



Community Bulletin July 6, 2013

*****Please note that the meeting on July 11th has been rescheduled. The next community association meeting will be on Wednesday July 10th, at the Foothills Mennonite Church, 6:30-8:30 p.m., Sanctuary.*****

Please send your written comments to Council by July 10th, 2013. Email: cityclerk@calgary.ca. More details below.

Summary of Resident Concerns

Attached to this community Bulletin is a three page brief of Resident Concerns that will be sent to Mayor Nenshi and each Alderman of Council. The brief can also be used as a resource for residents to help prepare their written submissions to Council or help with presentations to Council on July 22/23/24.

How to Submit to Council (Please submit by July 10th, 2013!!!!)

Submissions must be made before July 11, 2013 at 10:00am. **So effectively the deadline is July 10, 2013.** Do not wait until the last minute to send your comments!!!!

Submissions can be made using one of these methods:

In person and by mail:

Due to the floods, a temporary office of the City Clerk's has changed.

Temporary Office of the City Clerk, The City of Calgary
4th Floor, 1212 - 31st Ave. N.E.
Calgary, Alberta T2E 7S8

By e-mail: CityClerk@calgary.ca and please send a copy to president@uhccalgary.org

We also encourage you to contact your individual Alderman. More information on City Council can be found at <http://www.calgary.ca/General/Pages/Calgary-City-Council.aspx>

Below is a list of City Council with email addresses:

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

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

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>

One of the residents has asked the community association to forward her letter to all residents. She notes that, "the most infuriating part for me is that they are speaking on behalf of the City of Calgary in the last sentence of paragraph three." --Amelia Falk

The last sentence of paragraph three states, "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." Dr. Falk's objection, shared by many residents, is the appearance throughout the ARP process of an excessive degree of entanglement between the developer and the city planners. The ability of the city to act as a neutral regulator is uncertain.

Amelia Falk's Response to July 3, 2013 letter by Western Securities to Residents Regarding Stadium Shopping Centre Redevelopment follows:

July 6, 2013

Dear Mike Brescia and Ryan O'Connor,

As an educated well-informed resident of University Heights I find your recent letter to the Community extremely presumptive and condescending! If your goal was to put Community members minds at ease about the impending redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre then you have certainly NOT succeeded.

Despite the numerous grammatical errors in your letter I have been able to read between the lines. You have made me aware that perhaps I have not been speaking out strongly enough in regards to this matter. After reading your letter, I feel as though your intent is to bully residents into doing things your way. I am afraid you have another thing coming.

I cannot speak on behalf of others (as you have presumed to do in your letter), however I expect you will be seeing more of us than ever at the upcoming Council hearings.

Regards,

Dr. Amelia Falk
Resident of University Heights

Report on July 3, 2013 City of Calgary Open House

A City Information Session on Stadium was held July 3, 2013, at St. Andrew's Heights Community Centre.

The proposed ARP that will go before Council on July 22, 2013 can be found here:

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Documents/Publications/stadium-shopping-centre-arp.pdf>

The information panels describing the proposed ARP can be found here:

<http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/LUPP/Documents/Publications/stadium-information-panels.pdf>

One significant change was that the land uses now planned for SSC include a 20% increase for each land use above what was listed in the base case assumed for the Traffic Impact Assessment study.

Report on July 4, 2013 Community Meeting

Thanks to Ward 1 Candidate Judi Vandenbrink for attending the meeting and sharing valuable information. Judi's website is <http://vote4judi.com>

Also in attendance was Perri-Lynn Blair representing our MLA, Donna Kennedy-Glans. Donna's email is calgary.varsity@assembly.ab.ca Constituency office: (403) 216-5436.

Discussion was wide-ranging and included comments from UH residents about their experiences understanding and reacting to the City's public engagement process. Numerous questions about redevelopment were raised, answers were provided and a variety of comments were volunteered by meeting attendees.

Later discussion focused on the issues that would be addressed by the UHCA at the upcoming City Council Hearing, and the names of people were listed who volunteered to address a specific issue.

Finally, two UH residents also provided examples of the types of comments they would make at City Council. One of these residents had her comments videotaped for presentation at the Hearing because, although she planned to be away from Calgary during the Hearing, she wanted her voice to be heard.

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 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.

