Tourist Homes in BVT-C
Sent: 2025-03-03 9:29:44 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Cheryl,

Thank you. Below please find my submission.

To Whom It May Concern,

RE: Opposition to the Removal of Tourist Homes in BVT-C

I am the owner of a property in the BVT-C area of Canmore, which I purchased in 2021. Since then, it has been registered and operated as a tourist home. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed by-law change that seeks to eliminate tourist homes in this zone.

Financial Implications:

Since 2022, my property tax assessment has increased by 65%. In Canmore, tourist homes are taxed at a rate approximately three times higher than residential properties. Reducing the number of eligible tourist homes will decrease the higher-taxed property base, potentially leading to increased tax burdens on the remaining tourist homes or a shortfall in municipal revenue.

Zoning Instability:

Over the past four years, the zoning designations for tourist versus non-tourist homes in Canmore have undergone multiple revisions. Notably, effective 2024, owners can no longer declare personal use for their tourist home properties, resulting in all tourist homes being taxed at the higher rate, even if owner-occupied. This constant regulatory flux creates instability and uncertainty for property owners, undermining investor confidence and disrupting long-term planning.

Economic and Community Impact:

Tourist homes play a vital role in supporting Canmore's local economy by providing accommodations that attract visitors, who in turn contribute to various sectors, including retail, dining, and entertainment. Eliminating tourist homes contradicts the town's objectives of fostering vibrant communities and may lead to decreased tourism revenue, adversely affecting local businesses and the broader community.

Conclusion:

I purchased my property with the legitimate expectation, based on existing zoning laws, that I could operate a tourist home. The proposed by-law change not only threatens my investment but also undermines the principles of fair governance and economic stability. I urge the council to consider the broader implications of this decision and to engage with stakeholders to develop a more balanced approach that supports both community interests and property owners' rights.

Sincerely,

Ashley

From: [Charles Glahome](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Changes to Short-Term Rental By-Laws
Sent: 2025-03-03 10:05:41 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Municipal members,

I am writing to express my concerns and disagreement regarding Canmore's proposed changes to the short-term rental by-laws, particularly with respect to tourist home properties.

As someone who is directly impacted by these changes, I believe the proposed restrictions on tourist home properties could have unintended consequences for both homeowners and the local economy. These changes will limit the flexibility that homeowners currently have in utilizing their properties, something a vast majority of tourist homeowners categorically sought when purchasing a Tourist Zoned home. Specifically, the restriction would make it more difficult for property owners to offer short-term rentals, a practice that supports tourism and helps sustain local businesses in Canmore. Especially considering the proposed developments of downtown, and the town as a whole, are focused on the long term goal of making Canmore a tourist destination.

I understand that the intention behind these changes is to address concerns around housing affordability and community well-being, something that drastically and urgently needs resolving for the long term sustainability of Canmore. The lack of available, affordable and appropriate long term housing for locals is a major issue here and has only got considerably worse over the last few years. It has been sad to see so many local residents forced to leave their homes and the town because of the removal of available and affordable housing options. Specifically in Spring Creek, Teepee town and downtown areas of Canmore where affordable housing units have been replaced with mostly STR properties.

I believe there are alternative solutions that could better achieve these goals without imposing such significant restrictions on property owners who operate in good faith, adhere to existing regulations and have been paying the higher rates of property tax. The planning and development of housing for local residents should be a priority, utilizing and enforcing the regulation for residents to work a minimum of 20 hrs per week in the valley is a great option that should be used for more residential properties all across Canmore. Better consideration and planning of the town's direction and proposed goals when deciding on future developments and building would also be a step in the right direction.

A couple of questions I would like to ask,

1. What enforcement is being done to stop the illegal STR's in residentially zoned properties around Canmore? Now currently, and into the future?
2. What research and investigation has been done to predict how many tourist zoned properties would actually convert to residential? And how many properties would that be? - My feeling is the outcome would be the opposite, with more units choosing tourist zoned status to protect the value of their investment.
3. Why approve permits and allow for hundreds of new tourist zoned properties to be built over the last few years to then reverse the decision and withdraw the tourist home designation?

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to working together to find a suitable solution that will benefit all parties involved.

Sincerely, Charles

March 7th, 2025

RE: Support for Tourist Homes in Canmore

Dear Town of Canmore,

I am writing to express my support for the continued use of tourist homes in our community, particularly regarding the ability to rent out vacation homes for longer periods of time, beyond the typical 28-day limit.

