

Stadium Shopping Centre: Community Feedback

Summary of Public Comments on the Proposed Area Redevelopment Plan

LAND USE PLANNING AND POLICY

2013

Stadium Shopping Centre: Community Feedback

Summary of Public Comments on the Proposed Area Redevelopment Plan

Contents

- WHAT WE'VE HEARD 2
- WRITTEN COMMENTS..... 3
 - INFORMATION TABLES: 3
 - ON-SITE SIGNS: 4
 - ONLINE COMMENTS: 11
 - UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION OPEN HOUSE: 22
 - COMMUNITY WALKING TOUR: 29
 - PUBLIC DESIGN WORKSHOP: 30
 - EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE: 34

WHAT WE'VE HEARD

The City of Calgary's engagement on the proposed Stadium Shopping Centre Area Redevelopment Plan started in December 2012, when City staff met with the South Shaganappi Area Development Committee. Following that meeting, there have been eight main ways public input on the proposal has been collected:

- Another meeting with the South Shaganappi Area Development Council
- Information tables at the University of Calgary and Foothills Hospital
- Signs on the Stadium Shopping Centre site where comments can be posted
- An online forum where comments can be posted (www.calgary.ca/stadium)
- A meeting with members of the University Heights Community Association
- A community walking tour with members of the public
- A public design workshop which included a survey
- Email correspondence with members of the public

All comments submitted in writing are included below, along with summaries of comments received verbally during the walking tour, and while at the University of Calgary and Foothills Hospital. In summary, the main things that The City has heard to date from the public are:

- **Traffic:** There are concerns among members of the surrounding community that increased density will overload the road system around Stadium Shopping Centre. The main points raised are that higher densities will cause more vehicle shortcutting through University Heights and will create significant traffic delays getting into and out of the area.
- **Density:** Many members of the surrounding community feel that the floor area that is allowed on the Stadium Shopping Centre site is too much density, and that the density does not fit with the surrounding neighbourhood.
- **Building Height:** The current land use designation (zoning) allows heights up to 46 meters (approximately 14 storeys), which many people feel is too tall. Concerns about height have related to shadows being cast on the surrounding area and neighbouring school fields, as well as buildings that height not fitting into the community context.
- **Safety of School Children:** Safety concerns about having a hotel next to a school and the additional traffic generated by the development have been raised regularly.
- **Office Space:** Some members of the public have expressed that there should not be office space on the site because of the traffic it could generate.
- **Hotel:** Safety concerns (i.e. crime and disorder) as well as concerns about traffic generated by a hotel have been raised regularly.
- **Businesses:** The existing businesses at Stadium Shopping Centre have been identified as something that nearby residents do not want to lose, while there has also been some desire for a grocery store and a café to be added to the site.

- **Parking:** Nearby residents and businesses in the shopping centre have expressed the need for sufficient parking on the site, especially short-term parking in front of businesses.
- **Green Space:** Community members do not want to lose any green space in the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre, and although some are supportive of relocating the municipal reserve lands along 16th Avenue as a central courtyard, many have expressed that they would like to keep this land where it is currently located. There is also interest in having a range of public spaces that encourage social interaction.
- **Pedestrian Bridge:** There is support for a pedestrian bridge across 16th Avenue to connect Stadium Shopping Centre to Foothills Hospital.
- **Timeline of Process:** The initial goal of having the area redevelopment plan completed by May and ready for Council to consider by June was seen as too fast for community members to properly consider the proposed plan.

WRITTEN COMMENTS

The full text of all the written comments has been provided below. For events where written comments were not collected, a summary of comments has been recorded by City staff.

Information Tables:

On February 27, 2013, City staff visited the cafeteria at Foothills Hospital and on March 5, 2013, visited the student union building at the University of Calgary to talk about the proposed area structure plan with staff and students of these facilities. The general themes of the comments heard during these were:

- **Businesses:** University students and staff, as well as hospital staff and visitors, are frequent users of the existing businesses at Stadium Shopping Centre and identified these as an amenity that they did not want to lose. The addition of further restaurants and cafés was seen as desirable.
- **Hotel:** Many hospital staff and visitors commented that a hotel within walking distance of the hospital would be a substantial asset for both the hospital's operations (which include limited hostel-type accommodation for out-of-town patients) as well as for visitors, including patient families, vendors, researchers, and others with hospital business. University students and staff did not generally comment on the possibility of a hotel, though the presence of the nearby Hotel Alma was noted.
- **Office Space:** Several hospital staff commented that additional office space within walking distance of the hospital would be useful and attractive for medical specialties and ancillary services. University students and staff did not generally comment on the proposal to add upper floor office space.
- **Pedestrian Bridge:** There was nearly unanimous support and enthusiasm for a pedestrian bridge linking the hospital with the shopping centre. Many hospital staff and visitors

expressed frustration with the current walking conditions, and the delays and safety concerns related crossing at the existing intersection. University students and staff were also supportive of improved pedestrian links between the university facilities at Foothills Hospital and those at the main campus.

- **Residential Units:** Multiple hospital staff commented that they were (or had been) University Heights residents and that they enjoyed the ability to live close to the hospital as well as the shops and services. Several individuals commented that additional apartment units would be attractive to hospital staff. Several students and staff expressed positive interest in the addition of residential units near to the university.
- **Traffic:** Many hospital staff and visitors expressed concern that the intersection of 16 Avenue and 29 Street N.W. was already busy at peak times, and were worried that additional development may contribute to further congestion.

On-Site Signs:

Three signs were posted on the Stadium Shopping Centre site in early February to provide information about the proposed area redevelopment plan with an area where people could post comments. The comments received to date are:

#	Comment
1.	No high rise
2.	Keep at one height
3.	Central plaza/courtyard for residents and hospital users
4.	Bad ideas
5.	Not in favour of any development
6.	Candy store please!
7.	Not in favour of development proposal
8.	3-4 storeys along 16th
9.	No development!
10.	Skate park
11.	Larger scale residential along N portion
12.	Outdoor patio
13.	Please put a Safeway (or better yet a Superstore) in here! K thanks!
14.	Leave a place for established businesses (Cat House specifically)
15.	Park and cafés and cycling lanes down street
16.	So what are you doing?
17.	Good work. Good dope.

18.	:(
19.	Not approved
20.	This is bad
21.	I like the idea
22.	I like lower buildings
23.	Check out 'Strip Appeal' from the City-Region Studies Centre for ideas on how to re-invent the strip mall! (rooftop greenhouses, easier pedestrian access vs. huge parking lot)
24.	The strip mall itself is not an issue. What is an issue is the traffic. Replace the inefficient 3-way stop with a traffic circle/roundabout.
25.	So much for Calgary's walkability! Another strike against the community aspect.
26.	No!
27.	Please no big box American chains
28.	As long as there's Hi-Ball, I'm happy.
29.	No high-rise condos
30.	Height restrictions; No high-rise. How does the intersection house this?
31.	Condo will be great; university and hospital staff
32.	Add fresh produce grocer :)
33.	I love the idea; It's lovely!
34.	Liquour store ASAP
35.	Urban/neighbourhood feel; Keep these great stores! Better accessibility for walkers (instead of walking through parking lot). Ready for change
36.	Liquour store ASAP
37.	Liquour store needed
38.	Another chance for a few developers to get rich by screwing the rest of us with government approval.
39.	Good idea! :)
40.	Avoid high density housing; There is enough traffic in the area already
41.	Liquour store please
42.	Good dope
43.	One level
44.	Great idea. Happy valentine's day.
45.	Liquour store needed
46.	It sucks!!
47.	Liquour store badly needed

48.	Good work; I love the idea.
49.	Crossing at 36 Avenue to cross the railroad tracks (United Church)
50.	Keep the Cat House!!
51.	Keep Olive (yay!) Groove
52.	Fruit and veggie stand
53.	Bistro type restaurant
54.	Hell yes, as long as Olive Grove stays.
55.	A non-Starbucks, non-Tim Horton's coffee shop (I agree, yes)
56.	Don't! I need a place to buy lunch
57.	We love the Cat House
58.	Add McDonald's
59.	Keep Olive Grove
60.	Keep the bakery
61.	Green space
62.	Local coffee shop that has open mic music events!
63.	Reasonably priced places to eat, like the Viet. restaurant. Required places like Mac, Drug store, green spaces and no residences.
64.	Fruits and vegetables! Small grocer?
65.	Bike friendly!
66.	Niche for established businesses; Cat House, Mac's and Paragon in particular.
67.	Liquor store
68.	KFC
69.	Safe walkway
70.	I support this (I second this; so do I)
71.	Child-friendly pub
72.	What will happen to Sanity?
73.	Not enough sticky notes and pens
74.	The food places will be gone; more food!
75.	No thanks, We don't need a shopping mall.
76.	No Walmart
77.	What will happen to the Cat House?
78.	If they build the mall and increase traffic in the area, what will happen to ambulances trying to get to the hospital?

79.	If you build it, they will come.
80.	Why do we want this to look like Kensington (no parking)?
81.	Please don't where will we buy lunch? It's stupid!
82.	Don't
83.	Don't do it, it's not that necessary.
84.	Keep Olive Grove
85.	Fine, but extend our lunches by one hour
86.	Don't do it
87.	What will I do when I'm hungry?
88.	Where do I go when I'm hungry? This place is my life!
89.	Skate park
90.	Don't
91.	If they build another one I will be happy
92.	Don't do it! Don't do it!
93.	Liquor store, current amenities, easier bus access (stop on 16 Avenue)
94.	Liquor store
95.	Pedestrian/bike overpass over 16 Avenue at 29 Street and Shaganappi at Children's
96.	Pedestrian overpass over Shaganappi at Children's hospital
97.	Vegetable market
98.	ARP boundary not clear. What park? Large enough to enjoy?
99.	Indoor playground for kids like the Devonian park
100.	Good
101.	Swimming pool
102.	Traffic flow will be changed with a big mall; both ambulances and school people will be delayed.
103.	Put a crosswalk light!
104.	Liquor store please!
105.	Liquor store?
106.	Liquor store please!
107.	Sounds good
108.	Don't do it
109.	Liquor store
110.	Niche for established businesses

111.	Keep established businesses in new ones; like a coffee shop
112.	Keep Mac's please
113.	No liquor store
114.	Keep stores; not too dense development
115.	Keep remaining stores; add on; hold back on apartments etc...
116.	Development should be limited to 3 storey buildings! Parking needs to be free!
117.	Candy store
118.	Keep current stores but add more!
119.	Keep the same stores
120.	Low rise
121.	What about traffic?
122.	Low rise only; keep the parking free
123.	Yes!
124.	No!
125.	Grocery store
126.	Senior's facility
127.	Keep the same stores
128.	Be smart and keep it the same way
129.	The City needs to be more neutral, not give developer everything they want; listen to the community more! Moderate development wanted!
130.	Just say yes!
131.	No; we school kids buy lunch here
132.	Please no! It's bad.
133.	Please don't
134.	It is absolutely needed! This area needs to be more commercialized
135.	No!
136.	Yes!
137.	Keep the same stores
138.	Do it!
139.	We already have so many
140.	Should be zoned C1
141.	No offices, too congested
142.	Build with solar and geothermal sources of energy



143.	Keep pedicures and manicures – Expression Nails
144.	Keep all businesses in place
145.	Keep the Olive Grove – no apartments or offices!
146.	Maybe you would like the mall to fall down and then you would have nothing?
147.	I would like you not to build a mall
148.	No! It is so annoying!
149.	Stop it!
150.	I would like an ice cream/candy shop
151.	Walkability is key
152.	Keep some 20min surface parking
153.	Mixed use
154.	I love this idea
155.	Sounds like a horrible idea; this isn't Brentwood; not worth the trouble
156.	Very exciting
157.	Good job
158.	Keep Hi-Ball's sweet and sour sauce
159.	Keep the nail place
160.	Do not disturb Stadium Shops; I like it here as is
161.	What about all the small businesses?
162.	Fast food restaurant
163.	Please keep Bon Ton Bakery and Billingsgate; add a produce market
164.	Produce market (I agree, we agree too!)
165.	Keep the Olive Grove
166.	Yes; drive thru access to present shops!
167.	If you build it, they will come
168.	The businesses that are here are established; it will produce too high of a rent for them; do not do it.
169.	Keep Nails salon
170.	Access to University Heights!
171.	Not too big! But a real grocery store would be nice
172.	This will strangle University heights and Saint Andrew's
173.	What about the little men? Please leave the family businesses; Bon Ton, Hair, etc...!
174.	Do it

