

Open House on Stadium Shopping Centre Area Redevelopment Plan

May 14, 2013

Summary of public feedback from the Stadium Shopping Centre Area Redevelopment Plan Questionnaire

Property Edges

Value having residential against the school edge

Value having buffers to the community - place park space between community and development

Value having ground level residential along park for safety at all hours

Concern for residential use next to schools

Value property along Uxbridge to be continuous to site entry

Concern about the North alley exiting onto Uxbridge Drive re: traffic capacity?

Value extending Unwin into site (North alley) to create more access (4 comments)

Value tallest buildings along 16 Ave to maximize sunlight

Value the information that was presented on property edges (3 comments)

Value green space along 16 Ave (3 comments)

Concern for sufficient room for bus (3 comments)

Concern about the usefulness of a path along 16 Ave given the traffic noise

Value minimal intrusion

Concern that CBE needs to be aware of proposed changes to lane and parking lot UES & Charter School

Value visual improvements to edges

Value having buildings set back from Uxbridge

Value buildings along Uxbridge having access and active edges

Value maintaining a sense of a residential community and commercial area

Value setbacks and green space to avoid edges looking too urban (ie like downtown) (2 comments)

Value sunlight preservation

Building Design

Value higher buildings along the Uxbridge and 16 Ave sides & taper down to residential (2 comments)

Value the building design shown in the pictures (4 comments)

Concern that building design does not resemble the community

Concern that development cannot deliver this level of quality

Value the qualities of Garrison Woods

Concern that development will be institutional-looking

Concern that development will be unattractive like the apartments on Crowchild & 24 Ave NW (2 comments)

Concern about level of detail: wish to see likelihood of hotel, maximum heights & density (2 comments)

Value low rise & open feel (2 comments)

Value attractive building design (3 comments)

Value building heights 3 stories or less

Value building heights 4 stories or less (6 comments)

Value building heights 6 stories or less (4 comments)

Concern for high rise buildings - not consistent with community character, or appear out of place (4 comments)

Concern that a building height of 14 stories is too high (5 comments)

Concern about parks and schools being affected by building height

Value shadow studies to visually show impacts of tall buildings and to address community concerns (3 comments)

Concern that buildings portrayed cannot be accommodated – meant for a larger site

Concern that more height equals more traffic impacts*

Concern that high density equals more traffic impacts

Value small footprint design (2 comments)

Value placement of large buildings, density, offices on large parcels to handle congestion

Value information presented on building design (2 comments)

Value addressing the needs of business – cold storage capacity, loading/unloading

Value street-oriented buildings - attractive & street level presence (3 comments)

Value residential buildings with private entrances along street edge to create a safer and friendlier environment

Value step backs to retain human scale (4 comments)

Value green space/landscaping/openness in between buildings (3 comments)

Request to see a few different proposals for building style, materials & exterior facades, and to decide on what is acceptable

Land Use

Value mixed-use (2 comments)

Value NAC's community focus (2 comments)

Value SSC being residential in feel

Value existing density as enough

Value higher density but adapted to context

Value higher density – seen as useful for school and children's hospital growing demand for proximity to accommodation and services (2 comments)

Concern for high density (6 comments)

Concern for impacts of land use on community

Value seeing a detailed plan showing land uses, heights, density, parking

Value housing over medical offices with retail below

Concern about office space

Concern for medical offices creating traffic impacts (2 comments)

Concern for hotel (traffic generation, area too small to support hotel, do not need or want hotel) (11 comments)

Concern about pawn shops being allowed (2 comments)

Concern about more bars & restaurants being added

Concern about auto-oriented uses - auto-shops or funeral parlour (2 comments)

Concern about liquor stores being allowed

Value having a market and current food retailers

Concern that neighbourhood cannot support a grocery store

Value current retail stores (2 comments)

Value clinic and lab in area – not at SSC

Value more restrictive land uses

Concern that development will be an annex of FMC (2 comments)