As a host, I have found that renting out my vacation rental for extended stays benefits both the community and the guests. Many of my guests are seasonal workers who come to Canmore for employment opportunities in industries such as hospitality, construction, and outdoor recreation. By being able to host these guests for more than a month, I am providing them with a stable and affordable living option while also contributing to the local economy.

Furthermore, tourist homes help address the ongoing housing shortage in Canmore. By opening up vacation properties to longer-term rentals, we are adding to the available housing stock for individuals who may struggle to find suitable accommodations in the area. This flexibility benefits both residents and those working in Canmore who might otherwise have to look outside the town for housing, which can be less convenient and create longer commuting times.

Tourist homes also provide an additional revenue stream for homeowners, allowing them to maintain their properties and contribute to the local economy through taxes and service use. The income generated from renting out vacation properties supports local businesses, including cleaning services, property management, and maintenance, which in turn helps create jobs in the community.

Moreover, by allowing hosts to rent their properties to seasonal workers or other long-term guests, Canmore can continue to attract skilled professionals who are essential to the town's operations during the busy seasons. This is especially beneficial in Canmore's tourism-driven economy, where skilled seasonal workers contribute greatly to the success of the hospitality and outdoor industries.

In addition to providing housing options for workers, tourist homes contribute to the town's cultural diversity. Many long-term guests come from different regions or even other countries, bringing a unique perspective and enriching the local community. This diversity is important for Canmore's development, as it fosters a welcoming and global atmosphere. It also creates opportunities for residents to interact with a wide range of people and cultures, enhancing the overall social fabric of the town.

Additionally, tourist homes help support Canmore's local economy in off-peak seasons. Seasonal workers often rent properties in the quieter months, helping businesses in the area stay afloat year-round. This helps maintain the vitality of local shops, restaurants, and services that are essential to Canmore's character and economy. Without the stability provided by

longer-term stays, many of these businesses would face financial struggles during the slower seasons.

Tourist homes also help to alleviate the strain on the local rental market, which is often tight and highly competitive. By allowing homeowners to offer their properties as longer-term tourist homes, the town can reduce pressure on other types of rental housing, offering more options to residents and seasonal workers alike. This can ease the overall housing crisis in Canmore and provide more flexibility for those in need of accommodation.

Tourist homes also offer enhanced local community engagement. Long-term guests are more likely to engage with the community beyond being just visitors. They often contribute to local events, volunteer opportunities, and social causes, fostering stronger community bonds.

Moreover, these homes help reduce pressure on hotels by offering an alternative for longer stays, which can free up rooms for transient visitors and offer a more diverse range of accommodation options in Canmore. This diversification allows us to cater to different types of travelers, from long-term workers to short-term vacationers.

Long-term rentals in tourist homes can also contribute to better property maintenance. As homeowners host guests for extended periods, they are more inclined to keep their properties in good condition, which ultimately benefits the surrounding neighborhood by maintaining a higher standard of living.

In addition, by creating a stable income through longer-term rentals, homeowners gain financial stability, which allows them to reinvest in their properties, contributing to overall community growth. This financial stability can also allow homeowners to stay in Canmore, preventing the displacement of residents due to rising property prices.

Lastly, extending the availability of tourist homes beyond short-term rentals helps create a more sustainable tourism model. Instead of relying solely on transient visitors who stay for only a few days, we can cater to individuals and families looking for a home-like experience over a longer term. This helps to balance the tourism-driven economy with the needs of local residents and workers, ensuring that Canmore remains a thriving community year-round. Longer-term rentals also tend to have less impact on the environment compared to short-term tourism, as they reduce the need for frequent turnover and resource-intensive cleaning between stays.

Additionally, many property owners, like myself, purchased our homes with the understanding that they were zoned for use as tourist homes. These zoning regulations were a significant factor in our decision to invest in Canmore's real estate market. Changing these regulations after homeowners have made long-term financial commitments is unfair and opens the town up to legal issues. It is essential for property owners to have the confidence that the rules they bought into will remain consistent, as this directly impacts their ability to generate income and support their investment. Revoking the right to use these properties as tourist homes would not only undermine property owners' rights but could also have negative repercussions on the local economy, which benefits from the contributions of these homeowners.

Along 2nd Avenue, there are only a handful of homes that haven't been developed into tourist homes. These properties are already surrounded by tourist homes, so it seems illogical and counterproductive to prevent this part of the area from having tourist homes. Allowing these properties to continue as tourist homes would maintain the character of the neighborhood and contribute to the overall cohesion of the area. The existing infrastructure and environment are already set up to support this type of use, and restricting it now would be unfair to property owners who are already in this area and have invested with the zoning in mind.