175.	Keep hair salon; Phil and Sebastian would be great; Fratello would be even better!
176.	Coffee shop; Tim Horton's; bank
177.	Keep small businesses; no hotel!!
178.	The small businesses here now make it unique; do we really need more big box stores? No to development
179.	Fresh produce and make sure Bon Ton and bakery stay
180.	On second thought, do it very slowly.
181.	Coffee shop! ie Good Earth, Phil and Sebastian, Fratello Analog; Thank you!
182.	High end housing please! Townhouses, not apartments
183.	Get rid of Impark! I agree!
184.	I am a young person – I don't like your ideas
185.	No housing, hotels, apartment places
186.	Keep shops open during development; this is where we shop on foot! We support our neighbourhood businesses!
187.	Wine store, Bon Ton, Coffee Shop, Produce Market
188.	Traffic and disruption to 'established businesses' ought to be major concerns
189.	Keep Cob's and Olive Grove
190.	LRT to Foothills Hospital and Children's!
191.	Build a grocery store
192.	Pedestrian overpass over 16 Avenue at 29 Street
193.	Fair trade coffee and tea shop
194.	Keep the density down! Deal with the traffic! Keep our green space.
195.	Make it pretty
196.	Tom Baker upgrade necessary – at same time as redirection of Stadium Shopping Centre; two major construction zones within a ¼ mile; traffic nightmare; green space? I don't think so.
197.	No hardscaping
197.	No!
198.	Keep the nail shop!!
199.	Liquor store
200.	Where is traffic and the interchange into the area?
201.	Keep it all but give it a facelift
202.	How does this serve the residential community?
203.	How will you control traffic through University Heights?
204.	I would like to have a candy shop! (agreed)

205.	I say keep the nail shop!
206.	Another developer gets rich at the expense of the people...
205	Keep bar and Bon Ton's

Online Comments:

The website at www.calgary.ca/stadium allows for public comments in a discussion forum. The comments received on the website to date are:

#	Comment
1.	All the examples you use as illustrations of similar (?) developments have access by roads on all four sides. The Stadium Shopping centre has on one road for access and it is overused now. How do you plan to deal with the extra traffic this development will engender?
2.	<p>I am a long time resident of University Heights and though I welcome a revitalization of the Stadium Shopping Centre, I am opposed to the kind of large development that is proposed. Given the size of the parcel of land and the nature of the community, this should be zoned as CC1 not CC2 thereby limiting the size and scope of the development. By limiting the size, the concerns of traffic and transportation will be mitigated. Having access and egress directly from 16th Ave will have little effect on these problems with high density development.</p> <p>There was suggestion that high office/retail development would increase jobs for the area. With two hospitals and the building of a third in addition to UofC and the athletic facilities at McMahon and the Foothills Athletic Park there is no need to increase jobs in this area. Furthermore that is not the responsibility of our community.</p> <p>I strongly object to office space in this complex. There is plenty of office space in the area (eg 16th Ave & Shaganappi Trail). Office space exacerbates the traffic with more cars coming and going. People working in and attending offices do not contribute to community life. Conversely, if there is to be residential space, at least there would be less traffic generated and residents would make a positive contribution to the life of University Heights. So residences maybe but NO OFFICES.</p> <p>We are a small community already surrounded by high density non-residential development. We do not need anymore. What we need is the fine services and shops that have benefited us all over the years.</p>
3.	I can not imagine on that small piece of land putting a 14 storey hotel. I lived in Garrison Woods for a number of years. This development proposal is nothing like that. In addition, I do not agree that it is a primary transit line. It is not close enough to the C-Train to be considered primary. I am also very concerned about traffic impacting the access to the Foothills Hospital. During the Christmas season I have seen it take 20 minutes to go a few block s due to traffic. This is not acceptable near a hospital Finally, why would you give up green space to a developer? You can't get it back.
4.	I have attended many of the recent meetings on the Stadium ARP, West Campus lands, and UHCA AGM. I wish to register my concern for the unrealistic, compressed process that is presently in place with the ARP being presented to the community by April 11/13 prior to going to the planning commission on April 25/13. The members of this community are showing up to meetings in large numbers and want their voices to be heard. If the city is truly serious about engaging the surrounding communities an extension to the deadline is necessary. We want this site to be developed in a sustainable way, that is an asset to the area, and not a source of increased, dangerous traffic gridlock. Will City Council agree to extending the deadlines for this process? Thank you for your consideration.
5.	<p>As a parent of young children attending Westmount school which is neighbouring the proposed development, as well as a resident and home owner in the Varsity community which is a stone's throw of the proposed development, I do have various and serious concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: The City of Calgary is fast tracking this ARP for no reason related to the public interest. The fast tracking only serves the benefit of the private developer on the expense of its citizens. The fast tracking does not give the Citizens, The Community or the City staff the time

needed to properly evaluate the ARP. I ask to give –at least a full year– to properly conduct studies, solicit public input and craft a thoughtful input and critique.

- Crime rate and possible endangerment of minors: The ARP description suggests a possible motel as part of the development. The area is host of various schools. A motel development in sight adjacent to the school playgrounds, can pose potential risks to children. The school boards, parents or The Calgary Police were not consulted in these regards.

I ask that the ARP be clear about the developments and the land use, as well as extensive consultation with the Calgary Police Services, parents and the School Boards, (including the Charter School Board) would need to take place to insure that our children are safe while playing at the school playgrounds.

- The lack of local community benefit: The ARP as its stands does not provide a benefit to such a unique and established community such as green/open space trees, etc. This relates back to the comment above regarding the timing. Enough time should be given to the community to work with the City and the Developer and seek community benefits. The ARP –as it stands at the moment– sole focus is to realize profits to the developer with total disregard to the community. The ARP needs to mandate active community representation and input for all development permitting projects
- Parking and Traffic concerns as well as impact on public safety: The ARP is vague and lacks comprehensive parking and traffic impact studies. The ARP needs to have a guideline incorporated which stipulates parking requirements for tenants and public. Considering the unique characteristics of the community, extensive consultation with the schools, community residents and existing area businesses need to take place.

6. I was in the presentation of the Stadium "brain storm plan" a few days ago.

I admitted: It surprised me, when looking at all those ideas of buildings, offices, retail stores, etc were jumping in front of my eyes... Wow what a plan!

But my perspective of everything changed when I got closer: The brain storm was the drought of solutions for traffic conflicts with pedestrian, cyclists and some hundreds cars that will populate this area, not mentioning 200-300 new workers, and some hundreds more of new residents. Finally, the darkness ended my happiness when I noticed a plan to open an entry/exit of the new Centre straight onto 16 AVE. Just 200 m West of the actual intersection.

I asked for plans on the Uxbridge X 16 Ave crossing: No plan. - 16 AVE is the Canada #1 Highway.

I asked about the 2 weird crossing some drivers do accessing or exiting the gas station: No plan, I think just a few people have thought about them.

I asked myself: Why did City of Calgary re-build a bridge 800 m west (Shagannapi Crossing)?

7. We have a daughter attending the school in this area and would like to mirror the comments about safety as well. Are any physical barriers being built between the mall and the school? Our chief concern is the flow of traffic in the University Heights area. More specifically, I do not see the logic of having prohibited left turns and right turns within University Heights. In fact, they impede the flow of traffic and contributing to the congestion. When developing the Stadium Shopping Plaza, these restrictions must be removed so as to give drivers and/or buses other options of leaving this somewhat congested area. There may be been valid reasons in the past but one needs to allow traffic to flow.

8. It was a pleasure to meet you at our community meeting last Thursday night. Thanks for listening to me.

Let me say again that I am, and most of the community, are not about no development but rather appropriate development. The questions we all have are common questions I think you will find which is why I feel it is important to share the responses. My question is particular is what the plan is to deal with traffic.

As mentioned, I am in the business of community consultation myself and it is common practice and even regulated that I consult, receive feedback, incorporate the feedback and respond accordingly. It is my responsibility to document that all this occurred to ensure the respondent has been heard and any issues are addressed to the best of my ability and I show the regulators that I have done that before decisions are made that may adversely affect a community or individual. I hope you will respond the same way whether regulated to do so or not and based on the right thing to do.

I am sure you have heard most of this but I will summarize with, the traffic at the school every day, the Polish Catholic Church which has daily mass, the traffic into the shopping center and most of all, the traffic that shortcuts through our community to get to the hospital. Traffic has increased in our community because of a change at the school and the expansion to the Foothills Hospital, one of the largest employers in Calgary. New news that came out the next day of the meeting is the addition of a 1 billion dollar Cancer Center to be built at the Foothills. Please just imagine the increased level of traffic with these new additions not to mention during the construction itself. Illegal turns currently occur into our community because of driver's frustration at trying to turn from 16 Ave. onto 29 St. I have great difficulty getting in and out of my community. Traffic counters are not going to give you the information you need to make decisions on what is being proposed. From the last development meeting there is more traffic now and the development was turned down because of traffic concerns. I have not mentioned football games because they are infrequent and can deal with them on that basis.

I hope you will take all of this into consideration and respond accordingly. My questions and concerns echo many others which is why I feel it would be important to respond and show everyone involved that you have done so while taking into consideration the concerns brought forward. The homes here in this community are our greatest assets and there is concern for those assets given what is being proposed.

I would also welcome the opportunity to discuss with you or anyone else in your department how we incorporate Issues Management into our client's projects. While the projects we work on are not always popular in the energy business, we do have a great deal of success for all involved.

9. There are very good comments already, so I'm glad I can keep it short.
What's the rush?
There are apparently no existing developed plans yet to be decided on, Just pie in the sky pictures giving the community the warm fuzzy feeling how it COULD look like. Sorry Western Securities, that's not the base on which decisions are made.

Our Alderman Dale Hodges should never allow the C-C2 zoning.

Just looking to the east to the Boardwalk (former Queens) having 18 storeys. How would 14 storeys look at the Keg's place casting its shadow on almost the entire new development?
We should also keep an eye on 29th Street connector with new Baker Centre and West Campus "Highway."
10. I have a child attending one of the schools in behind the proposed development site, and I DO NOT want him attending a school located next to a hotel. Hotels/motels will only have a negative impact on this area: transient hotel population will lower the level of safety currently enjoyed by all the residents, and potentially lower the current land value of the neighborhood. I support the idea of increased density in general, but it is not worth it if I am going to be worried about my son all day while at school, worried a child may step on a needle, or who knows what else, and name one person who would like a hotel built beside their house or school. I would be fine with a 15 story commercial or residential building if we really want to fit more people here, but let's make it permanent population. Occupants would at least have somewhat more of an invested interest in our community which in turn would help reduce crime and increase desirability for living here.
11. It is difficult to understand and appreciate the ideas which are circulating around the Stadium shopping mall development project confronted as we are by the systematic furtiveness of procedure thus far. The developer, Western Securities, insist there are no plans in place as yet, but I find this pronouncement problematical considering the lack of time allotted to the community to assess and evaluate this development. The community needs another year to analyze and approve this project.

There may be no definite plan in place, however it appears there are definite proposals. These proposals must be addressed beginning with the size of the development. Unfortunately, we were re-

zoned to CC2, which could result in a development of up to 792,000 square feet and with building heights up to 150 feet in height. As the land size is less than 3.2 hectares, this zoning (according to your own guidelines) should be CC1. This re-zoning to CC2 should be addressed and changed. A development at its maximum potential is out of the question, as we would see an unacceptable increase in traffic and density within our community.

Increased traffic has already altered easy flow in University Heights, resulting in lengthy wait times at several intersections. There are long wait times in accessing Crowchild Trail from 24th avenue and congestion on both Utah and Uxbridge Drives related to school traffic. Our small community is already impacted by the Foothills and Children's Hospitals, the University of Calgary, the football stadium, and Father Bauer arena and we cannot even handle the current traffic issues (which remain to be addressed for several years).

The proposed hotel on the Stadium site is incompatible with an elementary and a high-school in close proximity and would also add to the current parking problems. With apartments, businesses and medical offices and a hotel in the present list of considerations, there must be specific parking and traffic plans in place for all parties. This is not in place.

And what of the aesthetics of the development? Can we expect a new trend in mall development offering protection of community green space or are we to be another dismal example of the blighted mall architecture so prevalent in our city?

We must insist on retaining all of the green space along 16th avenue and disallow a traffic route through the adjacent reserve lands. The green space that presently borders the schools and our community offers an opportunity for Western Securities to create a unique area of beauty and serenity, which, if effectively designed could influence city planners to address "green" in future developments.

We did not ask for this development, however we are asking for protection of our quality of life, and that the developers and the City of Calgary realize that they have an obligation to protect the environs of this city – not just for us, but for the future citizens as well.

12. Sigh. Of course the NIMBY's come out right away. Very sad.

13. I certainly agree with Ron, who commented 5 days ago. I had developed a shorter version of many of his comments. No, we are not NIMBYs; we are realists who already experience the current amount of traffic due to Foothills Medical Centre and the U of C, in proximity to St. Andrews Heights and University Heights. I hope the people who are trying to cram their comments onto a small yellow sticky-note over at Stadium Shopping Centre ("SSC") will elaborate on their concerns in a larger format!

Currently, access to the SSC is already difficult enough. I do not see how this could be improved by having higher traffic volumes on streets not designed to be major thoroughfares.

DO NOT EVEN THINK ABOUT HAVING MORE TRAFFIC (BOTH HUMAN AND VEHICULAR) IN THE AREA OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

DO NOT EVEN THINK ABOUT ALLOWING AN INCREASE IN THE ALREADY EXCESSIVE TRAFFIC ON 29TH STREET! This is an ambulance access point, and accommodates traffic by FMC workers, patients, and their families, as well as carrying a lot of truck traffic, some of it having no business in the immediate area. The proposal or a much later Cancer Treatment Centre at Foothills will surely increase traffic on 29th Street (currently some of the treatment has been offsite due to space constraints at the Tom Baker Centre). As such development cannot be stopped, the City must plan accordingly for the pressures related to that, and not blindly accept any and all proposed increased developments in the area. Look at the cumulative effects; otherwise, what are Planners for?

