



September 24, 2025

Sumit Sandhu and Har Sandhu
Circle YYC & 2685880 Alberta Ltd.
Calgary, Alberta

Lei Wang, Agent
Horizon Surveys
Calgary, Alberta

SENT BY EMAIL TO har.sandhu1998@gmail.com & lei@horizonsurveys.ca

Re: 132 Varsity Estates Place NW – LOC2025-0141

Dear Sirs,

The Varsity Community Association would like to respond in writing to two telephone calls between myself and Har Sandhu on September 16 and 18, 2025 and some social media posts.

1. Allegation of misinformation at the public meeting on September 15, 2025

You stated that you were disappointed there was misinformation spread at the public meeting on September 15. When I stated that the information contained in the power point presentation was accurate you agreed and stated that the misinformation was in the questions asked by the public at the meeting. I believe your consultant, Lei Wang, answered all of those questions accurately and professionally. The question about who owned the company proposing the development was not answered by Mr. Wang and the ownership was not disclosed at any point during the meeting so your identity was not known to anyone at the meeting. Had I known you were present at the meeting, I would have invited you up to answer any questions that you felt were not adequately addressed by Mr. Wang. You could have requested to speak ahead of time to be added to the agenda or you could have come forward at any time during the meeting to request to speak.

You will recall that I had called Sumit prior to the meeting about another property and asked him if he wanted to be included on any correspondence with respect to the public meeting on September 15. He stated he did not want to be included and that all correspondence should be directed to Lei Wang.

You provided as an example of misinformation, the question about firewalls which you felt wasn't relevant. I would agree that members of the public are not aware of which issues are addressed at the land use redesignation stage vs development permit stage, however, this question was addressed by Mr. Wang who stated the project would comply with current building codes.

You further stated that the question regarding CMHC funding was spreading misinformation. The person who asked that question was also in attendance at the Varsity Civic Affairs Committee meeting on June 2, 2025 with Mr. Wang. At that time Mr. Wang stated CMHC funding might be used for this development and he confirmed on September 15 that it is a possibility. This is not misinformation and you had the opportunity to put this on the record if it was important to clarify the financing of the project. The Varsity Community Association limits its comments and concerns to planning matters and does not comment on financing arrangements and this was not part of our presentation.

2. Request for New Meeting to Address Misinformation

As agreed upon in our phone conversation, we are willing to organize another public meeting jointly with you at the Varsity Hall to allow you to present the plans yourselves and answer questions directly to dispel any misinformation you feel is circulating with respect to the application.

As stated in my email dated September 17, the Varsity Hall is available on November 7, 14, 21, December 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, & 19. I recommended avoiding Fridays as people are busy on weekends. I also suggested that if these dates are not acceptable we could book the Dalhousie Community Centre as an alternative. We would simply request that you cover the cost of printing and distributing flyers, renting the hall if it is somewhere other than the Varsity Community Centre, posting signs, providing any required AV equipment, and videotaping the meeting. If you wish to pay for an ad in the Varsity Voice the deadline for the December newsletter is November 1 and the deadline for November is October 1. I can also include notice of the meeting in my column (deadlines are the same).

I noted that the opposition to this land use redesignation is widespread and I did not feel a presentation of the same plans would change that position. Area residents do not feel this project is appropriate in this location as it would overwhelm and overshadow neighbouring homes, create parking congestion and vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, remove mature trees, and is not contextually sensitive to the existing community. In addition to the Varsity Community Association submission, there were over 130 letters submitted to the file manager regarding this application outlining a variety of reasons for their opposition. I believe you should have access to these submissions. To ensure you have seen our submission and rationale for opposition to the project, I will email it separately. It would be important to explain how residents' extensive feedback has been incorporated into revised plans at a second public meeting.

The fact that over 500 people attended the public meeting on September 15 demonstrates the deep concern of Varsity residents and they were very clear they felt the application should be withdrawn.

To be respectful of the residents' time, the application would need to be substantially different from what was presented on September 15. Otherwise, the presentation would duplicate what has already been shown to residents.

The land use redesignation should to be tied to plans through a concurrent DP application. As you are aware, the final plans for a development permit including the number of units can be very different than conceptual plans at the land use redesignation stage. If the land use application is not tied to drawings that are part of a development permit application, it would require yet another public meeting which is not a good use of anyone's time.

I note that while composing this letter I received an email from you requesting the November 7 date. I will confirm with the office that the date is available (sometimes the website isn't up to date) and I will book that date for you. I will confirm by email.

3. Allegation of Vandalism

You called on September 18 to complain about vandalism of your company sign and the property. I did notice someone had recently spray painted “no” on the company sign which is located between the property and Varsity Estates Drive. This defacement of a sign is unacceptable and I will circulate an email to the residents requesting that any future sign not be defaced. I was surprised as this is the first time I have seen this type of vandalism in Varsity and I apologize for the expense and inconvenience involved in replacing the sign.