The benefits of tourist homes extend beyond the financial and social aspects, as they also contribute to the overall sustainability and livability of the town. With Canmore's growing popularity as a tourist destination, it is crucial that we adopt policies that support long-term, responsible tourism, while also taking into account the needs of both residents and visitors. Allowing for longer-term tourist homes is an important step in achieving this balance.

I hope that the town will consider the many positive impacts of tourist homes, both for the workforce that supports our local economy and for homeowners who are able to provide essential housing options. This flexibility ensures that Canmore remains a vibrant, attractive community for both residents and visitors alike.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mai Lee

Good morning. I'm James Nygren

Disclosure: I own and have resided in a Tourist Home in Canmore as my primary residence for over 17 years with the Town's full knowledge and approval. I reside in the development area covered by Bylaw 2025-02.

We're here to discuss Bylaws 2025 - 02, 03, 04 which are intended to remove Tourist Homes as a permitted or discretionary use in several land use districts. This is in alignment with the Livability Task Force recommendations, which also resulted in a subsequent Housing Action Plan.

While we're not here to discuss the Livability Task Force report, I can comment that I feel the Report and Action Plan are somewhat flawed and illogical in their recommendations.

Regarding the proposed Bylaws, I have conflicting opinions in that on one hand I could support them but also oppose them.

Personally, I would support the Bylaws, because by limiting the growth of Tourist Homes and the recent conversion of approximately 41 Tourist Homes to residential, there would be fewer Tourist Homes which could result in a higher market value of my property when in the future I decide to sell.

On the other hand, there are several reasons to oppose the proposed Bylaws:

- from the February 4th Council minutes, removing Tourist Homes in Three Sisters Village, Smith Creek, Silver Tip and Spring Creek is not being addressed at this time, but will be considered in future consultations with the appropriate developers. If removing Tourist Homes from these areas is not successful and these Bylaws are approved, it could mean a double standard exists in Town. This is a reason these Bylaws should not be approved until consultations with the developers have concluded.

- has Council analyzed the recent growth of Tourist Homes in the development areas covered by these Bylaws? Is it significant enough to prohibit future Tourist Homes or is Council simply following the Task Force recommendations?

Thank you.

From: [Cheryl Rostek](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to "Removing Tourist Homes as a Use in Various Districts - Bylaws 2025-02, 2025-03, 2025-04"
Sent: 2025-03-05 3:59:06 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Madam/Sir & Town Council,

I am writing to express my **OPPOSITION** to the following proposed amendments regarding Tourist Home Use in Canmore:

1. (BYLAW 2025-04) Proposed amendments that would remove Tourist Homes as a permitted or discretionary use in the following nine sections of the LUB, along with the repeal of all related sections:
 - o Sections 3.18 - Teepee Town Comprehensive Redevelopment District (TPT-CR)
 - o Section 4.1 - Town Centre District (TC)
 - o Section 4.2 - Gateway Commercial District (GD)
 - o Section 4.3 - Gateway Commercial District with Automotive Uses (GD-2)
 - o Section 4.4 - Bow Valley Trail Central Commercial District
 - o Section 4.5 - Bow Valley Trail Teepee Town Commercial District
 - o Section 4.6 - Bow Valley Trail General District
 - o Section 14.24 - Town Centre 1 Direct Control District
 - o Section 14.32 - Canmore Hotel Direct Control District
2. (BYLAW 2025-02) Proposed amendments that would remove Tourist Homes from the Bow Valley Trail Area Redevelopment Plan, including the following sections:
 - o Section 5.1.1
 - o Section 5.1.3
 - o Section 6.1.3, subsection 15
 - o Section 6.2.3, subsection 1 in the second instance of subsections
3. (BYLAW 2025-03) Proposed amendments that would remove Tourist Homes from the Teepee Town Area Redevelopment Plan, including the following sections:
 - o Section 3.1, paragraph 4
 - o Section 4.1.5, Policy 2

To be clear: I am in **OPPOSITION** to all proposed amendments that seek to eliminate or remove Tourist Homes as a permitted use, both in the LUB and in the applicable ARPs where Tourist Homes are currently allowed or permitted.

For the record: This email is to be considered as an expression of **OPPOSITION**, and not as a "Neutral or Unstated" stance.