Upcoming Meetings

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

- July 10th, 2013 (Video taping available starting 6:00 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 City Hall. Please send your comments before July 10!
 - Attend July 10, 15, and July 18th Community Meetings for practice.
- Speak at council on July 22 (or possibly July 23rd, or 24th) (5 minutes)
- Videotape your concerns if you cannot come
- Volunteer to get people to attend the July 22nd Meeting at City hall
 - Calling List
 - Driving Pool
- Attend the July 22nd (and possibly July 23rd or 24th) Meeting at City Hall
- 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@uhcacalgary.org or call 403-870-2782



Summary of Concerns of University Heights Residents re: proposed Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) for Stadium Shopping Centre.

UHCA Position: The University Heights Community Association welcomes moderate, community sensitive, densification in the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre that is designed through the type of community-inclusive collaborative planning process to which the city has already committed itself in the MDP. The proposed ARP fails to meet these substantive and procedural planning principles. University Heights Community Association (UHCA) will therefore request that City Council defer any decision on the Stadium ARP and direct City Admin'n to collaborate with not only the developer but also with University Heights (UH) as the directly affected local community to develop a revised ARP that provides more certainty about protecting SSC's character as a Neighborhood Activity Centre. So far the expedited ARP process has not been reasonably responsive to UH and other affected communities.

1. SSC is a Neighbourhood Activity Centre under the MDP. S. 3.3 describes NAC's as "appropriate sites to accommodate moderate intensification over time, with uses and development scales appropriate to the local context and community needs." The intent of the MDP is that intensification focuses primarily on residential densification, making more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
2. However, the proposed ARP allows for densification that is primarily commercial and totally out of scale for a NAC, allowing instead an extraordinarily massive Major Activity Centre (MAC)- scale development on a relatively small site of 2.48 ha. With a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 3.0, the potential exists for about 800,000 square feet of development, including large office and medical clinic buildings as well as structures (including a "hotel") up to 46 metres or 14 stories in height. Such a development at SSC would represent an intensity exceeding 750 jobs and people per ha. This compares to a minimum MAC intensity level of 200 jobs/ha, whereas the NAC requirement under the MDP is 100 jobs/ha. Also, the site is accessible by just one side of one residential road). To put this degree of densification in perspective, 800,000 sq ft (and) this would be:

- About 1250% more developed floor area than the existing SSC development of 64,000 sq ft consisting of only 1 story retail and restaurant units.
- About 300% larger than the 270,000 sq foot development that the UHCA successfully appealed at the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board in 2008.
- Equal to 83 percent of Market Mall floor area, on 20% of the land area of the Market Mall site!
- Larger than the newly proposed 58 story, 750, 000 sq. ft. downtown Telus Tower.
- About 280% more intense (750 jobs and pop/ha) on the very small, MAC-surrounded SSC site (2.48 ha) than the density (260 jobs and pop/ha) for development on the large 160 acre West Campus site.

In short, this proposed ARP effectively circumvents the MDP by, in effect, reclassifying the SSC site from a small NAC to an immense MAC without a formal land use reclassification. Nor was this the intent of the South Shaganappi Community Area Plan.

3. The ARP for SSC does not address the Unique location of University Heights: UH is already more densely developed than 125 of Calgary's 150 "Established Communities". And unlike these other established communities", the small community of UH is surrounded by heavy traffic generating MAC's : to the south, across 16th Ave, Foothills Medical Centre, (14,500 employees); to the west, Alberta Children's Hospital and the West Campus of U of C with 900,000 sq ft of planned development; to the north, main campus of U of C (9,000 employees and 31,000 students); to the east, McMahon Stadium and Foothills Athletic Park. Moreover, many of these MAC's are undergoing large expansions: the Baker Cancer Centre directly across from SSC; the U of C; and the Foothills Fieldhouse / soccer sportsplex with a 10,000 stadium capacity. These MAC's form the city's largest employment centre with the exception of downtown Calgary and generate immense traffic congestion on 16th Ave. NW, creating near capacity failure at the key intersection of 16th Ave and Uxbridge Dr. Furthermore, a huge amount of vehicle short-cutting occurs through UH by drivers wanting to drive to a MAC without having to deal with the clogged intersections in this congested region. Even more traffic is brought into UH by non-residents bringing their children to the two schools in the community, parishioners attending services at our two churches, and patrons of the popular retail stores and restaurants within or adjacent to SSC. Moreover, although TransCanada Highway/16th Ave brings much additional traffic to the UH area, the SSC site is not "on" this thoroughfare in that there is no entrance from or onto 16th Ave from the site. Instead, very significantly, the site is only accessible from Uxbridge Drive which is a mere residential street rather than a collector street.