Please note that if the sign is replaced it must comply with the rules in the Land Use Bylaw for a temporary sign in a residential area. The sign must not be located within 7.5 metres of vehicular access to a property and must not exceed one square metre in size. The sign should also be located entirely on the property in question.

You also stated that someone had put paint on the driveway which would be expensive to remove. I looked at the property later that day and the only paint on the driveway is a small pink symbol that was placed there by Enmax (See Attachment A). Every driveway in the area has these pink symbols painted on them as utility work by Enmax is about to commence. I understand that all property owners recently received notification of this planned upgrade. It is clear the vandalism was limited to the sign only.

4. Allegation of Harassment

You stated that people were ringing the doorbell of the house at 132 and harassing your tenants and they were wanting to move out as a result. Later that day I rang the doorbell to speak to the tenants, however, there was no answer and the house appeared to be vacant. When I asked the neighbours they confirmed the tenants moved out last month and no one else has moved in.

5. Allegation of Racism

You stated in your first call on September 16 that racism was exhibited at the public meeting on September 15, 2025. I indicated that there were no racist comments during the presentations or the question and answer period. The focus was purely on planning issues related to a land use redesignation. You agreed with that but stated that there were racist comments made to you at the meeting. I want to clarify these comments.

Firstly, the people at the meeting were not aware of who owned the property. A resident asked a question about ownership and stated it was a numbered company on the land title. Mr. Wang did not disclose any details about the ownership. They would not have been able to identify you as the owners and they were not aware that you were at the meeting.

Secondly, I have contacted a number of people who were present at the meeting including members of the Varsity Civic Affairs Committee who were standing at the back of the room and seated throughout the hall. No one observed any racist remarks or even any heated conversations.

In the 40 years I have volunteered with the Varsity Community Association I have never encountered racism of any kind at any public meeting. This would be completely unacceptable and anyone exhibiting racist or threatening behaviour would be asked to leave. If you can identify any individuals who made derogatory comments, they will be banned from future meetings.


At the meeting, despite their strong opposition to the project, Varsity residents were respectful and polite. There was no profanity or yelling and everyone stayed seated. There was only applause when the audience agreed with a certain point. In fact, everyone warmly applauded Mr. Wang for attending the meeting and answering questions. Mr. Wang graciously stayed to chat with residents further and even helped stack chairs after the meeting. He and I have a friendly, professional relationship despite our difference of opinion on this application. There was certainly no racism exhibited towards Mr. Wang and I'm sure he would confirm that.

In view of the unsubstantiated statements about vandalism and harassment and the lack of corroborating evidence it raises questions about the credibility of this claim.

6. Postings on Social Media

We were disappointed to see misleading statements posted by Har, Sumit, and Circle on social media.

Post #1 by Circle; Reposted by Sumit Sandhu on LinkedIn:

**Circle**
108 followers
12h · 🌐

[+ Follow](#)

Over the past week, our team hosted an open house for our rezoning and development application at 132 Varsity Estates Place NW.

We would like to thank the Varsity Community Association for hosting such a well-organized event with an incredible turnout. With more than 300 neighbours in attendance, we are truly grateful for the opportunity to connect and engage with the community.

It was a privilege to hear directly from residents, listen to their perspectives, and share our vision for how thoughtful development can add long-term value to Varsity Estates. These conversations are essential—we want to continue building in a way that respects the existing community fabric while also addressing Calgary's housing needs.

That said, it was disheartening that, during and after the open house, our team was subjected to derogatory comments and personal threats. We strongly believe that negative comments are not constructive in creating a safe place to share differing opinions on development. We believe strongly in open and respectful dialogue.

While differing opinions on development are expected and healthy, personal attacks do not move the conversation forward.

At Circle YYC, we remain committed to transparency, meaningful community engagement, and delivering projects that provide lasting benefit to Calgary. We look forward to continuing these conversations in a constructive way—and to being part of building stronger, more inclusive communities across our city.

The first and second sentences are inconsistent. The meeting was advertised as being jointly hosted by the Varsity Community Association and Horizon Surveys who is the agent on this application. For accuracy's sake, a committee member counted and there were over 500 residents in attendance.

Lei Wang presented plans and renderings on your behalf. You did not personally engage with the community or share your vision. You did not identify yourselves or acknowledge that you were in attendance even when people asked who owned the property. There was no "conversation".

The residents were very clear they believe this is a highly inappropriate development in this area that will reduce quality of life and property values for nearby residents due to the overwhelming massing and overshadowing, increased intensity of use and parking congestion, pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, lack of soft landscaping, and architecture that is incompatible with the existing context. Varsity residents strongly disagree that this development in any way "respects the existing community fabric".

Varsity has a wide variety of housing types at all price points and only 45% of our dwelling units are single-family homes. There are townhouses and apartment buildings within close proximity of this site that currently "address Calgary's housing needs". This project is being imposed on a quiet cul-de-sac with 8 estate homes that back onto the golf course and it will stick out like a sore thumb. These neighbours are the ones who will have to live with the negative impact of this project long after the developers have moved on.

