



Community Bulletin July 13, 2013

***** The next community Meeting will be on Monday, July 15th, at the Foothills Mennonite Church, 6:30-8:30 p.m., Sanctuary.*****

Western Securities Letter to Residents, July 3, 2013

The owners of Stadium Shopping Centre recently mailed a letter to each household in University Heights.

A copy of the letter can be found here:

<http://www.westernsecurities.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/WesternSecuritiesLimited-LetterToUniversityHeightsCommunity-July3-2013.pdf>

The UHCA response to this letter is included in this bulletin along with a copy of the letter.

Fundraising Drive

We need to continue to raise funds for our legal and consulting fund. To date we have raised over \$45,000 from about 100 donations. Let's try to reach our goal by raising an additional \$30,000.

Some of the most meaningful donations have been small donations from individuals on a fixed income, some from outside of University Heights. Every little bit helps and it all adds up to a big result.

Resident John Rowse, an economist, has written a letter to clarify how the Stadium Development might impact you. For your information, it is included in the newsletter as an appendix.

What you can do:

Donate what you can to support our legal efforts.

How to donate: Please send your cheque made out to UHCA and drop off or mail to: UHCA c/o Foothills Mennonite Church, 2115 Urbana Rd. N.W. Calgary, Alberta T2N 4B9.

Report on July 11, 2013 Submissions to Council

Over 50 letters of concern were sent to council before the July 11, 2013 deadline to include it in package for the July 22, 2013 hearing. Citizen involvement is the cornerstone of a democratic process.

Below is a list of City Council with email addresses:

	Name	E-mail
Mayor	Naheed Nenshi	naheed.nenshi@calgary.ca
Ward 1	Dale Hodges	dale.hodges@calgary.ca
Ward 2	Gord Lowe	gord.lowe@calgary.ca
Ward 3	Jim Stevenson	jim.stevenson@calgary.ca
Ward 4	Gael MacLeod	gael.macleod@calgary.ca
Ward 5	Ray Jones	ray.jones@calgary.ca
Ward 6	Richard Pootmans	richard.pootmans@calgary.ca
Ward 7	Druh Farrell	druh.farrell@calgary.ca
Ward 8	John Mar	john.mar@calgary.ca
Ward 9	Gian-Carlo Carra	gian-carlo.carra@calgary.ca
Ward 10	Andre Chabot	andre.chabot@calgary.ca
Ward 11	Brian Pincott	brian.pincott@calgary.ca
Ward 12	Shane Keating	shane.keating@calgary.ca
Ward 13	Diane Colley-Urquhart	diane.colley-urquhart@calgary.ca
Ward 14	Peter Demong	peter.demong@calgary.ca

Please send a copy of your correspondence to: president@uhcacalgary.org
and to our MLA Donna Kennedy Glans: calgary.varsity@assembly.ab.ca

What you can do:

Please continue to write letters to the mayor and alderman to express your concerns. The council (aldermen and mayor) are the people that will be voting on the ARP and they need to hear from you!

If you have questions about submissions, please contact Peter Khu at 403-870-2782

Meeting with Alderman

In the next week, we will be meeting, or speaking on the phone, with several Alderman. The concerns raised by University Heights Residents are important to all Calgarians for three reasons:

First, the approach of redeveloping Neighbourhood Activity Centres in established communities into an extremely dense major activity centre is inconsistent with the Municipal Development Plan. If this approach is accepted by council, then any neighbourhood could be next.

Second, the traffic impacts of the proposed development to the critical intersection of 16th ave and 29th St., has the potential of impeding traffic on the Trans Canada highway and to the emergency room of the Foothills Medical Centre, as well as daily access to and egress from University Heights for its residents.

Third, the treatment of University Heights by City Administration and the developer as just "one of many stakeholders" rather than as the directly affected local/host community and therefore the primary stakeholder, will raise strong "due process" concerns for many concerned communities

Further, it is our hope that any future consultation for Stadium Shopping Centre will be the kind of truly collaborative process involving the community, the developer and the city, as required by the Municipal Development Act.

What you can do:

- Write a letter to council per above. Send a copy to all of the alderman and the mayor – ensure you copy Peter Khu as well.
- Please ask friends or family in Calgary to write to the City Aldermen and Mayor indicating your concern regarding “due process”. Even though they may not live in University Heights, the process of consultation may affect them in the future.