Where is the evidence that City planners are abiding by the stated objective that high-density developments should be placed in close proximity to LRT stations?

Where is the ability to ensure no increased traffic through TWO residential areas--St. Andrews Heights and University Heights?

In summary, this proposed redevelopment is unrealistic, at best. It does nothing positive for the

surrounding areas, but would obviously line the pockets of a few. There is no way that vehicular and human traffic will not increase exponentially on the surrounding streets that already handle HOSPITAL and UNIVERSITY traffic.

14. My comments on the development and this process:

1. This is far too vast a development for the size of the site.
2. The traffic in the area is already congested as all the residents and community users know. Anyone actually trying to use the streets in the area (Uxbridge Drive, 29th Street, etc.) knows adding a development on this scale is not feasible – there is nothing that could be done to accommodate the volumes of traffic.
3. A traffic study was conducted over a school break – this is obviously not going to reflect the heavy use in the area on most days. How can a proper assessment be done if this is the attitude of the City towards getting accurate information on area use?
4. The affect on the area as a whole will be to overwhelm the traffic and other resources of the area – there is already a huge residential development coming to the University grounds. Is any consideration in the shopping centre development given to the change in the nature of the Community and its residents?
5. Traffic at the intersection of 16th Avenue is already over taxed – adding this development will make the Trans-Canada highway an embarrassment to the city for any travelers who are try to visit or pass through.
6. This development is no where near any practical rapid transit. This means that all traffic to the development will be by passenger car.
7. Parking is at a premium in the area at present – in fact the area cannot accommodate current uses. The amount of parking required for this development makes it simply impractical.
8. The speed of the approval process is too fast – community and stakeholder groups do not have sufficient time to understand and react to this development. This should be delayed for at least a year while stakeholders gather further information – The developer and the City seem to forget that virtually all community involvement is done by volunteers in their off-work time. The developer and the city have paid full time professionals to push the project forward – what's the rush except to push an untenable project through without sufficient community involvement?

15. A hotel makes no sense in this area. Motel village is feet away. Redevelopment on that site could create better use of space. The Stadium development is not similarly surrounded by roads and would result in much traffic, not to mention neighbouring an elementary school, which would seem a bit odd.

Neighbours before developers please.

16. I am opposed to the high density development proposed for the Stadium Shopping Centre redevelopment. A focus on retail and residential redevelopment of Stadium Centre would be a good fit with the emphasis of this as a community centre of activity. Commercial office space however, has no place in this project. It would be a serious detractor to the quality of living in University Heights. Of note:

- Staff and clientele using proposed Stadium office space contribute little to the community
- Traffic cutting through the community can be expected to increase as the density increases
- Access and egress to and from the community will be compromised by the increased traffic generated. Congestion at Uxbridge Dr and 16th Ave, Unwin Road (both ends), and at 24th Ave and Crowchild Trail already limit residents' transportation options at peak times

- The height of buildings required to house the proposed office space will shade both the shopping centre itself, and the adjacent community park space and school grounds. Maximum heights in the SW corner of the development as proposed will shade the adjacent playground in the early part of the day
- Significant opportunity for nearby office development is available and planned for adjacent to the Foothill's Medical Complex on the SW corner of the intersection of 16th Ave and Shaganappi Trail.

University Heights Community is at the heart of significant developments beyond the Stadium Centre redevelopment including the proposed new Cancer Centre, development of the West Campus lands, redevelopment of Foothills Athletic Park, and the proposed doubling of on campus residences. This proposal must be regarded in the context of the cumulative effect of all these developments on the quality of living in adjacent communities.

17. I agree with the many posts objecting to the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre as presented to date. It is too big of a redevelopment for the site and this community. Hotels can be built in Motel Village. Traffic is a huge concern already, and this will only make it worse. I doubt Calgary Roads would allow a new access off 16th Avenue into this proposed development. Parking will be a big concern too. Two public schools, University Elementary and Westmount Charter border this property which could threaten the safety and security of the young students. Why is this project getting fast-tracked? Why is the developer and the City so vague about the proposal? Are they floating trial balloons ... proposing big office towers or hotels, then scale back to appease the opposition?

18. I have attended some information events at our school council and am alarmed by the development proposed for this area.

1. I am alarmed by the timeline being proposed. Is this being pushed through Council so that community members cannot organize objection? I cannot see any other reason why a project with so much at stake would be rammed through the process so quickly. Is the planning committee afraid that with proper time given to the process, the many flaws and holes in the plan will be brought to light?
2. I am alarmed that this plan includes the possibility of a hotel being built adjacent to my child's playground. What planner in his/her right mind would actually plan to do something like that? The safety concerns are huge.
3. The density of development that is being proposed is completely unrealistic for the area and will only result in one thing: traffic nightmares in an area that is already out of a horror movie - 16th Ave and Uxbridge Dr. and entering Uxbridge Drive from the gas station. Our school busses leaving Westmount have to go through that intersection every day at the end of the day when traffic is very busy. It can add 5-10 minutes to already very long bus rides. More cars will exacerbate this problem.
4. The idea of taking the green space adjacent to the RedWater Grill and making it a direct access point to 16th Avenue is ludicrous. With the exit to Shaganappi Trail right there, it would be an accident waiting to happen. But more importantly, the green space you are proposing to use is vital to University Heights. I believe that University Heights is already below the acceptable amount of reserve lands.
5. Added to the West Campus Development and Foothills Athletic Dept. redevelopment, the city is looking at a massive influx of traffic into a much smaller area. I do not see that this has been accounted for in realistic terms. It has been given lip service, but no true solution has been given.
6. This development does not reside on the primary transit network, so the only way to access the area, realistically, is by car. Where will everyone park? I have been told that the developer must provide parking, but parking is already a challenge in the area. Adding thousands of

additional cars will only make the situation worse.

Above all, it is critical that this development proposal be given the time needed for all parties to voice concern and to find out what is actually driving this development that, to people outside the process, seems absolutely ludicrous.

19. I am very concerned about the development of Stadium Shopping Centre. I understand that the time has come for this area to be redeveloped, however I believe that what the developers have in mind will have a detrimental effect on the community of University Heights.

My major concern is the density of the project. With a large density comes a host of problems that will effect the quality of life in the University Heights Community. If redevelopment is to occur I hope the city will have the best interests of the residents in mind, The redevelopment should:

- a) Not be 83% of the size of Market Mall on a much smaller land base
- b) Have buildings that are no higher than 3 stories - a low rise development that could encompass both retail, commercial and residential
- c) Take into account the traffic problems that we already have with the 16th Avenue and 29th St. intersection. This includes the increased traffic with Westmount Charter School and the cut through traffic from University Drive via Unwin to access 29th St.
- d) Take into account the number of people who make their way to the various institutions that surround this community, Foothill Hospital, Children's Hospital, the University and Foothills Athletic Park and McMahon Stadium. This could number in the several thousands and add to the density that already exists.
- e) Have a positive impact on the immediate area. That would be our community.
- f) Have the safety and security of school children in mind. A hotel would mean transience and with schools so close, could be a hazard.
- g) Should keep the parks that border on the schools in full sunlight so that any building would not cast shadows on those areas.
- h) Keep the parkland that we already have . There is no guarantee that a swap would compel the developers to provide for a green space that would remain green. We feel it is important to keep the green space along 16th Ave. as we were robbed of space when 16th Ave. was widened for the overpass.

These are some of my thoughts as you continue to develop the ARP. As a resident of Calgary I hope that this development will be one of class and will enhance this area and not detract from the wonderful ambience that we already enjoy.

20. You may correct me, but I understand :

1. The current zoning of the Stadium Shopping Centre is C-C2
2. The area of the parcel of land in question for this redevelopment is 2.46 hectares
3. C-C2 zoning applies to land parcels greater than 3.2 hectares, so how did this zoning, which is 0.74 hectares short, come to be and when did this occur and why? Did the developer request a re-zoning to C-C2 or did the City decide on its own to this rezoning?
4. Ten percent of a neighborhood is to be reserved for public green space lands. University Heights has less than this. Does the Area Redevelopment Plan, which is to go to the city Planning Commission in April of this year, show any more of our already reduced green space to be lost due to road(s) required for ingress and egress to this shopping centre? And this proposed development is more commercial and residential

than a community based shopping centre. It will massively increase the density of this residential area; daytime parking (free) resulting from employees and visitors to the Foothills Hospital site, Tom Baker Cancer Clinic, Alberta Children's Hospital and research facility buildings at both hospital sites, the University of Calgary, and the University and Westmount schools are already taxing our on-street parking. A hotel is not a proper commercial entity situated in such close proximity to an elementary school (grades 1 to 6), a charter school (grades 1 to 12) and playgrounds and soccer fields for our youth in our residential community.

5. At a previous Community Association Meeting held at the University School, where there were members from the City, I spoke with a party who was at the Traffic and Planning Department display. My question to him was what were the plans for handling the increased traffic on Uxbridge, Unwin, 29th Street NW that this massive development would incur, and his reply was "There is nothing on board regarding these issues." How and why is this proposal even being given consideration? I invite all of you to come at 3 p.m. on any week-day, when twelve regular sized school buses from Westmount Charter School are leaving and there is a shift change at the Foothills Hospital Complex and the University is closing its daytime classes, and see for yourselves the traffic problem that now exists, never mind how it will be with office towers and residential units on the site of the shopping centre.

I look forward to your replies.

21. I am a UH resident and, while I have not attended any of the meetings due to work commitments, I have read over the documents on this site (particularly the developers pre-application discussion document). Overall I am supportive of the plans to revitalize Stadium Shopping Centre. I think we can all benefit from this if we are allowed to provide constructive input that will impact the process. There is a lot to like about the plans found in the discussion document. Particularly moving the green space along 16th to a location within the complex that would allow it to be used effectively; engaging and expanding the park space adjacent to the school; making a street-friendly complex with ground floor retail space that would be attractive to community residents. However, there are also some serious concerns, particularly with the use density as planned. It is entirely unclear how traffic into and out of this site will impact the flow along Uxbridge drive (one of only three entry points into UH community) and, more importantly, the 16th Ave/29th St interchange. It is unreasonable to model this on a high density residential community when effective public transportation is poor and (mostly) far away. I would propose the density of use be scaled back significantly by modifying the high rise residential unit and the hotel plans (limited number of executive type suite accommodation units?)

22. At yesterday's Community Tour with Rollin Stanley, the City's General Manager for Planning, Development and Assessment, it was suggested by Desmond Bliet (Planner 2) that we communicate our concerns to our Alderman.

Our Alderman is Dale Hodges and his contact information is as follows;

Email: Dale.Hodges@Calgary.ca

His Website also has a link to contact his Ward 1 office. That link is: <http://www.calgary.ca/Aldermen...>

Here are the points I am sending to Alderman Dale Hodges;

1) I am personally supportive of the redevelopment of the Stadium Shopping Centre. However, this redevelopment must be an enhancement to the residents of University Heights and not detract from our needs and enjoyment nor those from other local communities.

2) The community engagement process currently under way does not allow the affected residents adequate time to get involved and understand the redevelopment initiative, fully review its impact to our community and most importantly voice our concerns in an organized manner. I would encourage the City to delay the submission of the Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) which is slated to go before the Calgary Planning Commission in April, 2013.

3) The defining issue is the current zoning of the Stadium Shopping Centre. The current zoning (C-C2) has been grandfathered into the South Shaganappi Community Area Plan to the detriment of University Heights and other surrounding communities. C-C2 is used for parcels of land greater than 3.2 hectares and no larger than 12 hectares. Currently the land use bylaws would not allow this land to be designated as C-C2 because it is only 2.46 hectares. This disconnect has alarmed residents and created most of the angst, as the current zoning allows 12-14 story office towers and hotels which would almost certainly detract from the small neighborhood feel enjoyed by local residents. What we want to see is a Garrison Woods or Bridges (found in Bridgeland) style of redevelopment which will greatly reduce the density of the site from its current zoning. The redevelopment should be conducive to a community gathering place with retail services.

4) Green space is not only important to the residents of University Heights but also to the 2 schools located in the community. Current Municipal bylaws require 10 percent of our neighborhood to be set aside for playgrounds and parks. University Heights has less than 10 percent municipal reserve due the widening of 16th Avenue and the new overpass. Mention was made at the "community open houses" of incorporating green space into the re-development of Stadium Shopping Centre. First, any green space on privately owned land is no longer "public". Second, I do not want to see a further reduction to our existing green space by repurposing the land parallel to 16th Avenue, behind the Keg/Wendy's and Redwater to make an additional access point for traffic. Although we may not be able to create any more public green space, future redevelopment needs to be open with minimal cascading shade from the threat of tall office towers; well treed and amenable to pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

5) Development in surrounding areas over the past few decades has resulted in traffic and parking problems for local residents. Traffic and parking planning not only needs to accommodate the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre, but should also alleviate existing traffic and parking issues from past overbuilding. Existing traffic and parking issues need to be fully studied which I do not believe can be adequately addressed nor solutions developed within the proposed ARP schedule.