UH is also a community with no community hall and where Stadium Shopping Centre (the community's only one) has always served as the quintessential type "urban village core" and community "heart" that so many Calgary planning documents are committed to preserving during densification programs.

4. The proposed ARP fails to give adequate attention to these unique contextual features of the proposed SSC Redevelopment in several ways, including the following:

a) The Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) upon which the ARP relies, is seriously flawed by utilizing the "standard" traffic assumptions of city-wide traffic studies and the regional macro-model instead of utilizing a micro-model that is sensitive to the unique traffic situation facing UH and the subject site. The authors of the TIA further weakened its reliability by generally relying on 7 year old traffic data, by doing very few and brief traffic counts within UH during unrepresentative periods. UHCA believes there are serious concerns with the TIA that need to be addressed prior to relying on its conclusions. A key concern is the intersection of 16th Ave and 29th St/Uxbridge Drive, so important for accessing Foothills Hospital as well as UH. It has been identified as presently at failure and, despite planned small upgrades, it will again be put in jeopardy by the cumulative traffic impacts of the SSC buildup this ARP allows combined with other large planned developments nearby, such as the new Baker Cancer Centre and West Campus.

b) The ARP suggests that the traffic generated by the SSC redevelopment will be less than a standard development of this size because it is a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) when it clearly is not. Unlike the recent Brentwood ARP, the site is not on an LRT line (the nearest LRT Station, Banff Tr, is over 1 km away) and it has no Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) servicing it. The SSC site area is served only by basic bus service which has low usage because of its infrequency and slowness. Recently Calgary Transit (Route Ahead) indicated it ranked investments in transit along 16th Ave as having lowest priority amongst its options.

c) The ARP suggests that the traffic generated by the SSC redevelopment will be less than a standard development of this size because it is a mixed use development. Unfortunately, because the development is primarily commercial and not residential, the gains from people walking and cycling to work will not be realized. To achieve these suggested trip reductions UHCA would like the ARP to specify that a minimum of 50% of the developed floor area be dedicated to Residential use. This would help this sector of the city by providing more homes close to existing (MAC-related) employment opportunities while supporting and reinvigorating University Heights, thereby achieving a more appropriate balance in the ARP's responsiveness to the needs of the affected communities and the surrounding institutions.

d) The ARP envisages a massive amount of additional (and inordinately large and tall, at 46 m) commercial buildings on the SSC site despite the many institutional and commercial MAC's surrounding it. This commercial development will take the form primarily of (very high traffic generating) medical clinics and offices as well as retail units to replace what will be lost. In contrast, the ARP is silent about the floor size of the development's hotel and residential (favoured by UH) components. By also being silent on what type of land uses will be the first rather than possible future phases of the development, the ARP fails to provide the required type of reasonable direction to the developer and certainty to UH.

e) The ARP fails to require prior completion of required infrastructure for the redevelopment to proceed. The TIA identifies fourteen intersection and public transit infrastructure enhancements that it states must already be "in place" if the traffic impacts of the proposed densification of the SSC site are to be accommodated. . UHCA feels the ARP fails the community in not articulating limits to the amount of floor area that can be developed based on the amount and effectiveness of the various required infrastructure upgrades identified in the ARP. This admission is particularly significant in view of the immense impact and costly damage to City property and infrastructure caused by the unprecedented flooding that occurred in June 2013. City budgets have to be allocated to prevent or mitigate a "flood" of river water or project-generated traffic, and hence completion of required infrastructure prior to any redevelopment is essential for protecting the broader public interest.

5. During the development of this proposed ARP, UHCA has not experienced meaningful information-sharing, consultation or responsiveness from City Administration in the course of its closed door collaboration with the developer. Both City Administration and the developer have rejected UHCA's formal request for the kind of community-inclusive collaborative planning process that the City committed itself to in the MDP. Two unfortunate consequences flow from this failure to include UH in the collaborative process. First, the relevance, reliability and credibility of the allegedly supporting evidence in the proposed ARP (and TIA) is greatly weakened because the local residents possessing valuable local expertise were not allowed to be involved. Secondly, this "due process" failure has resulted in a planning process that is polarized, adversarial and publicly unsupported, not "orderly and economic" . The risk is that the avoidable existing contentiousness regarding the ARP, if not fairly addressed, will extend to every future step in the development approval process for the SSC site.