Cheryl Rostek

Sent from my iPad

From: [Teryn Rostek](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to "Removing Tourist Homes as a Use in Various Districts - Bylaws 2025-02, 2025-03, 2025-04"
Sent: 2025-03-02 8:07:24 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Madam/Sir, & Town Council:

I am emailing to voice my **OPPOSITION** to all of the following proposed amendments regarding Tourist Home Use in Canmore:

1) (BYLAW 2025-04) Proposed amendments removing Tourist Home as a permitted or discretionary use in the following nine sections of the LUB, as well as all sections repealed in the following:

- Sections 3.18- Teepee Town Comprehensive redevelopment District (TPT-CR)
- Section 4.1- Town Centre District (TC)
- Section 4.2- Gateway Commercial District (GD)
- Section 4.3- Gateway Commercial District with Automotive Uses (GD-2)
- Section 4.4- Bow Valley Trail Central Commercial District
- Section 4.5- Bow Valley Trail Teepee Town Commercial District
- Section 4.6- Bow Valley Trail General District
- Section 14.24- Town Centre 1 Direct Control District
- Section 14.32- Canmore Hotel Direct Control District

2) (BYLAW 2025-02) Proposed amendments eliminating Tourist Homes from to the Bow Valley Trail Area Redevelopment Plan, including the following sections:

- Section 5.1.1
- Section 5.1.3
- Section 6.1.3, subsection 15
- Section 6.2.3, subsection 1 in the second instance of subsections

3) (BYLAW 2025-03) Proposed amendments eliminating Tourist Homes from to the Teepee Town Area Redevelopment Plan, including the following sections:

- Section 3.1, paragraph 4
- Section 4.1.5, Policy 2

To be absolutely clear: I am in **OPPOSITION** to all of the proposed amendments eliminating or removing Tourist Homes as a permitted use in both the LUB as well as the relevant ARPs to which Tourist Homes currently exist or are permitted.

For the record: This email is to be considered in **OPPOSITION**. It is not to be considered as a "Neutral or Unstated" position.

Teryn Rostek (Zoller)

From: [Jasminder Soin](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Land use Bylaw Amendment for Tourist Homes (2025-04)
Sent: 2025-03-06 9:11:48 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi there,

My name is Jasminder Soin, and I am a "Tourist Home" unit owner in [REDACTED] (TheLodges at Canmore Complex).

I appreciate the town's efforts to address the housing shortage. I understand the town of Canmore is currently considering the removal of Tourist homes in favor of more Residential zoning to address the need for long-term housing in our building. While the goal of increasing residential availability is important, eliminating Tourist home zoning may have some unintended consequences that negatively impact part time residents such as myself, the tourism industry, and local businesses. In my view, a balanced approach that preserves Tourist home zoning while also expanding residential opportunities would be a more effective solution for Canmore's long-term success.

We purposefully purchased a "Tourist home" because of the flexibility it affords us. We have a home in Calgary, but our family moves into our unit for the winter months as our kids are involved in a ski program. Canmore is truly our other home. During the summer, to offset the cost, we take advantage of renting our unit on a short term basis for periods when we are not using it (though we spend a lot of time in Canmore during the spring, summer, and fall seasons as well). There is a rental pool in our building, and this is the main reason we purchased in this particular building.

Removing this zoning option in the Lodges at Canmore complex seems counterproductive, as it was purpose-built as a Hotel condo. With Tourist home zoning, we are charged higher property taxes that, in turn, support the town of Canmore. Switching our unit to "Residential" zoning in a Hotel condo, thereby making ourselves and future owners unable to access the rental pool, seems counterproductive. In the same vein, "Visitor accommodation" would prevent a future owner from staying for prolonged periods during the winter months like we do now. For ourselves, if we were unable to rent out our unit as a short-term rental, we would opt to leave the property vacant removing our unit from the market entirely.

Canmore thrives as a destination for travelers seeking outdoor adventure. Hotels alone cannot meet the diverse accommodation needs of visitors, many of whom prefer vacation rentals for stays in self-contained units. Tourist home zoning ensures a variety of lodging options, and provides an avenue for part time residents such as ourselves while also serving a need for the town. With this change, you will be reducing the number of short term rentals available in Canmore, and may push visitors to alternative destinations as the already high costs of tourist accommodation will continue to rise. This could potentially reduce the tourism revenue on which many Canmore businesses rely.

I understand that striking this balance between tourism and housing is challenging in a town such as Canmore. Rather than eliminating Tourist home zoning altogether in the Lodges at Canmore, my hope is that we look for alternative solutions to address the housing shortage. This zoning provides for a particular type of use that our family finds valuable, and is well suited for The Lodges at Canmore complex which is a Hotel condo.

I would be happy to discuss this further and explore potential solutions.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely, Jasminder Soin

From: [Rajka Tulik](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: TPT-CR District land
Sent: 2025-03-07 2:19:13 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed changes to Bylaw (2025-04) as it pertains to TPT-CR. Our decision to invest in Canmore and develop property in Teepee Town was made based on specific and clearly outlined bylaw requirements. These bylaws were a crucial factor in our decision-making process, and had they been different, we would not have proceeded with our investment.