23. Photos and images from the workshop presentations look decent to me. I'd like the current retailers to be incorporated - the current shopping centre is ugly and totally uninspiring, but actually there are some pretty good shops (butchers, fishmongers, restaurants). Think about how it can be connected to the hospital better, perhaps by a pedestrian bridge. Please keep the parking underground. Make sure it has a joined together feel, not just a collection of standalone buildings. Make sure whatever is built is adaptable to different tenants and uses (i.e. don't let chain restaurants build their own signature buildings). Make space and buildings that could be occupied by any business or other use. Make sure it is leafy with nice sitting spaces. a decent bar or two, or three would be nice for the afterwork crowd from the hospital, university and other businesses (again, make sure the built space is adaptable, not just a chain bar/restaurant's own design that is useless for anything else). Express shuttles to the C-Train would be good. Hope this ends up looking like the nicer images from the presentations and not just another average development that's just a bit better than what was bulldozed.

24. Dear Alderman Dale Hodges,
 Stop this nonsense if you want our vote.
 Thanks,
 A voter

25. I have reviewed the past workshop presentations and minutes, and I fail to understand how changing one single-level strip mall (with a limited number of retailers) into 10 new multi-level complexes will improve traffic, cyclist, and pedestrian movement around this site. Yes, I understand how the flow can be changed, but building MORE will ultimately create MORE traffic, and the plans do not show any parking. Given the density of the proposed development, I'm assuming at least a 5-story underground parkade will be built, as this is what will be needed to accommodate the cars for people living within and using this site daily. It is naive to believe that users of this site will not drive and expect to park, and without planning to accommodate parking, the overflow will be into the community.

Currently there are several car-car, car-pedestrian, and cyclist-car accidents around this site, so I'm also assuming a pedestrian/cyclist overpass will be built across 16th Avenue to allow safe access to the site. I do not support having a transit hub on the north side of 16th Avenue, as discussed in the January meeting, the transit hub is more appropriate for the hospital site - our community is already

overwhelmed by school volume twice daily.

I am also against the development of this site overflowing into the school grounds which surround the current mall. I am not aware of another public elementary school that lies within one block of a hotel, and I have concerns for student safety given the proposed hotel development. The residents of Briar Hill are already coping with crime and transient populations overflowing from hotel/motel properties surrounding their community, and I do not wish for this issue to also be present in University Heights. Interestingly all of the potential "after" photos used in the presentation show a buffer between high-density apartment buildings and other buildings such as single family dwellings or schools; however there is no buffer allocated in the current plans - my understanding of the current plans is that residential/retail will flow directly onto the surrounding school grounds.

26. As suggested by the circular sent out by our community association, the following are my comments and concerns related to the University Heights ARP process and subsequent proposed development planned for the Stadium Shopping Mall. Unfortunately, my work out of country precludes me from attending this Thursday's open house, but my wife and several of our neighbors will be attending so I am hopeful there will be more than a single voice (besides Peter's) being heard. So, towards this, and to ensure that Peter is not the only person raising any sort of audible protest, the following provides some of my input to this discussion and decision process.

Unfortunately, I have access to a very limited email address list while in Trinidad, so please feel free to forward this note on to other community members, city officials and any other interested parties on my behalf. Also, it's probably worth stating that these are my personal opinions and do not reflect the positions of anyone other than myself. That said, others are more than welcome to dissent, chime-in and/or respond otherwise as this is mostly intended to get people thinking and the conversation going.

Issues that I think merit further discussion and/or reconsideration within the context of the proposed ARP and development include:

- Timing.....I am more than a little concerned about how the City of Calgary appears to be fast-tracking this ARP. Typically, a fully considered ARP takes years to get done. Even a simple change of land use decision will need almost a year to go through a fast-tracked process of review, input, consideration and approval. While I appreciate this may be as a result of the failed efforts for a development permit suffered by a prominent local land developer previously, and I realize that this ARP is not quite as complex as say the East Village one done a few years back, the current schedule of conceptualizing, drafting, seeking public input and approving in 3 months seems a tad aggressive....particularly when it has only been in the past couple of weeks that signs went up around the mall announcing the initiative. My impression is that the timing seems biased and certainly not set up for full engagement, discussion and review by the community and other stakeholders. When coupled with the U of C West Campus development, the impact potential to this community in the very near term is huge....not much different than would be a ring road through Lakeview, yet we seem to lack much of the media coverage, fanfare and drama attracted by that issue. Unfortunately, I think residents have a single opportunity to affect some changes here, because I suspect that once the ARP is approved, there will be very little that can be done to oppose the subsequent development permits provided they loosely conform to the ARP guidelines. Unfortunately, the same applies to the development going on to the west of us....but that's another thing.
- Local community benefit....let's not have this be just a bigger tax revenue base for the city. I believe that the community should realize a benefit from any sort of development such as is being proposed. Certainly the City will, as will the developer. Particularly in an established community. But nothing I have seen other than a few vague motherhood sentiments suggests that this is being seriously contemplated for anything such as streetscape improvement, green space development, improved bicycle paths, benches and proper arbor care of the transplanted trees, etc. etc. To underscore this point, several years back, the City made a commitment to residents to relocate trees and retain a green space between the community and 16th Avenue when the road widening and overpass was built. As of last year, many of the relocated trees along that green-space are dead and the "park" as most of the residents and school kids who make use of it refer to it as, is not even on the City of Calgary's arboring schedule. A forgotten promise perhaps, but one which I think exemplifies the concern of how commitments can change

once an objective is achieved. As such, I suggest that the ARP expressly incorporate a community benefit component and that local community benefit be an appropriately weighted criteria for all subsequent permitting approval. I also believe this should be a negotiated criteria between the residents and our employees (i.e., the City).

- Traffic mgmt....This is a large part of the issue that will materially affect community residents both during construction and thereafter. In Crescent Height and Rosedale, it took the City of Calgary over a year to simply do a study in order to come up with a traffic management plan for less than 20 intersections within a residential community. The much considered plan in Crescent Heights ended up being to install several stops signs and 4 traffic buttons. How is it that in University Heights that in the matter of a few weeks that the city can now claim to be able to plan traffic management systems for an ARP that will materially change the entire flow and access into the community, the university and the city's largest hospital? Also, there is a new charter school, Tim Hortons and Shell that all need to be a part of the public discussion on traffic and planning as they present the three largest influences to current traffic and accident issues in the affected corridor of Uxbridge. That won't get any better with increased traffic. I believe the proposed ARP needs to stipulate a full traffic and community impact assessment as part of development approval and that community input is a mandate.
- The ARP description suggests a possible motel going in. I see this as a clear indication that the city has done an extremely poor job of engaging the local community as I do not believe this fact is well known (thus my concern with information dissemination). Were it well known, I think there would be a lot of uproar over it related to crime rate escalation, police presence, isolation of the residential community versus access to the supposed central community gathering place being contemplated. Should we ask all of the parents at the adjacent elementary school if they would like a motel beside the playground? I'm guessing the city hasn't yet. I am also guessing that parents of children in this school aren't necessarily getting any info on a development that will clearly affect their school. There are motels (and zoning) located both east and west of the Stadium mall in Montgomery, Bowness and Banff Trail (i.e., Motel Village). I don't want to get into the detail here, but the simple fact that this ARP has a motel in the "plan" serves as a great example of the complete lack of appreciation for the host community....pushing this through as a thought-out and stakeholder-approved plan is ludicrous. There are several other points related to the general make up as described in the ARP website, that appear to contradict the stated objective but conform well with the previous development plan in terms of usage. The ARP needs to be very clear in scope and usage details.
- Parking.....the description being floated out there by the city paints this great little notion of some idyllic community with something along the lines of maybe a local butcher and a baker, a drug store that actually knows you and lots of local community activity....wait a minute....we already have that. Actually the pictures and land use descriptions sounds more like high density, medical related service development. Bon Ton's owner has already commented that he will probably relocate because of the costs associated with them staying, Maguires is gone, ditto the Keg. We'll get a brand shiny new Shoppers Drug-mart (just like the one you see at every other new development), along with several other medical-related service operations tailored to serving the hordes coming during office hours.....how is that creating a hub for the community? But almost as importantly....where is everybody going to park? Underground parkades only get built in the downtown core where rent justifies the cost, or by governments with too much cash to spend. Otherwise they are not a viable option in any land developer's budget that I am aware of. So again.....where do people park?

So from an ARP perspective, I suggest amendments/inclusions of the following:

1. Timeline.....this is the single biggest item that I believe needs to be addressed in the near-term. People in our community (based on my informal survey) are uniformed, If they truly realized the scope and manner of change being (somewhat slyly) presented within this initiative, I firmly believe that would change. We need at least a full year to properly conduct studies, solicit public input and craft a thoughtful input and critique. If we don't do this, then I fear the ARP will get jammed along and we'll end up being another hospital-proximal service

development with bad access, traffic congestion, and all of the personality of industrial strip mall. We have a great opportunity here to create a unique and complimentary development that benefits everybody and fits within the platform of a university/medical/community hub as opposed to meeting a developer's short-term investment criteria that ultimately adds to the dismal landscape that Calgary's 16th Avenue corridor has mostly become.

2. The ARP needs to have a guideline incorporated which stipulates parking requirements for tenants and public. I suggest it be in the ARP so that the community can get engaged before a developer has drawings in hand. The current process which sees this being a city-developer specific negotiation within the development permit process does not work well, simply because there is a mutual interest in minimizing parking...which maximizes community impact. We need the city to review analog developments and build a credible case for whatever guideline they come up with and then incorporate that into the resulting ARP. This guideline needs to be specific to this community and the usage demographics rather than be a canned version of some sort of generic go-plan type of criteria which does not consider the particulars. This will help ensure that the already burdened parking situation that exists within both the university and the Foothills hospital does get re-created here.
3. The ARP needs to mandate active community representation and input for all development permitting projects.....not just some warm words espousing the virtues of stakeholder engagement that in reality is a newspaper ad and a sandwich board on the side of the road.
4. Development content - I believe the city has been too vague in detailing what will be allowed within this ARP. Ideally, there should be a review committee struck to over-see the proposed content being contemplated for the community. Stakeholders should include local merchants, the Church, the school and residents. Unfortunately, the present ARP proposal feels somewhat like a re-hash of a previously failed development proposal that is now being foisted upon an unsuspecting community as a means of achieving what was once already turned down under the guise of a development permit.

I strongly believe that University Heights is a unique and particularly vibrant community within the northwest quadrant of Calgary. It is why we live here. The proposed developments on both the east and west flanks is significant in sheer scale relative to this community, and there needs to be a mutually agreeable solution achieved.

University Heights Community Association Open House:

On February 28, 2013, City staff attended an open house hosted by the University Heights Community Association. At the meeting, comments were collected on several boards throughout the room. The comments received on those boards were:

#	Comment
1.	If you are going to build this, you need to add a new traffic light.
2.	Curious increase in density far from LRT and then LRT pushed to low-density locations in other places. Does not add up.
3.	Taper from SW to NE to decrease viewing of kids in both schools.
4.	Tall buildings could block noise from 16th and Uxbridge; Focus on pedestrian access to UES green spaces.
5.	Putting in 1-3 high towers is not acceptable! They would create too high a density. They would be too close to the schools, cause a tunnel on 16 th , and also cause shadows on the schools
6.	Can development be done in phases to enable current businesses to remain?
7.	You need a psychiatrist!

8.	Those cars will move into University Heights area. A car free area development with outside cafés would improve the area but the carpark is used also by the Stadium when there is a game.
9.	When construction is going on, will there be hazards for students of the nearby schools?
10.	Emphasis on mixed! Enough high-end, luxury, overpriced. Room for present retailers.
11.	Should be built on a human scale; to the scale and size of the neighbourhood. No high-rise building, 3 floors (C1) ok.
12.	Way too high. Existing traffic is already backed up.
13.	Density is way too high
14.	This plan needs its own exclusive entry
15.	15 stories block the south sun
16.	Hotels means conference renters, bars, and football fans
17.	Shortcutting through area is already a huge problem
18.	Access in and out of the community is a major concern. Having sidewalk accessibility on the site is of limited value to the community given the very narrow sidewalks to walk to and from the site, particularly in winter. Is it realistic to assume coordination with the university planning?
19.	No! The shopping centre is best left at that development. This with more small stores would improve the area.
20.	There are enough restaurants; we do not need a hotel in this congested area.
21.	Proposed concepts: mixed-use, pedestrian/cyclist friendly, green space, aesthetics, are much better than what presently exists.
22.	Parking at shopping centre is an issue; hopefully parkade will help
23.	Parking needs to exceed one stall per unit
24.	I vote for 24/7 restricted area parking
25.	You would need to be miracle workers to mitigate the increased traffic in this already tight community
26.	Such a small space in which to consider buildings of so much height, therefore adding to density and traffic
27.	Re: green space along 16th Avenue (walled-in)- over community has already fought for years to have that left; don't ever remove it
28.	Further parking restrictions with enforcement necessary
29.	Densification needed, but within reason; must fit into neighbourhood.
30.	It takes 3-4 lights to turn from 16 Ave eastbound to Uxbridge Drive now. It takes 3-4 lights to turn from Uxbridge Drive from Foothills Hospital to 16 Ave westbound; traffic is a major problem.
31.	New retail space at the university residence area has been unfilled for at least a year. What retailers want to come in there or at Stadium Shopping Centre?
32.	The green space referred to is the school playground, isn't it? Actually fields for two schools. Why is there a question about taking it away for shopping centre access? Would this be allowed in other neighbourhoods? I think not.
33.	It is already hard to leave this neighbourhood due to increased numbers of university students,