Schedule of Community Meetings to prepare for the City Council Hearing

These are our meetings to prepare for the Council Hearing starting July 22. Due to emergency priorities, this may be a three day hearing, July 22, 23rd, and 24th.

We still need volunteers to communicate community concerns. Each person has 5 minutes to speak on one topic. Some topics, such as traffic, require many speakers. You are, of course, welcome to speak on your own outside of our organized presentations.

Although it is critical to get as many people out as possible to the Council meeting, some people are not able to make it because they are on vacation or for health reasons.

We have hired the services of a documentary film maker, and your comments can be video-taped at our remaining community meetings. Email president@uhcacalgary.org to set up an appointment if one of the times below does not work for you.

What you can do:

- Represent University Heights Community, in person, at the Council Hearing on July 22, 23, 34.
- If you can't be there in person, send in a video of your concerns – email: president@uhcacalgary.org to set up an appointment.

Upcoming Meetings

These meetings are to help citizens prepare for the council meeting presentations. Additionally we will have video-taping available to ensure that those who cannot be there in person will be represented.

All sessions will be at the Foothills Mennonite Church between 6:30 and 8:30 pm

- July 15th, 2013 (Video-taping available starting at 6:00 pm)
- July 18th, 2013 (Video-taping available starting at 6:00 pm)

Checklist of What you can Do:

- **Write** to the Mayor Nenshi and the Alderman. Encourage friends from outside University Heights to write.
 - Attend the July 15, and July 18th Community Meetings to prepare and practice for the council meeting .
- **Speak** at council on July 22 (or possibly July 23rd, or 24th) (5 minutes)
- **Attend** the July 22nd (and possibly July 23rd or 24th) Meeting at City Hall
- Videotape your concerns if you cannot come
- **Volunteer** to get people to attend the July 22nd Meeting at City hall
 - Calling List
 - Driving Pool
- **Donate** to the UHCA legal Fund (any amount will be gratefully accepted)
UHCA c/o Foothills Mennonite Church, 2115 Urbana Rd. N.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2N 4B9

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Peter Khu at president@uhccalgary.org or call 403-870-2782



Response to Western Securities' July 3/13 letter to UH Residents by Peter Khu, President of UHCA

I have been strongly urged by many residents of University Heights to respond to your company's July 3, 2013 letter to our residents concerning the proposed ARP on the redevelopment of the Stadium Shopping Centre (SSC) site. The University Heights Community Association (UHCA) and individual residents have repeatedly taken advantage of what few opportunities we have had with representatives of Western Securities to express our concerns and describe our requests relative to the ARP and the type of high density development it would allow on the SSC site. Unfortunately, we have seen no evidence of a meaningful degree of responsiveness to our substantive key concerns by the City or Western Securities.

Instead the residents of University Heights believe we can be most helpful as well as relevant at this time by informing you about our community's feelings and reaction to what we sincerely believe are your company's process failures. By that we mean WS's failure to meaningfully inform or involve our residents and its Community Association in the considerable work you and your consultants did on the form and nature of SSC redevelopment during the key period of ARP formulation. We focus on this issue because "due process" and the associated "fairness" issue can be as important as the substantive concerns that affected residents have about your development proposals. This has certainly been the case in the issue of SSC redevelopment.

I will organize and express my thoughts about the "process" and related issues by describing my reactions to the following 10 specific statements that caught my eye in your July 3 letter. (In each case, your underlined quote is followed by my comments in parentheses).

1. "At this point we, like you, are a stakeholder in the ARP process."

(The ARP is being formulated in the context of an already quite advanced development proposal by WS for the SSC site. Therefore, while you are an interested party in the ARP process, you are not a stakeholder in the broader context of your intent to complete and apply for your SSC development proposal. In other words, WS is not a stakeholder but the project proponent who is required to consult stakeholders – defined as parties that may be directly affected by your development proposal, typically a local community such as UH. If WS is a "stakeholder" in the context of a consultation

program, you would be consulting yourself, which clearly would make a mockery of the concepts of stakeholder consultation.)

2. “No matter what the process is, at the end of day we are the people eventually putting shovels in the ground.”