Despite overwhelming opposition to the project, Varsity residents were very respectful and polite during the presentations and question and answer period. There was no profanity or yelling and those in the audience remained seated and patiently lined up to ask questions. There were no interruptions when people were speaking. This is the typical courteous pattern for public meetings in Varsity.

The owners of the property were not identified other than as a numbered company and no one was aware the property owners were at the meeting. You state that your team was subjected to derogatory comments and personal threats, however, we have not been able to verify this statement. We're unsure how you and your team could have been faced with comments or threats when the audience did not know who owned the property or that you were in attendance. We had numerous committee members and volunteers throughout the auditorium with several at the back of the room and no one overheard any raised voices, derogatory comments, or threats.

Here are some of the responses I received from these volunteers:

"I was at the back of the room near the doorway the entire evening. At no point did I witness any aggressive or negative comments towards anyone. It is a gross falsehood that the meeting was anything but respectful."

"I attended the entire September 15th meeting. The developer's representative reminded the large audience that he was a representative and his role was to relay information and feedback to the owner of the property in question. He asked that the attendees keep that in mind and be respectful. In my observation, the audience absolutely lived up to that request. People who spoke were impassioned and at times frustrated by the inability to speak directly to the owner/developer. But in no way were they disrespectful or verbally abusive. I did not witness any remarks that could be construed as violent, racist, or threatening. Any suggestion that speakers participating in the public forum were anything but civil would be disingenuous at best. The closest remark that could be considered disrespectful was the comment that the developer was a coward for not attending in person - made by a person who had no knowledge that the

September 24, 2025 – Letter from VCA re: LOC2025-0141 - 132 Varsity Estates Place NW

developer was in fact in the room (and who may have departed by then as that remark was made in the last 1/4 of the evening)."

"Some of the questions were pointed but there is no way anyone could call them threatening, racist or disrespectful. Some people asking questions asked the same question or made the same point more than once - which was inefficient - but the tone was generally respectful. I did not realize the developer was there."


If you can identify anyone who was threatening towards you, please let us know and we will deal with it immediately.



We notice you state you are committed to transparency. Why then did you not identify yourselves at the public meeting and answer questions directly especially when residents were requesting that? There's nothing wrong with having your consultant make the presentation and field all the questions but it is inconsistent to state you are committed to transparency and then avoid transparency.


You refer to open and respectful dialogue. The representatives of the Varsity Community Association have a long history of open and respectful dialogue with all developers regardless of any difference of opinion. That is exactly what has happened to date on this application and what will continue to take place as we have on-going discussions with you and your representative, Lei Wang. We would ask for the same in return.

You state you are committed to "meaningful community engagement". Were you listening when over 500 residents clearly told you they don't want this development in their community? If you ignore the consistent feedback you receive and proceed with this project despite strong community opposition, then how is the engagement meaningful? It simply becomes a "check the box" exercise that has no meaning whatsoever.

Post #2 by Har Sandhu on LinkedIn:



Har Sandhu, MBA  · 3rd+
Real Estate Development
11h · 

+ Follow 

We understand that development can spark strong emotions, and we fully respect differing opinions, but dialogue must always remain respectful.

Unfortunately, our Varsity project has also highlighted the difficult side of development, with many instances of negative comments, threats and even property damage, behaviour that is simply unacceptable.

Despite this, we remain committed to showing up, listening, and continuing the conversation in a constructive way that helps build understanding and stronger communities.

September 24, 2025 – Letter from VCA re: LOC2025-0141 - 132 Varsity Estates Place NW

The same questions and comments apply to this post. If you have any evidence of negative comments at the public meeting, please provide it to us and we will act on it. If not, then please refrain from making unsubstantiated allegations. If you find out who defaced the sign let us know and we will contact that person.

You have stated you are committed to showing up and listening and we hope you are truly open to understanding, respecting, and honouring the views of Varsity residents and their representatives from the Varsity Community Association.

For future conversations regarding this application, we would prefer to use email or in-person or zoom meetings.

Yours truly,



Jo Anne Atkins
Director of Civic Affairs
Varsity Community Association

c.c. Councillor Sonya Sharp
Teresa Goldstein, Director of Community Planning
Reza Bacchus, File Manager
Chris Davis, Christopher Davis Law
Bob Benson, President, Varsity Community Association
Board of Directors, Varsity Community Association
Varsity Civic Affairs Committee
Neighbours: J. Schick, H. Rohmann, W. Lay, E. Kothari, N. Kothari, D. Schick, C. Han, D. White, A. White, M. Roberts, Y. Yong, K. Wong, M. Lee, R. McLeod, B. McLeod, D. Beavis, D. O'Neill, M. Trowell, K. Funk, P. McTaggart-Cowan, M. Stach, M. Giesbrecht, M. Hamilton, M. Hulliger, J. Lalli, M. Reynolds, T. Samer, D. Semenchuk

ATTACHMENT A - PHOTOS OF DRIVEWAY AND PAINTED SYMBOL BY ENMAX