	Westmount parents, hospital workers. Please do not bring in many more vehicles.
34.	Does anyone think of air quality here? The UES playground/fields often smell of car exhaust. We already have the new Westmount bussing issues - more traffic and diesel engines (x8 buses) on the street. Please no more vehicles here.
35.	Density should be limited to 4-5 storeys maximum.
36.	No! They would have to go past our house! ENOUGH TRAFFIC NOW!
37.	Need better access into University Heights from the NW
38.	Safety concern for school kids if a hotel/motel is allowed. City cannot control the type of clientele in a hotel/motel. No to a hotel/motel.
39.	Why do we restrict traffic through the neighbourhood (restricted turns for example) and then allow increased bussing/traffic just because of the school? What is wrong with increasing the quality of the neighbourhood school education so charter schools are not seen as necessary?
40.	Open spaces on this map already taken up by roads on other map.
41.	What is the projected increase in traffic? How much of this increased traffic will cut through Ulrich Road NW? Where will all the people going to football games park?
42.	The last thing this area needs is another hotel!
43.	The community cannot absorb the traffic, the 'people density', and the ensuing problems of over development. The hotel is too high; we're already surrounded by UofC, hospital, school buses, etc...
44.	Expand neighbourhood-oriented commercial. Not in favour of hotel.
45.	Pedestrians crossing 16th Avenue at street level is ridiculous; tunnel or bridge?
46.	If we are to be a walkable community, how about including apartments for seniors, a mid-size grocery store, recreation facility - that we, the community, could get to without using cars.
47.	7 years ago we were told by Mac Logan, from the City, that 40,000 vehicles per day come into our area; I am certain the number has increased, so dealing properly with traffic is paramount.
48.	Too much development, too close to two schools.
49.	Too much traffic in such a small location
50.	Not desired: motel/hotel or residential.
51.	Multi-storey development will destroy privacy!
52.	Residential should match the existing; not high density.
53.	Too much, too much, too much.
54.	No hotel; yes to fruit and vegetable store.
55.	29/16 intersection is already overwhelmed and can't handle this much density.
56.	At certain times of the day traffic is very congested. Hotels and high density residential and office would make access very difficult for University Heights community.
57.	Enough development to create a vibrant area around a school.
58.	Where is the community meeting space?
59.	Too much traffic! I can't get in or out of my neighbourhood now!

60.	Will current businesses be given the option to stay without a huge hike in rent?
61.	A hotel would be inappropriate.
62.	You can't put any more traffic on shopping centre area. 24th Avenue is clogged with Children's Hospital and university. Schools in area create a huge amount of traffic. Hotel and schools together is inappropriate.
63.	Hotel space, really? This area needs more affordable housing.
64.	Love the idea of using the alley beside the church as an additional entrance/exit. Hate to lose the greenspace by the highway. What about future highway widening?
65.	Preserve all of the existing green space including the section between current development and 16 Avenue
66.	Traffic: the three way stop on Uxbridge works very well. It is not necessary to put in a roundabout, leave things that work alone!
67.	Forcing schools to compete for space, parking.
68.	How many proposed buildings?
69.	Why hotel? Why not affordable housing units to address bigger problems in city?
70.	Moderate development; Garrison Woods type ok.
71.	Need more access into neighbourhood, not less. Remove no right-hand turns into neighbourhood.
72.	Keep Cob's
73.	What happens to current vendors?
74.	We need to keep walkability and community for families.
75.	How will the developers work with the schools to make this a vibrant community?
76.	Highest buildings on SW, depending on height, will block sunlight.
77.	Need traffic studies done during hours that Foothills Hospital workers cut through the neighbourhood (4-5pm?) plus study of 32 Avenue and Crowchild intersection, as it is very difficult at times to exit the shopping centre.
78.	There are limited number of ways into/out of the community at present, how will roads be able to handle increased traffic without blocking the community? How about during construction? Especially with Westmount charter school attendees being mainly from out of community?
79.	Huge concerns with hotel development and transient population next to school and community playground.
80.	What is the next level of thinking we need to do?
81.	Desired form of development: commercial/retail, and professional.
82.	What kind of businesses will be allowed in the new development? Is there going to be policies in place to prevent unwanted types of businesses?
83.	16th Avenue needs a pedestrian overpass.
84.	We do not agree to giving up any more green space.
85.	Can we deal with problems that exist now before we add to it?? Traffic/green space/parking.

86.	Pedestrian underpasses to cross 16th Ave should be considered.
87.	Traffic at 29th - 16th - Ux is already a major problem. Any redevelopment must begin with a major intersection overhaul.
88.	Uxbridge Drive: make it exclusive for house owner parking area.
89.	How can we manage bottleneck at Uxbridge and 16th Avenue?
90.	Was the traffic survey done during teacher's convention when there was no school traffic?
91.	Create road looping charter school to manage traffic. Opportunity!
92.	TIA needs to address impact at least to Crowchild/24th Avenue intersection. 3-4 light delays for left turn daily in afternoon. That is current, more traffic is a problem.
93.	Reduce traffic through Unwin.
94.	Consideration needs to be made that 2 schools (K-6 and 5-12) are adjacent. A hotel and schools??? Really?
95.	Local marketplace to walk to!
96.	Paid parking brings traffic into community.
97.	Traffic is only a problem if space is made auto-oriented; focus on other means of accessing site.
98.	Traffic inc from hotel use not welcome.
99.	Traffic already a major problem in the community; parking is already a major problem; school buses!
100.	Less parking in the area in general? Where are people going to go?
101.	3pm Children's hospital shift change, 3 or 4 light to make a left onto University.
102.	Traffic is heavier now than the last proposal, with no changes!
103.	10-15 stories is too high.
104.	Land not to be used for a hotel or motel; land should support a family community.
105.	Anything over 3-4 storeys is too high.
106.	Traffic terms of land use patterns, no office/hotel space should be allowed to oversee the fields and playground areas of the two schools, as this is both a safety and a privacy issue.
107.	ARP: South Shaganappi Communities Area Plan, Jobs/residences? Neighbourhood? Western Securities?
108.	Pedestrian underpasses to cross 16 avenue should be considered.
109.	Cut through traffic (on Ulrich and Ulysses and from University Avenue) must be addressed. This is unnecessary volume through the heart of the community.
110.	Concern with added traffic, which is already a huge problem. The neighbourhood already has a parking (2h) restriction. School buses at two schools already have a problem pulling away on 29 Street; they are SB on 29 St; too much traffic for such a small area.
111.	Same kind of study that took place with the Children's Hospital. Same crap, different project.
112.	16th Avenue needs a pedestrian overpass.
113.	We do not agree to giving up any more green space.

114.	Traffic at 29th - 16th - Ux is already a major problem. Any redevelopment must begin with a major intersection overhaul.
115.	Construction period is especially disruptive. Our neighbourhoods already have problems with construction traffic, tandem dump trucks, etc. How is this project planned to reduce living impacts during construction?
116.	What is Uxbridge designed for in terms of traffic flow? Not this!
117.	Too many rental units for a small community.
118.	A motel?? Really??
119.	No more trades for green space, please. We are already in an industrial zone with the hospital heating and university heating plants etc...
120.	Some of our existing stores are destination shopping. Will there be enough free parking stalls to allow those stores to stay in business?
121.	You can add 20-30% traffic to the study that you conveniently conducted during teacher's convention/family day/reading week.
122.	The issue of moving what will be a huge amount of traffic must be solved before high density housing is built.
123.	The traffic count survey should/must be expanded to include Underhill Drive and Ulysses Street before development approval.
124.	Traffic study was done on teacher's convention; no traffic from schools.
125.	Was Tim's and Shell involved in any of this?
126.	Uxbridge Dr already has bottleneck traffic between 8:15 and 9:00 and 3:45 and 5:15. The roadways in our neighbourhood are also drag racing tracks in warm weather.
127.	In terms of land use patterns, no office/hotel space should be allowed to oversee the fields and playground areas of the two schools; as this is both a safety and a privacy issue.
128.	Avoid construction traffic in neighbourhood.
129.	Transient hotel population is not welcome.
130.	Children's Hospital
131.	Traffic is already horrific; don't increase it!
132.	Great visuals. The writing is excellent. I especially like the pictures of somewhere else. Genius. Of course, it does not instill confidence!
133.	Traffic impacts on residential areas of University Heights?
134.	How can we support each other in taking the next steps? What unique contribution can we each make?
135.	NO HOTEL. If you have to, condos with underground parking. Yes to specialty shops and restaurants (keep Bon Ton, Billingsgate, Cob's), and need stuff like Sunterra, Community Natural Foods, etc...
136.	Please do not make an entrance at west after the Uxbridge Road on 16 Avenue, it will kill us. What do you plan with the gas station?
137.	Keep the retailers that are in Stadium now.
138.	Height of hotel? Schools and hotels not a good mix.

139.	Make the area as green as possible.
140.	No more buildings up down or sideways. There is too much traffic now!
141.	Consider lowering 16th Avenue into a 'valley' to minimize noise and dust both for Stadium and for Foothills Hospital.
142.	We need a gathering area, with coffee shops and outdoor seating.
143.	Large structures two storeys and over do not fit the landscape of our community. Increase in traffic brings increased crime; what will you do about this? Increasing the population density in an already densely populated neighbourhood is not healthy for the families already in University Heights.
144.	Keep retailers in SSC. This is way too fast ARP by April 25.
145.	We do not wish to risk losing secure businesses that are in the shopping centre now.
146.	Green space; We will not give up our green space along 16th avenue to this redevelopment. They can develop their own green spaces to make this redevelopment look better
147.	Traffic; The traffic lights at Uxbridge and 16th will not accommodate much more traffic than it already does. UofC students cut through the neighbourhood as well as all the school buses and cars.
148.	Enhance the community, do not re-engineer.
149.	If a hotel is built, there should be a direct connection with the new cancer centre across 16 Avenue for the sake of out-of-Calgary patients and their families.
150.	LRT from Lions Park to Foothills and Childrens!
151.	High density is inappropriate for this site in the context of existing development and traffic problems. I would like to see a development that enhances the neighbourhood but considers traffic impact.
152.	Keep the green space at the south end by 16 Avenue. New design should consider the Polish church and not block the view.
153.	Bridge/overpass across Shaganappi at the Children's.
154.	Please no hotel!
155.	Design should encourage a walkable neighbourhood. Minimize transient 9-5 population that leaves empty buildings in the evening. Focus on neighbourhood safety in the evening.
156.	Project charter? Following ARP.
157.	Please create a safe walkway for children going to and from UES and Westmount.
158.	Underground parking! Surface area should be for people, green spaces, shops, pathways, and short term parking.
159.	This has the possibility of being very positive or very negative, but it will not be neutral.
160.	Traffic: bad. Hotels: bad. Interchange: bad. One small shopping centre: GOOD.
161.	Maximize community integration.
162.	Lack of diversity is a major concern.
163.	We really need a community centre where you can meet and get to know your neighbours.
164.	I am the parent of two students at Westmount. Already there are many near misses of traffic versus kids. A Northern Laneway as shown in a dotted line next to WCS is a huge safety concern and should not be permitted.

165. Need a community space.
166. Density is a major concern.
167. Parking lot is already full. Where would everyone park?
168. We are already hemmed in by very high density UofC, hospital, apartment buildings, and associated traffic. It's too much!
169. Walkability! No having to fight through parking lot. Utilize rooftops (ie greenhouses).
170. Excited about the development of this area; it has been stagnant.
171. Very concerned about the amount of traffic; it's already a problem.
172. Garrison Woods development would be welcomed; four storeys max.
173. Current shops need surface parking for in/out quick service; will move without this.
174. Do not wall in our church.
175. Green space is a welcome transition to community.
176. Continuous green space (walkway, maintain current arrangement).
177. Priorities: green space, gathering areas, walking routes (from Boardwalk to UES especially) maximize daylight.
178. Density seems very high.
179. Keep open space and neighbourhood feeling.
180. Westmount charter fought years for this space!
181. Parking needs to be addressed properly. Pedestrian use for an aging population and young school children needs to be addressed. A formal community centre should be an essential component of a developer's plan. Traffic at 49000 cars per day in our neighbourhood is intolerable! Transit and shift schedules at Foothills and UofC should be part of the ARP.
182. Do not increase density; already too dense.
183. 16 Avenue and 29 Street is already a bottleneck.

Community Walking Tour:

On March 13, 2013, City staff toured the area around Stadium Shopping Centre with members of the community and Rollin Stanley, General Manager of Planning, Development and Assessment. The concerns identified by community members on this tour were:

- **Westmount Charter School:** School buses and parents load and unload in front of the school along Uxbridge Drive in the morning and afternoon, creating congestion and leading to increased traffic in the community. The buses also need to turn around in the community to get on the right side of the street, which can be a safety hazard.
- **School Fields:** University Elementary School and Westmount Charter School fields are right beside Stadium Shopping Centre, making it important that the shadowing of buildings over the playground during the school day and safety issues be considered. Concerns were also expressed about who would be using new housing or hotel accommodation on the Stadium Shopping Centre site and what impact that would have on the schools and community.