(Process DOES matter, especially in the land/property development business. A poor consultation process gathers little valuable and essential information from knowledgeable local residents, detracting from the quality of the development proposal. Poor process also frustrates and alienates the concerned but ignored local residents, which often leads to an adversarial, polarized and protracted project review process. This is what already occurred (2006–8) with the earlier SSC development proposal and this is unfortunately what could occur again if current process deficiencies are not adequately addressed. UHCA is prepared to work with you and the City in a good faith, cooperative effort to prevent this.)

3. “We wanted to take this opportunity to touch base with you in advance of this (Council) meeting and share some ways for you to engage with us.”

(The wording of this statement clearly suggests that WS believes that it alone has high quality ideas about how community engagement can and should be done re SSC redevelopment. In reality, vast corporate and simple human experience in consultation has shown that an important best practice is for the consulting party to start the process by working open-mindedly and cooperatively with the party being consulted on what form the consultation process itself should take. When you first listen, it is amazing what you will then be allowed to say!)

4. “We have a responsibility as a developer to continuously examine and advance our land into places that reflect “now” and the future.”

(UH residents believe development companies like Western Securities also have another form of responsibility -- a corporate social responsibility to pursue your commercial objectives in a manner that is also sensitive to the broader public interest, including being respectful of and responsive to the legitimate substantive and process concerns of the local communities you affect.)

5. “We’re excited to work collaboratively with the University Heights community.”

(We residents of UH are “excited” too, but it is because WS has failed to work collaboratively with us. Indeed, WS has refused to collaborate with UH residents, as manifested by your rejection of the UHCA’s request that we work together to implement a jointly designed community “collaboration and involvement” process for the redevelopment of the SSC site.

We deliberately include the word community “involvement” because extensive experience has shown that effective and sustained involvement is necessary to defuse the type of frustration and distrust created by the way WS, to date, has denied the

residents of our community timely/clear information and meaningful engagement in your project planning process. By helping WS to defuse anger, earn trust and build a stronger relationship with UH residents, a good faith involvement process can pave the way to a more cooperative resolution of issues and a shared vision for SSC redevelopment. This would be beneficial to both UH and WS but also to the City as a whole.)

6. "The Stadium ARP acts as a guideline or a "blueprint" where topics such as improvement of public space, street character, connectivity, and integration with surrounding communities are identified"
(We agree that the ARP serves as a directing "blueprint" for future development at SSC. And that is why its provisions must be clear, its handling of issues balanced as between developer and community needs, and its objectives consistent with the letter and intent of the Municipal Development Plan.)

7. "Zoning has been established for these lands since the 1970's and there is no intention on our part or the City's to change it."
(Zoning is relevant because it sets the legal maximum relative to key development issues such as density and land use. However, the actual density and form of development allowed on a specific site is ultimately a question of what is appropriate, manageable and compatible with the existing community. In short, it is a broad "public interest" assessment, not a narrow "legal" interpretation.)

8. "In a joint effort with the University Heights Community Association and other stakeholders we defined urban planning and design principles"
(The residents of University Heights strongly disagree that they were ever allowed to be part of any genuine "joint effort" to define the principles of development at SSC. A couple of "by invitation only" meetings closed to the public and involving a very small number of local residents having very general and brief chats about vague principles over a two year period in 2011 and 2012 is hardly a "joint effort". Our experience suggest that WS's criticism of the City for arranging Rollin Stanley's walkabout in our community in March 2013 appears to more accurately reflect your company's actual attitude to working with University Heights.)

9. "Following Council's review of the ARP, we will begin a more detailed consultation process to create the actual development plans for the site"
(It always appears to UH that WS is only willing to talk about how it will conduct "more detailed consultation" at some later date rather than during the formulation of the ARP when many of the "big issues" pertinent to your SSC redevelopment were not yet resolved with the City to your satisfaction. The evidence in our possession also

indicates that your “actual development plans for the site” are already close to complete.

If we are wrong in these two impressions, there is a way WS can alleviate our suspicions. WS could do that by informing the UHCA, by letter before the July 22nd Council Public Hearing, requesting City Council not to approve the SSC Proposed ARP and that WS will enter into a “joint effort” with UH residents to collaboratively design a revised pre-application development plan that will be the reference point for the formulation of a revised ARP instead of submitting a formal Development Plan application to the Development Authority sometime in the next year.)

10. “This is not just another development site to us; it is a family legacy.”