The proposed amendments to these bylaws threaten to undermine not only the use of our property but also its market value. The sudden and unjust modification of these regulations compromises the long-term stability and viability of our investment, and we strongly believe that this change is both unfair and unreasonable.

We respectfully urge you to reconsider these proposed changes, as they effectively "yank the rug" from under property owners who have made significant investments based on the existing rules. This course of action does not seem to take into account the hard work, planning, and financial commitment that has been put into developing within Teepee Town.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and strongly encourage you to act in a manner that respects the integrity of existing investments in Canmore.

Sincerely,
Shon and Rajka Tulik
[REDACTED]

From: [Jane Ward](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Written Input for the Public Hearing Land Use ByLaw change to TC
Sent: 2025-01-31 10:17:04 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam

Apologies that I cannot attend the public hearing in person.

I understand this proposed amendment follows up on the recent Housing Action Plan adopted by Council in 2024. I also understand the Town's desire to restrict and regulate Tourist Homes, I do however wish the following points to be considered regarding existing Tourist Homes:-

1. Affected properties within the TC District were purchased for their flexibility of use, be it residential/tourist/personal. To remove this flexibility, fundamentally alters what was purchased in good faith, and is unduly punitive.
2. "Previously approved tourist homes may continue to exist in their current form provided that they **'are not vacant for six consecutive months'**."

This blanket rule is far too rigid. It fails to consider the prospect of a tourist home being vacant through no fault of the owner, for reasons such as reconstruction of the building following fire/force majeure etc.

It would be unduly punitive for an owner to lose the Tourist Home classification in this scenerio, when the property is literally unsafe and uninhabitable.

At the very least there should be a caveat to the 'six month vacancy rule', to allow for specific situations beyond the owners control, which would protect the Tourist Home designation, during rebuild etc.

I appreciate your consideration of the above points.

Kind regards

Jane Ward

To: Mayor and Council,
Town of Canmore

Re: Bylaw 2025-04

I support the Livability Task Force recommendation to limit the growth of Tourist Homes. Consequently, I support the revisions (with one exception – see below) proposed in the bylaw to eliminate, from the Land Use Bylaw (LUB), Tourist Home as a discretionary use in many districts of Canmore.

My wife and I live in a condominium unit in the Town Centre district. It has an approved discretionary use - Tourist Home; until Dec 31st, 2024, we paid municipal taxes as tax class Tourist Home - Personal Use. Effective January 1st. 2025 we opted to keep our unit with the Tourist Home use and we are now paying municipal taxes as class Tourist Home.

My concern with the proposed bylaw is that there seems to be no content that addresses the "grandfathering" of our unit's Tourist Home use. When the bylaw is approved Tourist Home will no longer be a discretionary Use in the Town Centre district where we live.

I think it is very important that our (and all other Tourist Home Owners) ability to use our unit as a non-conforming Tourist Home is documented in some way in the LUB. I think this could be accomplished by adding a clause something like this to section 1.16 Non-Conforming Buildings and Uses of the LUB:

"Tourist Homes that exist or have been approved to be built prior to the date of passage of Bylaw 2025-04 shall be allowed to continue to have their Tourist Home use provided a Change of Use is not approved".

A clause like that would assure Owners of Tourist Homes, that the allowed non-conforming Tourist Home use of their property will not be changed unless a Change of Use is requested. i.e. confirming "grandfathering" of those properties to have a Tourist Home use. Also, if at some future time I wish to sell my unit I need to be able to confirm in some documented way to the buyer that they could use the unit as a Tourist Home. Adding a clause to the LUB, like the one I suggested above would let me do that.

It would be very harmful to me if, after all the Bylaw changes that are passed to limit the growth of Tourist Homes, I lost the ability to use our unit as a Tourist Home just because that ability was not specifically documented in one of the legal documents (like the LUB) controlling the use of property in the Town of Canmore.

Yours sincerely,
Philip Wilson

From: [Alex Zoller](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (2025-04)
Sent: 2025-03-02 8:16:23 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Madam/Sir and Town Council:

I am providing this written input in **opposition** to *Land Use Bylaw Amendment (2025-04)*.

I encourage Town Council to **oppose** this bylaw amendment on the grounds that it limits the property rights of property owners.

Property owners should have the flexibility to rent long-term or short-term at their absolute discretion, without limitation by zoning bylaws.

I strongly oppose Land Use Bylaw Amendment (2025-04).

Regards,
Alex Zoller
Bow Valley Business & Property Owner