- **Polish Church:** The Polish Church is a unique piece of architecture and is a landmark. Some community members expressed the desire to keep clear sightlines to the building. Street parking was also raised as an issue when there are events at the church.
- **Uxbridge Drive and Unwin Road Intersection:** At peak times, traffic can back up from 16th Avenue to this intersection, and then it continues to back up these two streets. Concerns were also expressed about people short-cutting up Unwin to get to the university.
- **Stadium Shopping Centre Entrance:** Traffic is slowed at peak times by people turning left into the mall, or people trying to make a u-turn after exiting the Tim Horton's/Shell at the corner of 16th Avenue and Uxbridge Drive (there are no left turns allowed out of that site onto Uxbridge).
- **Tim Horton's/Shell Exit:** Cars exiting this site are legally not able to turn left onto Uxbridge Drive to access 16th Avenue. Many do anyway, creating traffic flow issues, or they make a legal right turn and then have to turn around in University Heights to access 16th Avenue.
- **Stadium Shopping Centre Stores:** Community members like the mix of retail stores and have key businesses that they do not want to see leave the community.
- **Stadium Shopping Centre Parking:** Community members expressed that they did not like having so much of the Stadium Shopping Centre site being a parking lot, but also want to make sure that there is some short-term surface parking available in front of businesses on the site. Merchants also need better alley access for delivery trucks.
- **Green Space on 16th Avenue:** The green space and walking trail along 16th Avenue connects the areas east of Uxbridge Drive all the way up to the Children's Hospital. It could also be better utilized as a space for people to spend time.
- **16th Avenue and 29 Street/Uxbridge Drive Intersection:** At peak times, it is difficult to turn left into University Heights from eastbound 16th Avenue. People leaving Foothills Hospital are also cutting through University Heights to avoid making a left turn onto westbound 16th Avenue. Concerns were also raised about the general congestion at this intersection since ambulances use it to access the hospital.
- **Edge of 16th Avenue:** Questions were raised about where buses will be stopping along 16th Avenue and whether they will be looping through University Heights. It was also asked whether there could be an entrance to the shopping centre directly from 16th Avenue.
- **Overall Development:** There are a few large projects being proposed for the area, including the university's West Campus, the Foothills Hospital Cancer Centre, and the nearby athletic park. Traffic needs to be considered in light of all these proposed future developments.

Public Design Workshop:

On March 14, 2013 a public design workshop was held at the University Elementary School gym where small groups of citizens worked with City staff and landowner to brainstorm potential solutions. The purpose was to try and find solutions to identified community concerns that will still meet the needs of The City and landowner.

Survey in the Participant Guide

Participant guides were distributed to citizens at the workshop which included photos of developments that Stadium Shopping Centre could look like, so participant could select the ones they preferred. The last page contained an open ended comment section at the back of the survey, paired with a map for reference so participants could pin-point their comments. The following comments were captured from both the comment section as well as from notes citizens indicated throughout the survey.

Each comment listed below captures a distinctly unique idea or concern that corresponds to the survey themes to capture the diversity of feedback. Comments were further clustered into sub-groups.

Ideas or Concerns about Mobility

Traffic Impacts are a major concern and transportation planning is seen as a major part of this process.

Ensure traffic movements are smooth and easy

- Traffic congestion is experienced at these key areas:
 - Traffic turning south from 16 Ave to 29 St onto Foothills Medical Centre (FMC).
 - Traffic short-cutting along Uxbridge and Unwin to connect to either University Drive or to 16 Ave NW. This traps drivers from single detached area of University Heights.
 - Near both schools.
 - Entrance/exit to Shopping Centre.
 - Entrance/exit to Tim Hortons/Gas Station.

Manage vehicle movement

- Consider traffic circles (at Uxbridge & Unwind, at 29 St & 16 Ave instead of lights).
- Consider speed bumps.
- Road through municipal reserve not desired.

Manage increased movement of traffic

- Risk of motor vehicle collisions (vehicle with vehicle, cyclist or pedestrian).
- Noise and pollution from more vehicular traffic.

Improve pedestrian movement

- Consider pedestrian overpass to Foothills Medical Centre.
- Provide pedestrian environment for walking.
- Safe pedestrian walkways across intersection and streets.

Improve Public Transit

- Improve public transit access from Banff Trail Station to area.
 - Consider a loop from FMC to Children's Hospital to UofC/Brentwood.
- Locate area where Bus Rapid Transit stop could be built.

Ideas or Concerns about Public Spaces & Good Edges

- Precedent: create a vital and livable neighbourhood like Brookline, MA - an example of modest density with good common spaces.
- Precedent: encourage creativity and imagination in edges as seen in “Green malls.”

Create opportunities for social interaction

- Provide a range of public spaces: walking places, outdoor patios, medium sized pocket parks (parkettes).
- Carefully link public space to private space through walking paths along housing to get people out onto the streets.
- Create a common/shared space to draw people out of their cars and homes.

Green space and landscaping

- Enhance the streetscape with a double row of trees.
- Treed boulevards to provide good green space.
- Improve development through landscaping.
- Ensure sunlight, trees and parkland in development.
- Maximize green space.
- Create park-like atmosphere between Foothills Hospital, University, Shaganappi area and West Campus.

Create good edges

- High traffic volume discourages people from activating edges.
- Create beauty and serenity in green spaces along 16 Ave.
- Develop municipal reserve as an attractive interface.
- Keep municipal reserve (green space along 16th Avenue) in current location
- Not concerned about maintaining municipal reserve in current location – opportunity to put buildings closer to 16 Ave.
- Improve church edge.
- Improve park edge.
- Create high street edge for Uxbridge.
- Create high street edge for 16 Ave.
- Put green space close to centre.

Ideas or Concerns about Streets for people

- Streets that are pedestrian, bike and car friendly.
- Some areas with only pedestrians are desired.
- Include some narrow streets and void wide roads.
- Create bustling walking areas.
- Increase walkability.
- Trees along Uxbridge.

Ideas or Concerns about Land Uses

- Preference for existing services.
- More retail desired.
- Opportunity for an activity centre for the community to include coffee shops and meeting areas.

- Hotel not desired – associated with transient population, concerns about potential risks of being close to schools.
- Concern about recreating Motel Village in this neighbourhood.
- Commit landowner to “community property enhancement development”(?) as a way to ease fears about hotel.
- Liquor store not desired.
- Ensure pub is far from school and green space as possible.
- Minimize institutional uses.
- Limit offices uses.
- High density medical services not desired.
- Long-term care facility not desired.
- Consider seniors residence and seniors assisted living.
- Childcare services not desired.
- Consider daycare.
- Allow town-homes with live-work.
- Underground parking for all tenants to preserve space for residents.

Ideas or Concerns about Density & Built Form

- Keep lower buildings near school/parks.
- Ensure commercial allows community-oriented businesses (grocery store, baker, pharmacy) not just office.
- Ensure tall buildings have a small footprint.
- Prefer short buildings (3-4 stories, 4 stories retail-residential mix, no more than 5 stories,
- Minimize high rise buildings.
- Increased density is fine and desirable from a city perspective but needs to work for community.
- 14 stories is considered too high.
- More attractive buildings (ie Garrison Woods).
- Taller buildings by Church where there are no windows.
- Keep original CC1 zoning.
- 800,000 square feet is considered too much, Bring it down to 500,000 or 400,000 square feet
- 1 Floor to Area Ratio preferred

Ideas or Concerns about Community

- Our community is a real gem.
- Hope that development will strengthen sense of community and links to neighbouring communities.
- Perception that development that allows rental ‘weakens community.’
- Concern that hotel will decrease community feel.
- Development should increase a sense of community and pride of ownership.

Ideas or Concerns about the Purpose of Development

- Increase links to hospital, university and neighbouring communities.
- Concern around bias - “The City is in bed with the developer.
- Ensure activity outside of business hours to avoid “low income transient commercial dead zone.”

- Avoid development that requires elevators.
- Desire for development.

Email Correspondence:

Member of the public were encouraged to email comments to City staff if they were not comfortable with the other methods of commenting. The emails received to date are:

#	Comment
1.	<p>I have just read the website about this development. My child attends Westmount School, and so I am interesting in development that is occurring in the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am wondering what is being done to ensure enough parking is present to support the increased usage of the area – both commercially and residentially. Currently parking in this area is an issue – especially if we need to volunteer for all-day school events. 2. I am also wondering what will be done to alleviate traffic congestion at the intersection of Uxbridge Drive and 16th Avenue. The intersection is a bit of nightmare right now during peak times. More traffic in and out of the area will further exacerbate this problem. <p>I have to say that my experience with City developments in the past has been that very little credence is given to traffic flow and then the City tries to Band-Aid the problem after the fact with more traffic lights and attempted retro-fitting.</p> <p>It is also a positive goal for more people to use transit, but the fact is that we live in a sprawling center and most of us will continue to use cars. I hope that the City is looking at the reality of this and planning for lots of car traffic not just looking at the dream of more transit use in the area..</p>
3.	<p>What kind of provisions will be made to allow existing businesses to stay during the redevelopment?</p> <p>The shops are the stadium (butcher, fish market, etc) are an amazing local resource and as a mother with young children the ability to walk to get groceries from my home is very valuable.</p> <p>I am concerned that if the shops are made to leave for construction they won't come back, or if rents are raised they will be forced to leave and go elsewhere.</p>
4.	<p>My wife and I have been residents of University Heights since 1963 and have watched the development of the residential area, Stadium Shopping mall, the University of Calgary, Foothills Hospital Development, and Children's Hospital. We have a very deep relationship with the University Heights area and it is of great concern to us as senior citizens as to the redevelopment of the University Shopping Center.</p> <p>The current Shopping Center provides us (Seniors) with easy access to our shopping and business (banking) requirements and the current University Shopping center serves this purpose very well and I see no reason to change and disrupt the current needs of the community.</p> <p>You are undoubtedly aware that the overall population of University Heights and the adjoining St.Andrews community consists primarily of Senior citizens of Calgary (est 70%) and therefore to provide services for an older population is different than a new and younger situation. I strongly urge that any changes to the Shopping Center be very carefully considered and should not be expedited for purposes of the developer.</p> <p>While there are minor problems with transportation and parking in the area which can be resolved by adjusting certain traffic routes etc, I see no need for a major redevelopment of the Shopping Center.</p>
5.	<p>I am writing to you as the start of our School Council's engagement within this planning process. I was delighted to read that the first guiding principle for future redevelopment, as listed on your website, is:</p> <p>"1. Have a positive impact on the immediate area"</p> <p>As you likely know, University School is immediately adjacent to the Stadium Shopping Centre. As a</p>

result, we are pleased to see that the City is committed to ensuring that any redevelopment has a positive impact on the school. Given that the students who attend University School are elementary age (Kindergarten to grade 6) and come from in-region communities that include University Heights, and also St. Andrew's Heights, Parkdale and West Hillhurst, there are a number of issues related to this redevelopment about which we have concerns.

It would be most helpful if you were able to share with us the City's operating definition of the first principle noted above. We would assume that several things should be part of the "positive impact", including:

1. Student safety (both in getting to school and while at school)
2. Preservation of sunlight for the school and school playground/athletic field
3. Maintained accessibility for all in-region students (specifically those in-region students who live south of 16 Avenue)
4. Maintained accessibility for out-of-region students

As you have probably realized, these four concerns are simply requests for maintained safety, accessibility and sunlight. They do not constitute any positive impacts. We would be delighted to hear from you about potential ways this redevelopment might have a net positive impact on the learning environment of University School.

Thank you for taking the time to read this correspondence and for what we anticipate will be a meaningful engagement regarding how the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre may proceed while at the same time preserving the safety, accessibility and sunlight that the students currently appropriately experience.

As this process continues, we will be delighted to provide additional feedback and guidance on how the safety and education of the children at University School may be preserved (and potentially improved) through the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre.

6. This is the main thing I would like to see concerning the Stadium Plaza and the Area Redevelopment Plan for same, is that there is a "niche" for the established businesses, the Paragon Pharmacy, Mac's Store and the Cat House in particular.
7. I think a four month time period from drafting to approval is much too fast to really investigate these changes. There are many stakeholders who will be affected and there is not enough time in the current schedule to review the impacts. Not sure why this project is fast tracked. Not much else with the city gets done in four months.
8. As a parent of young children attending Westmount school which is neighbouring the proposed development, as well as a resident and home owner in the Varsity community which is a stone's throw of the proposed development, I do have various concerns:
 - **Timing:** The City of Calgary is fast tracking this ARP for no reason related to the public interest. The fast tracking only serves the benefit of the private developer on the expense of its citizens. The fast tracking does not give the Citizens, The Community or the City staff the time needed to properly evaluate the ARP

I ask to give –at least a full year– to properly conduct studies, solicit public input and craft a thoughtful input and critique.

 - **Crime rate and possible endangerment of minors:** The ARP description suggests a possible motel as part of the development. The area is host of various schools. A motel development in sight adjacent to the school playgrounds, can pose potential risks to children. The school boards, parents or The Calgary Police were not consulted in these regards.