(The SSC site is also “not just another development site” for the residents of University Heights. For about 50 years this “Neighbourhood Activity Centre” has also served as our community’s cherished “heart” and gathering place. Our community supports the modernization and redevelopment of the SSC site. However, we want it planned in a collaborative manner that involves us as well as City Administration and Western Securities, and we want the densification to be more moderate in nature and more compatible with the existing neighbourhood than what WS is now planning.)

I want to conclude by saying that the context for our comments above is our continuing belief that it is still possible and desirable to forge a strong, cooperative and mutually beneficial relationship between University Heights and Western Securities. For that reason, we ask that you reconsider our request of May 8, 2013 to engage in the type of collaborative process outline in my email of that date.

Sincerely,

Peter Khu
President, University Heights Community Association

July 3, 2013

Dear Resident,

As you may know, Western Securities is working towards redeveloping the Stadium Shopping Centre. A proposed Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) prepared by the City of Calgary Administration is being completed and is scheduled for review by Council on July 22nd. At this point we, like you, are a stakeholder in the ARP process. But, no matter what the process is, at the end of day we are the people eventually putting shovels in the ground and therefore, we wanted to take this opportunity to touch base with you in advance of this meeting and share some ways for you to engage with us as we move forward.

Calgary is an evolving landscape. We are a growing city with changing demographics and as a result we have a responsibility as a developer to continuously examine and advance our land into places that reflect “now” and the future. The existing Stadium Shopping Centre is an example of a successful development that is reflective of the era it was built. The new development will be just as relevant, and we’re excited to work collaboratively with the University Heights community and other stakeholders moving forward.

The Stadium ARP acts as a guideline or a “blueprint” where topics such as improvement of public space, street character, connectivity, and integration with surrounding communities are identified. An ARP is sometimes confused for land use redesignation, but it is actually a city-led process in which zoning does not change. Zoning has been established for these lands since the 1970's and there is no intention on our part or the City's to change it.

We would like to thank the dedicated community members who have helped in the planning process to date. In 2010, in a joint effort with the University Heights Community Association and other stakeholders we defined urban planning and design principles that would help guide us in taking the shopping centre from today to tomorrow. Following Council's review of the ARP, we will begin a more detailed consultation process to create the actual development plans for the site and we're very much looking forward engaging with the community during this process. After all, we have a long history in University Heights and are invested deeply in the community. We were here in the beginning when the shopping centre was built on former farmlands in the early 1960's. This is not just another development site to us; it is a family legacy. This project is part of a long history of Calgary and a long history of a Calgary family shaping and preserving community.

On that note, we are committed to ensuring that you are “in the know” as we continue through the process. We encourage you to learn more about us and have launched a new website www.westernsecurities.ca/stadium where you will find the following along with ongoing project updates:

- A background on Western Securities
- A roadmap outlining the redevelopment process of the site, taking us to where we are today
- A proposed community communication plan beyond approval of the ARP
- A number of ways to contact and connect with us

Thank you for your time reading this letter. We look forward to hearing from you, and to working with you to evolve and improve the Stadium Shopping Centre.

Best regards,

Mike Brescia

Vice President, Commercial Assets
Western Securities Limited

Ryan O'Connor

Principal
Western Securities Limited

Appendix 1

Remarks on the UHCA fund raising campaign by John Rowse, 3236

Uplands Place NW (John Rowse resident of University Heights and an economist, has written the following letter to the community in support of the fundraising efforts.)

In the May 29, 2013, UHCA newsletter, President Peter Khu makes a strong case for raising funds for legal assistance. Here are some comments specifically on traffic issues to support this case.

Given the Calgary Planning Commission's June 6 decision approving the Proposed Stadium Centre Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP), full buildout to 800,000 sq. ft. may occur. If a full buildout occurs, there is no doubt that -- with 1500-2000 residents at a redeveloped Stadium Centre, 15,000-25,000 new residents of West Campus in the future, 1500 students in new University of Calgary residences to be constructed, and unknown numbers of additional people at the new cancer facility to be built at Foothills Medical Centre or associated with the expansion of McMahon Stadium facilities -- peak time traffic congestion will substantially increase on Uxbridge Drive at or near the critical intersection at 16th Avenue and Uxbridge Drive/29th St NW. At peak demand times this congestion will most likely spill over to 16th Avenue and 29th St NW too.

The Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted to support the ARP is based on numerous assumptions, some of which are doubtful. Despite a tight submission deadline, UH residents Wayne Davies and David Richardson prepared submissions to City planners containing detailed comments highly critical of the TIA.