Proposing that FMC parkades should go underground with a hotel above.
Concern that current land use designation remains - not appropriate with adjacent residential areas (2 comments)
Value having 400,000 or 50% less square feet than allowable (3 comments)
Concern about zoning being a mismatch with given site area
Value the information that was presented on land use (2 comments)
Value limiting non-residential uses
Value limiting residential uses due to parking concerns
Value increased residential and services of use to residents to improve quality of life (2 comments)
Value affordable housing that supports transit & pedestrian traffic
Value accommodation for seniors (2 comments)
Value seeing accommodation for families (rowhouses, 3 bedroom apt's) so community is more inclusive and plan for future generations (2 comments)
Value assisted living so local people can move out of homes and stay in the community
Value the idea of condos
Concern that current zoning exceeds what the community can handle (2 comments)
Concern about redevelopment fitting into the larger community
Value land uses that benefit the neighbourhood
Value having a small central meeting place – ie a small venue for friendly gathering for a Coffee House/fitness centre (2 comments)
Value clarification on whether parking is included in development space

Park Space

Value having places for people to meet - request for a community gathering space (3 comments)
Value a well-integrated, attractive and safe park space (3 comments)
Value incorporating trees and seating into the development (3 comments)
Value for space in front of restaurants so you can eat outside
Value multi-use space for recreation for all ages
Concern that incorporating park space into development will result in the community's loss of control of the space
Concern that incorporating park space into development will benefit only residents of the development
Concern that incorporating park space into development will benefit only the developer
Concern that land swap will not be park space but rather converted to hardscape (3 comments)
Concern that a relocated green space will be smaller
Concern about losing green space
Concern for adequate park space for each new resident – develop to provide this from current property
Concern that proposed densities will make park uninviting
Value current parks in community
Value retaining park space (3 comments)
Value park space to be increased (2 comments)
Value retaining same amount of open space (2 comments)
Value green space in current location (4 comments)
Concern about park on 16 Ave due to noise and pollution
Value having a central park or green space (2 comments)
Value allocating a portion of MR to create a central park/meeting space
Value a walking path along 16 Ave to connect to pond, Children's Hospital, West Campus, playground, soccer fields

Value connecting and improving the public spaces along 16 Ave, to improve bike path and pedestrian connection (4 comments)

Value having safe pathways to school grounds (from Uxbridge, & beyond) (2 comments)

Concern for parking during construction

Value the information that was presented on *Park Space* (2 comments)

Request to hear more details about park space

Value pedestrian safety and comfort

Value not having a huge parking lot

Transportation

Concern for increased traffic movements & congestion (17 comments)

Concern that traffic studies do not take into account the entire neighbourhood and will exacerbate traffic issues (3 comments)

Concern about traffic impacts from area-wide development (FMC, SSC, Children's Hospital, UofC, Endowment lands, Market Mall, Foothills Professional Building, Shell Station/Tim Horton's site) (4 comments)

Concern being able to get out of community in a timely manner (2 comments)

Concern about being held up on 24 Ave & Crowchild Trail

Value seeing another access to SSC site by adding right-in-right-out

Concern that capacity on 29 St is at maximum – consider discouraging more traffic

Concern about short-cutting through community (5 comments)

Value having transportation functioning well in advance of any redevelopment (3 comments)

Value having TIA determine the amount of development on the SSC site.

Concern that TIA does not capture entire neighbourhood

Concern that TIA captured only non-school days during Teacher's Convention*

Concern that modal split from community shows work trips only

Concern that increased traffic could result in >5000 vpd short-cutting through neighbourhood

Concern that better indication of future vehicle volume is needed

Value turn restrictions along north side of University Heights

Concern about the source of funding for transit improvements

Concern that cold weather affects cycling & walking (2 comments)

Value cycle lane for school kids

Value a supportive walking environment

Value pedestrian bridge

Value traffic calming measures

Concern for cycling safety on existing roadways

Concern for 16 Avenue and feeder roads with traffic congestion (2 comments)

Concern that Unwin is too narrow (from parked cars in front of duplexes) to provide good access to SSC

Concern that FMC's Cancer Centre plus expansion will require dramatic traffic control/solutions to avoid detracting from the community.*

Concern for McMahon Stadium overflow parking

Value moderating and controlling automobile traffic

Value free parking

Value on-site parking

Value parking that is not underground

Value underground parking with short-term street level parking for access to businesses