I ask that the ARP be clear about the developments and the land use, as well as extensive consultation with the Calgary Police Services, parents and the School Boards, (including the Charter School Board) would need to take place to insure that our children are safe while playing at the school playgrounds.

- The lack of local community benefit: The ARP as it stands does not provide a benefit to such a unique and established community such as green/open space trees, etc.

This relates back to the comment above regarding the timing, enough time should be given to the community to work with the City and the Developer and seek community benefits. The ARP –as it stands at the moment- sole focus is to realize profits to the developer with total disregard to the community. The ARP needs to mandate active community representation and input for all development permitting projects

- Parking and Traffic concerns as well as impact on public safety: The ARP is vague and lacks comprehensive parking and traffic impact studies.

The ARP needs to have a guideline incorporated which stipulates parking requirements for tenants and public. Considering the unique characteristics of the community, extensive consultation with the schools, community residents and existing area businesses need to take place.

9. I would like to voice my concern for the wild life impact the proposed off ramp from Shaganappi Trail would have on wild life. The redevelopment proposal on the corner of 32 ave and the lands east of Shaganappi trail would have a detrimental effect to the area. This land is undeveloped at this point. Because of the abundant vegetation in this area it is home to many native animal species. Most significantly the Hawk owl, coyotes, wood peckers and many song birds. Owl species numbers are quickly diminishing and at present the owls on this land are thriving. Please consider leaving these areas undeveloped for the sake of these species?

10. I stopped by the info session yesterday at Mac Hall and I wanted to give my input. I have worked and studied at Tom Baker Cancer Centre, Foothills Hospital, University of Calgary Health Sciences Complex, Heritage Medical Research Building, and the University of Calgary since 2007. From these experiences, I have spent much time eating and using services from Stadium Plaza: walking, busing, cycling, and driving between the University and Foothills; and I know many people who live in nearby apartments and single family homes. From my perspective, here are my insights:

- In the Foothills/Healthsci complex there is very little food and retail, all of which is extremely busy. Many of the professionals spend in the complex spend long hours at work and are happy to spend money buying lunch so some as they can do so very quickly. Currently, Stadium Plaza takes a little longer to get to than most professionals are willing to do on a daily basis, but they will certainly eat there on occasion. Moose Maguires is popular after work and before Stampeder games. The Keg is popular for special events. Vietnamese is a popular stop for medical students. Wendy's is popular for high school students. Many people on the highway make stops at Tim Hortons and the gas station. Everything at Stadium seems very busy IN SPITE of how long it can take to walk to from the complex across the street.
- An easier and faster pedestrian route would bring hundreds more lunch visitors to Stadium from the hospital. Currently, most professionals cannot afford to wait at the crosswalk for 3 minutes each way to cross 16th ave. Moreover, hundreds of people make daily trips between U of C and FMC. A DIRECT pedestrian route would revolutionize the area.
- The complex hosts a high number of visiting scientists and special guests whom need accommodation and places to eat.
- Parking at FMC is \$13 per day, and many people bus, bike, or walk. Buses are packed in all directions. Better integration of pedestrians and transit users would draw many people to the area.
- Many people rent in the area in order to be near work, in spite of little entertainment, poor transit, and relatively high crime. More options for renting, more after hours activity, better lighting, and better transit would help I think.
- A nice green space to sit and eat lunch at would be well used.

In summary, pedestrian access is key, and as I'm sure you are aware, there is a huge market for apartment rentals, restaurants, and other services. The main limiting factor is poor pedestrian and transit access. A direct route (i.e. pedestrian overpass on 16th ave drawing a straight line to the university, and another directly to McMahon) would be great assets for Stadium Plaza. Future integration with rapid transit along 16th Ave should also be considered. Congratulations on moving forward on this great project. This is a unique location in that it is walking distance to the University and FMC, and I cannot stress enough the importance of pedestrian access.

Very excited to see the concept move forward.

11. I have emailed you before regarding the Stadium development. I was unable to attend tonight's engagement meeting, but I received this email today and thought it would highlight some of the concerns people have around parking.

I am volunteering at a Science Fair tomorrow at Westmount Charter School (adjacent to the proposed development area). Read below what the teacher is saying about parking for us - the parking lot at the plaza is where we need to park. When we volunteer it is already a challenge to find parking. If the area is re-developed with even less parking, how will we find a spot to park when we go and volunteer at the school? The school population is almost 100% out of the area so, as parents, we have to drive to the school to volunteer. Just another angle to consider when weighing the community concerns

I am also concerned about the way this is being fast-tracked. It seems that if it is pushed through fast enough, the community won't be able to organize enough resistance to mount a vocal challenge.

12. I live on Ulster Rd in the neighbourhood and this is where I WALK to get my grocery/everyday shopping done. I am very concerned about the proposed development and the speed at which this seems to be going. I did not hear about the community meeting until I saw tonight's newscast. I have noted the dates of upcoming meetings and would like to be informed of any updates or further developments if you have a mailing list.

13. This is what I hoped to see in a possible "Stadium Plaza Area Redevelopment Plan : "

- A "niche" for the "established businesses," the Paragon Pharmacy, Mac's Convenience Store and Cat House in particular.
- A "used" or "second - hand" bookstore along the lines of either Fair's Fair in Calgary or along the lines of "Wee Book Inn" in Edmonton.
- A small to medium sized coffee shop, ideally one that sells regular in addition to fair - trade coffee.

14. To whom it may concern:

1. Please no hotel / motel at this place.
2. Well plan the park and traffic issue.

15. I will keep my message short.

I am a resident of University Heights. I am strongly opposed to the proposed redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre, for three main reasons:

1. This action will KILL a vital community centre, namely an excellent, well-used, much-appreciated suite of shops that many in the community walk to for daily shopping, services and restaurants. Stadium shopping centre is the hub of our community. Killing the shopping centre will destroy rather than enhance our community. That is flat out wrong, and flies in the face of motherhood statements from the City of Calgary like "enhancing the sense of community".
2. The traffic, already a problem, will become a nightmare. It will degrade our community.
3. The possible loss of green space, for either building or traffic access, is unconscionable. The

green space to the west of Stadium is used for community soccer, has a well-used playground, and is appreciated as a no-structure green space for walking, dogs, frisbees, whatever. Already this green space has been reduced due to the widening of the Trans-Canada Highway and access to the hospital. Enough is enough!

In summary, why are you trying to destroy our community?

To ensure that my message has been received and read, I would be grateful for (in fact, would like to insist on) an acknowledgement of this message.

16. I find that these are possible community concerns concerning the Stadium Plaza Area Redevelopment Plan:

- Traffic
- Disruption of the "established businesses" (since the owners would have to move at best or retire at worst).
- Response time for ambulances, in relation to their arriving at the Foothills and Children's Hospitals

I will let you know if I could think of further possible concerns.

17. I am opposed to the high density development proposed for the Stadium Shopping Centre redevelopment. A focus on retail and residential redevelopment of Stadium Centre would be a good fit with the emphasis of this as a community centre of activity. Commercial office space however, has no place in this project. It would be a serious detractor to the quality of living in University Heights. Of note:

- Staff and clientele using proposed Stadium office space contribute little to the community;
- Traffic cutting through the community can be expected to increase as the density increases;
- Access and egress to and from the community will be compromised by the increased traffic generated. Congestion at Uxbridge Dr and 16th Ave, Unwin Road (both ends), and at 24th Ave and Crowchild Trail already limit residents' transportation options at peak times;
- The height of buildings required to house the proposed office space will shade both the shopping centre itself, and the adjacent community park space and school grounds. Maximum heights in the SW corner of the development as proposed will shade the adjacent playground in the early part of the day;
- Significant opportunity for nearby office development is available and planned for adjacent to the Foothill's Medical Complex on the SW corner of the intersection of 16th Ave and Shaganappi Trail.
- University Heights Community is at the heart of significant developments beyond the Stadium Centre redevelopment including the proposed new Cancer Centre, development of the West Campus lands, redevelopment of Foothills Athletic Park, and the proposed doubling of on campus residences. This proposal must be regarded in the context of the cumulative effect of all these developments on the quality of living in adjacent communities.

18. I am a long time resident of University Heights and though I welcome a revitalization of the Stadium Shopping centre, I am opposed to the kind of large development that is proposed. Given the size of the parcel of land and the nature of the community, this should be zoned as CC1 not CC2 thereby limiting the size and scope of the development. By limiting the size, the concerns of traffic and transportation will be mitigated. Having access and egress directly from 16th Ave will have little effect on these problems with high density development.

There was suggestion that high office/retail development would increase jobs for the area. With two hospitals and the building of a third in addition to UofC and the athletic facilities at McMahan and the Foothills Athletic Park there is no need to increase jobs in this area. Furthermore that is not the responsibility of our community.

I strongly object to office space in this complex. There is plenty of office space in the area (eg 16th Ave & Shaganappi Trail). Office space exacerbates the traffic with more cars coming and going. People working in and attending offices do not contribute to community life. Conversely, if there is to be residential space, at least there would be less traffic generated and residents would make a positive contribution to the life of University Heights. So residences maybe but NO OFFICES.

We are a small community already surrounded by high density nonresidential development. We do not need anymore. What we need is the fine services and shops that have benefited us all over the years.

19. I am very concerned about the development of Stadium Shopping Centre. I understand that the time has come for this area to be redeveloped, however I believe that what the developers have in mind will have a detrimental effect on the community of University Heights. My major concern is the density of the project. With a large density comes a host of problems that will effect the quality of life in the University Heights Community. If redevelopment is to occur I hope the city will have the best interests of the residents in mind, The redevelopment should:

- a) Not be 83% of the size of Market Mall on a much smaller land base
- b) Have buildings that are no higher than 3 stories - a low rise development that could encompass both retail, commercial and residential
- c) Take into account the traffic problems that we already have with the 16th Avenue and 29th St. intersection. This includes the increased traffic with Westmount Charter School and the cut through traffic from University Drive via Unwin to access 29th St.
- d) Take into account the number of people who make their way to the various institutions that surround this community, Foothill Hospital, Children's Hospital, the University and Foothills Athletic Park and McMahon Stadium. This could number in the several thousands and add to the density that already exists.
- e) Have a positive impact on the immediate area. That would be our community.
- f) Have the safety and security of school children in mind. A hotel would mean transience and with schools so close, could be a hazard.
- g) Should keep the parks that border on the schools in full sunlight so that any building would not cast shadows on those areas.
- h) Keep the parkland that we already have . There is no guarantee that a swap would compel the developers to provide for a green space that would remain green. We feel it is important to keep the green space along 16th Ave. as we were robbed of space when 16th Ave. was widened for the overpass.

These are some of my thoughts as you continue to develop the ARP. As a resident of Calgary I hope that this development will be one of class and will enhance this area and not detract from the wonderful ambience that we already enjoy.

20. University Heights is already a very busy community with all the public institutions surrounding the area and I am very concerned about the continued development, and especially the stadium shopping centre lands. The City should only be involved in the promotion of this redevelopment plan if the immediate communities surrounding the specific site have a major issue with the current site and services. As a resident of the community for the past 22 years I know this is the case. The owners of the site have tried for years to take away our community shopping and service area and failed so have now convinced the city of Calgary to assist them in their venture to increase the value of the site for the direct benefit of the landowner.

We already have extremely high volumes of traffic in the area with the increased expansion of public institutions in the area. I live on the north side of University Heights, facing the university and can no longer even open the windows in our home due to the increased noise on 24th Avenue and University Drive, mainly due to the opening of the children's hospital and in particular the increased bus traffic into the University and along 24th Avenue to the children's hospital. It is strange that the city

institutes noise bylaws that restrict noise from the football stadium etc.. but exempt their own busses that use engine breaks continuously on 24th Avenue as they approach University Drive and the university bus hub. At the time the Children's hospital was being planned we were told that the city would install a noise barriers on 24th Avenue to deflect the noise. Guess what – no barriers were ever installed once they go the plan approved.

The amount of traffic already using University Height's roadways as a short cut to access University Drive and 24th Avenue is ridicules and unacceptable. With the redevelopment ideas put forth by the city, this will only worsen the problem, especially allowing traffic to flow onto what is now the laneway at the back of the mall and providing direct access through the community to University Drive. If the city would fix the access road to Crowchild Trail north, much of the traffic that now wants to go north on Crowchild would be removed from the community.

In summary, traffic, noise and security within in the community will only in made worse by the proposed redevelopment. I am not against upgrading the area, but as a community shopping centre and not a regional shopping centre, the area should be upgraded to meet the immediate needs of the community, not a developer that wants to make a bunch of extra money and the City planning committee that doesn't live in the area and could care less for the resident's needs.

21. I agree with the current zoning of the Stadium Shopping Centre site as C-C2. Calgarians need to accept higher density to be more sustainable.

I believe that multiple 14 storey integrated use buildings should be built on the site. Being within walking distance of two major employment centres (the University and the Foothills Medical Complex), this is a very good site for increased housing within the city.

I think the City should show leadership in keeping the zoning as is, but increasing the required developer supplied parking to a level that will assure no parking impact on the University Heights Community. Most of the University Heights community already has parking restrictions making the residents ultrasensitive to parking.

The University Heights Community should embrace the new development as providing additional students for University School, better services at Stadium Shopping centre, and likely better public transportation due to more people.