On page 27 of the Proposed ARP, 14 infrastructure investments are listed "that will be required to realize the vision of this plan." No investment was costed, 3 investments are to be shared between the landowner and the City, 6 others are to be made by the landowner alone and 5 made by the City alone. The final investment listed, converting 16th Avenue NW to six lanes from four, requires in particular two overpasses (at University Drive and at Crowchild Trail) to be converted to six lanes. This single investment is likely to be extremely costly. No City investment is a certainty given the City's difficult financial circumstances, and these circumstances have likely been made worse by the damage to infrastructure by the flood of June, 2013. Even if all investments are eventually made, however, they still may not address traffic issues adequately or they may only be made after the UH community has suffered years of serious traffic congestion.

One critical assumption of the TIA was that transit-on-demand (TOD) transport underpinned auto trips. Only if bus rapid transit (BRT) or LRT were available would this TOD assumption make sense. LRT is cost prohibitive and so BRT is the only possibility. Yet BRT service does not exist and was NOT listed as one of the infrastructure investments required.

A June 17 Calgary Herald news story on cost benefit studies of 7 transportation infrastructure investments stated that a West Campus-UC BRT loop route, costing \$30 million, tied for last among all investments.

Without BRT, TOD is not a sensible assumption and auto trips generated by SSC redevelopment will be greater, perhaps much greater, than assumed in the TIA.

What will increased traffic congestion mean when entering or leaving UH by car at peak times using the critical intersection? Traffic will be backed up longer along Uxbridge Drive, and perhaps along 16th Avenue (possibly in both directions) and/or along 29th Street. More time will be spent waiting, more gasoline burned needlessly and noxious exhaust gases emitted, and auto maintenance required sooner.

In slow or stopped traffic, drivers bear a noticeable and annoying waiting cost (a value of their time spent waiting) because they could otherwise use that time to do something else, such as engaging in some enjoyable recreational activity.

You can estimate the congestion loss to you personally by specifying a waiting cost per hour (\$10/hour or \$20/hour or \$50/hour, or whatever applies to you) times the hours (or fractions of an hour) stolen from your life each day spent waiting longer at or near the critical intersection, and multiplying by the number of days per year that you travel. If you transport passengers with you, the total cost will be greater. You should also estimate the additional costs of operating your car and earlier auto maintenance.

If traffic congestion grows sufficiently, drivers will attempt to avoid the critical intersection. They will try to leave or enter UH through the other 3 community access points on 24th Street and University Drive, propagating the traffic congestion to elsewhere in UH. People wanting to use the critical intersection will bear the brunt of increased congestion costs, but such costs will nevertheless extend into the community as well, and spillovers will occur to traffic along 16th Avenue and 29th St.

Due to increased traffic congestion at peak times, there may also be a slightly elevated response time required for EMS ambulances to enter and leave UH to assist persons suffering heart attacks or strokes or other emergencies.

Substantial traffic congestion costs may also affect property values. If part of the UH road system becomes nearly gridlocked during peak times, prospective buyers of homes in UH may make offers lower than they would without higher traffic congestion. Consequently, with heavy traffic congestion at certain times of the day, UH property values may be lower than otherwise. This loss of property value is difficult to estimate, but to form an idea of its size ask yourself how much less attractive your home would be to you or to a prospective buyer if -- during 10 hours or so per week -- you would have to spend noticeably more time waiting in traffic than you do now. Alternatively, properly done Stadium Centre redevelopment (particularly with regard to increased retail and only slightly increased congestion), might raise property values.

Even if you just walk or cycle, increased traffic congestion costs will still affect you. They will show up in the higher costs of transporting goods and people to Stadium Centre and in the willingness of retailers to locate there. The Bon Ton is one example: if its customers from across the city must contend with much increased traffic congestion and possibly nonzero parking costs, they may choose not to come to Stadium Centre to shop and the Bon Ton might have to relocate as a result.

How much are you willing to contribute to the UHCA legal fund to try to prevent some of the worst outcomes of traffic congestion? If UHCA does not mount a strong and persuasive defence of UH interests, serious traffic congestion -- that is not mitigated -- may accompany Stadium Centre redevelopment. Continuing to hire legal assistance and following the advice/strategy recommendations provided will raise the likelihood that UHCA can achieve outcomes that the community wants.

Thanks for reading. **Please consider contributing to the UH legal fund.**