Concern for ambulances entering FMC

Concern for emergency vehicles into University Heights
Concern for lower property values due to traffic issues
Concern for traffic affecting businesses (2 comments)
Request for controlled parking in University Heights neighbourhood
Request crossing light on Uxbridge Drive
Value right business mix to have adequate parking
Concern for construction of underground parking being disruptive
Value the information that was presented on *Transportation*
Value improved mass transit to SSC
Value improved connectivity to LRT
Value having an LRT stop for hospital students closer than Banff Trail
Request for more information about what a high quality transit stop looks like in Calgary
Value good, frequent public transit (2 comments)
Value improved shuttle bus to connect LRT, SSC & FMC (3 comments)
Concern buses are not adequate to manage traffic concerns
Concerns that traffic will affect the character of the neighbourhood
Value an evaluation of the land use and building design to determine impacts on local traffic patterns

General Comments about the Proposed Plan

Expectation to see plan or development proposal (6 comments)
Expectation to see City's plans to address traffic - more specifics needed to show how density affects traffic – wish to see final proposal presented by July 22 (4 comments)
Concern that ARP guidance will be difficult to enforce
Concern that the plan is too vague or general (7 comments)
Value more exacting density restrictions
Value having a discussion about specifics
Concern that data is not sufficient
Value the proposed plan & ready to see the development plan
Value limits to height, density and traffic
Concern that SSC is a TOD* (2 comments)
Value current services provided by SSC and wish for continued access to those kinds of services
Concern about reduction of SSC service during construction
Concern that inner City communities are at risk
Concern that NAC has become a MAC*
Concern about unfulfilled promises leading to lack of trust – during West Campus expansion – trees and raspberries were to be replaced.
Value C 1 zoning as appropriate but make it feel like a part of the community to avoid the qualities of a business park or mini-mall
Value change to create safety and provide the community with more
Concern about how much is planned for site -how can 250 residential units fit – overbuilding site? (3 comments)
Concern for high density & traffic congestion (3 comments)
Value more residential density and services, not land uses for work and medical
Concern about motivation of developers not being community-minded, focused on financial self-interest
Concern about the cost of maintaining infrastructure
Value development funding the cost of infrastructure improvements
Value addressing the traffic issues to ensure the community is not affected that much by parking

Concern that plans for parking are not adequately addressed (2 comments)
Expectation to reduce scale of development
Concern that ARP is a band-aid solution
Recognize a summary of community concerns & City's response to concerns
Value that City has heard community concerns and is acting on them
Concern that community concerns are not addressed
Concern that traffic solutions need to be in place in advance of development (2 comments)
Concern that May 14 posters do not show concerns incorporated* (2 comments)
Concern for high density (3 comments)
Concern that parking issues are not dealt with and detailed transportation analysis is needed
Concern about road capacity to receive density (2 comments)
Request for speed bumps along Uxbridge and Underhill
Value work- live-recreate-shop environment in community setting

General Comments about format and materials at the Open House

Concerns that expectations were not met – expectation of draft proposal of recommendations based on all the feedback from all parties on the boards tonight
Concern that residents don't understand that a development proposal has not been created
Concern that presentation of materials is superficial – does not show what will happen on site
Concern about rezoning and land use – expectation of compromise on these issues
Concern about the authenticity and sincerity of the engagement (7 comments)
Value good overall depiction of plans (2 comments)
Concern that community has not been heard
Value that the community is being heard
Value how community concerns were addressed
Concern that development needs have been addressed above the community (2 comments)
Concern that content is disappointing (2 comments)
Concern that "should" statements are unable to enforce policies
Concern that planning is 20 years behind
Value a presentation of the plan in a comprehensive manner
Value seeing diagrams of proposed land use instead of photographs
Concern that not enough information was provided - information and details are sparse (2 comments)
Concerns about what information will be presented to Council – plan is very high level
Value SSC serving the community (2 comments)
Concern that traffic information not dealt with adequately & request for clarification (2 comments)
Concern that redevelopment does not benefit University Heights & St. Andrews residence
Prefer big screen to show the development and a commentator to answer any relevant questions
Value redevelopment that is moderate in scale and fits with the community (2 comments)
Concern that posters were too close together – difficulty to get near to read them because of crowds (consider two sets)
Value materials & poster boards presented were informative and helpful (3 comments)
Value amount of time investing in bring information up to date and presenting it in a comprehensive manner
Value having the opportunity to talk to representatives from City Planning Staff (2 comments)
Value presence of large numbers of City/Planning Staff
Value City Planners as engaging, patient and willing to be direct with explanations
Concern for Planners voices heard at planning meetings