The University Heights Community is largely buffered from the development by a church and two large school properties. No individual residence will be in the shadow zone.

Traffic – if an interchange or traffic circle was built at 16th Avenue and Uxbridge Drive simultaneously with the redevelopment on the Stadium Shopping Centre site, the new traffic volume would quickly follow the path of least resistance. The 16th Avenue and Uxbridge intersection already requires a major upgrade. DO NOT ALLOW the developer direct access onto 16th Avenue – this would be very short term thinking.

I am a resident of University Heights who strongly believes that the silent majority support sustainability in their hearts.

22. This ARP of Stadium Shopping Centre is moving far too fast!!!

I just go home at 9:30 to read my personal email, and see there was a Coffee and Community Tour with Rollin Stanley, City of Calgary, General Manager of Planning March 13, 2013, 5:00-8:30 pm. Well, I missed that one.

My next opportunity is the Stadium Shopping Centre Public Design Workshop March 14, 2013, 5:00-8:30 pm. That's tomorrow. Should I tell my son I have to break our plans to go skiing because a developer with the City in his back pocket wants to push his pet project ahead without giving the public ample time to get involved?

I'm not opposed to redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre, but I believe in the adequate and proper public input process. Western Securities isn't doing their best to get the community on their side, quite the opposite.

23. I believe that the Stadium Shopping Centre site should be zoned C-C1. I support the redevelopment of the shopping centre site but only up to the maximums that the C-C1 zoning would allow (maximum floor area ratio of 1.0 and a maximum height of 10 m). This is consistent with the density allowed in Land Use Bylaw 1P2007.

I believe a C-C1 zoning and subsequent redevelopment would enhance University Heights. I am concerned that development with the current zoning of C-C2 would overload existing infrastructure and adversely affect the quality of life in University Heights.

We also need to consider the cumulative impact on University Heights of other developments on our perimeter such as the new Tom Baker Cancer Centre, West Campus Development, Foothills Athletic Park and new U of C student housing.

24. I am a resident of University Heights and I feel very connected to, and proud of the community where I live. I like that I can walk to my work at the Foothills Medical Centre, that I can meet my friends at the local pub in Stadium Shopping Centre, and that I can pick up milk, bread, fish and meat on my way home from work. I enjoy walking my dog every day in the green space surrounding the community.

I would only make one request regarding the redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre. Please make the zoning C-C1 so that we do not live with high-rise office towers next to our homes. That zoning code would allow us to have a neighbourhood shopping area rather than high buildings and offices.

25. Thanks to all of you from the City who spent a couple long evenings with us here in University Heights. I believe that the meetings were very worthwhile, although I do speak for myself as I have not sought feedback from others that were in attendance.

Can you also advise if there is a timetable set for the process, with the November target date mentioned on Wednesday night?

Thanks again – a very interesting situation, with a great opportunity for both residents and Western Securities to have a showcase development in our neighbourhood.

26. First of all, I would like to thank you and all the other members of the city Planning Department for organizing the planning session last Thursday, and individually taking time out of your evening and family time to allow the community to express their ideas and concerns regarding the new Stadium Shopping Centre development.

There are a couple of comments I would like to add to the plan we created last Thursday:

The underlying idea that I had is that this development should be like a village square, with businesses and living quarters looking out onto the central green. In fact, I cringe at the name "Stadium Shopping Centre" because the only connection we have with McMahon Stadium is to be their parking lot for games. Rather than it being thought of as merely a shopping centre, I would like this area to be thought of as "University [Heights] Village Commons/Greens/Square" as it is the heart and centre of the University of Calgary, McMahon Stadium, U of C Medical Centre, and West Campus.

As a village square, the focus should be on encouraging pedestrians and it would be vital for the majority of vehicular traffic to be immediately directed to underground parking with the above ground, 30 minute parking, being the less obvious, secondary choice. An attractive underground entrance, right off of the roundabout, is one solution to this, with the short term parking either an option from there, or from the north entrance. Crucial to this plan is continuing the free 2 hour parking underground so that people can combine several errands. Also the underground parking should be made as pleasant as possible, whatever that involves: better lighting or bringing in natural light, interesting and safe ways to travel between levels, murals.

As a guiding principle, I would like this area to "give me a reason to come there" and even more, "a reason to linger", especially during off times, evening and weekends. I can imagine a children's parade coming from the elementary school and around the village square (closed to traffic, of course), or a string quartet, or a dance performance, or folk dancing, or a weekly street fair, or an outdoor movie with popcorn and hot chocolate. We have the opportunity to create a space unique in the city that is cozy and inviting, focusing on pedestrians.

If I could have one wish, it would be to have a better climate. But realistically, we live in Calgary, and it may snow in any month of the year. Therefore, I really appreciated one suggestion from another group: to have an indoor greenhouse. Realistically, we probably can't afford to have another Devonian Gardens here, but what about having south-facing enclosed patios that could be opened on good days, perhaps supplemented with overhead propane heaters?

Additionally, I was so sorry that our design did not address concerns about the continuation of the walkway along 16th Avenue. It is important to acknowledge these apprehensions. Consequently, I would have liked to create a welcoming entrance, either at the SE corner, going under the medical/office building (with sightlines to the inner green), or between the two buildings on the south side, which would clearly invite pedestrians and cyclists to continue their journey through this area, and on to the West Campus pathway. Additionally, I believe that the pathway past the south side of University Elementary School and continuing along the south edge of the community should be paved, with a small pedestrian bridge added at the SW corner of the UES playground (ask anyone who came on the Wednesday Walkabout about this!)

On the same note, I feel that our plan did not properly incorporate the entrance to the UES playground, or rather, a gateway to the West Campus. I would like to have that entrance larger and attractive, and connected to the green, inviting communication into and away from the village.

One question, and perhaps nothing can be done about it, but what about the Catholic church? It is like a large elephant sitting in the middle of this area, and no one even talks about it. Can they be included in this discussion? Is there any way to encourage their members to visit the village green and to involve them in the community? Perhaps a Polish shop could be included in the village? (I believe this is a Polish Catholic church.) Or a walkway between the church and the village? or free parking on Sunday mornings (and maybe they would stop for a coffee or bread while they were leaving?) Can we make the lane ways around the church more inviting?

While we got a lot done in the time we had, and were sidetracked by the concerns about vehicular congestion, I regret that we did not have time to polish the design a little better. I hope that you can somehow include these ideas into that plan. I look forward to further opportunities to participate in planning this development.

27. It is difficult to understand and appreciate the ideas which are circulating around the Stadium shopping mall development project confronted as we are by the systematic furtiveness of procedure thus far. The developer, Western Securities insist there are no plans in place as yet, but I find this pronouncement problematical considering the lack of time allotted to the community to assess and evaluate this development. The community needs another year to analyze and approve this project.

There may be no definite plan in place, however it appears there are definite proposals. These proposals must be addressed beginning with the size of the development. Unfortunately, we were re-zoned to CC2, which could result in a development of up to 792,000 square feet and with building heights up to 150 feet in height. As the land size is less than 3.2 hectares, this zoning (according to your own guidelines) should be CC1. This re-zoning to CC2 should be addressed and changed. A development at its maximum potential is out of the question, as we would see an unacceptable increase in traffic and density within our community.

Increased traffic has already altered easy flow in University Heights, resulting in lengthy wait times at several intersections. There are long wait times in accessing Crowchild Trail from 24th avenue and congestion on both Utah and Uxbridge Drives related to school traffic. Our small community is already impacted by the Foothills and Children's Hospitals, the University of Calgary, the football stadium, and Father Bauer arena and we cannot even handle the current traffic issues (which remain to be addressed for several years).

The proposed hotel on the Stadium site is incompatible with an elementary and a high-school in close proximity and would also add to the current parking problems. With apartments, businesses and medical offices and a hotel in the present list of considerations, there must be specific parking and traffic plans in place for all parties. This is not in place.

And what of the aesthetics of the development? Can we expect a new trend in mall development offering protection of community green space or are we to be another dismal example of the blighted

mall architecture so prevalent in our city?

We must insist on retaining all of the green space along 16th avenue and disallow a traffic route through the adjacent reserve lands. The green space that presently borders the schools and our community offers an opportunity for Western Securities to create a unique area of beauty and serenity, which, if effectively designed could influence city planners to address “green” in future developments.

We did not ask for this development, however we are asking for protection of our quality of life, and that the developers and the City of Calgary realize that they have an obligation to protect the environs of this city – not just for us, but for the future citizens as well.

28. I posted the essence of these comments on the development website too (www.calgary.ca/stadium).

I am a UH resident and, while I have not attended any of the meetings due to work commitments, I have read over the documents on this site (particularly the developers pre-application discussion document). Overall I am supportive of the plans to revitalize Stadium Shopping Centre. I think we can all benefit from this if we are allowed to provide constructive input that will impact the process. I think it is VERY important that all sides engage in a constructive and open dialog and that, particularly the city, is willing to listen and modify plans according to well reasoned input.

There is a lot to like about the plans found in the discussion document. Particularly moving the green space along 16th (where it is currently effectively useless) to a location within the complex that would allow it to be used positively and effectively as an attractive public space; engaging and expanding the park space adjacent to the school; providing a matrix of pedestrian friendly streets and pathways that connect well; making a street-friendly complex with ground floor retail space that would be attractive to community residents.

However, there are also some serious concerns, particularly with the density of use as planned. It is entirely unclear how traffic into and out of this site will impact the flow along Uxbridge drive (one of only three entry points into UH community) and, more importantly, the 16th Ave/29th St interchange. It is unreasonable to model this on a high density residential community when effective public transportation is poor and (mostly) far away. Thus I think we can anticipate that increased traffic flow and volume will be a huge concern. A detailed traffic (and transportation) plan, including careful modeling is an important step for which I can currently find no information. A concrete commitment from the city to improve transport to the site might also be an important aspect of the process. However, I am skeptical that this issue will, or even can, be addressed adequately.

Consequently I would propose that the density of use be scaled back significantly by modifying the high rise residential unit and the hotel plans (limited number of executive type suite accommodation units?). If the density of occupancy is tuned down, then I think most of the overarching themes found in the discussion document are quite reasonable. If we can modify and adjust some ideas then I think we can probably come up with a terrific plan that will make all reasonable people happy.

29. I live in University Heights and have attended all the public info sessions to date. I have followed info from our community and still feel our concerns have not been acted on and a final decision is to be made by Council June 10.

I have no concern in regard to the need to redo the area but I feel it is too dense for the area and present traffic problems already evident will be very much further compounded. Entrance into and out of the center is onto Uxbridge and already a problem. Entrance and exit can not be done onto the highway due to the proximity of the present controlled inter section at Uxbridge and the highway. I have not heard about parking which I assume will be underground and must be plentiful.

I do not think any building should be over 6 levels and a hotel is not wanted or needed in this location. Residential above ground level businesses should be limited to prevent over crowding. I would hope the present shops would be retained. Entrance and exit from this area is further a problem due to the 2 schools in the area with bus and car pickup 2 times a day. The surrounding area is dense at present due to the many populated business like the 2 hospitals . University and maybe the new Cancer Clinic across the street. Further consideration of our concerns is necessary and a delay in the final plan is also needed.

30. Random Observations regarding the site as an observant user over ~20 years:

- Pedestrian Traffic between Stadium and Foothills Medical Centre site needs to be grade separated for safety and good vehicle traffic movement at 16 Ave / Uxbridge / 19 Street. A Plus 15 system linking those key sites (and a +15 system within Stadium) would be highly desirable.
- There are now far too many turning movements for safety near 16 Ave on Uxbridge. An essential element for traffic safety and smooth movement should be a median which allowed right turn only in and out of Tim Horton's and a roundabout to manage access to the Stadium site set further away from 16 Ave to allow vehicles to weave to the appropriate lanes for turning onto or crossing 16 Ave.
- No vehicle access directly to/from 16 Ave. from Stadium – would be confused with weaving movements of traffic from Foothills wanting to go north on Shaganappi or to the Children's Hospital / west campus. I have already experienced possible/near collisions between traffic exiting Uxbridge/ Stadium wanting to go west and traffic moving from FMC to Shaganappi. This is exacerbated by big trucks moving slowly away from the traffic lights on 16 Ave.
- An economical hotel for family of patients at FMC is a serious need and should be encouraged, as should economical and healthy restaurants.
- A parkade to make better use of the land would be desirable at Stadium but would need good access to adjacent buildings (hence the +15 suggestion) as well as good ground level pedestrian circulation and an attractive 'streetscape' within the site.

31. I wondered if there will be any "community engagement" events that were geared more towards the established Stadium Shopping Centre businesses. I just thought I would inquire, since I am aware that one of the owners of a certain cat lover's specialty shop known as "The Cat House" seems to be rather interested in the whole situation concerning the Stadium Shopping Centre and the Area Redevelopment Plan.

32. A few things are being overlooked...they are currently surveying to develop access roads to the new West Camus residential development. This will further diminish our green space and increase traffic.

Keep in mind that this reserve land was to be for educational bldg. only. Also when the city was monitoring traffic at the Unwin/Uxbridge intersection, they choose to do this during the family day weekend, when traffic was profoundly reduced.

33. Thank you for your response.

Certainly we will be doing our best to attend the different events.

Are you able to answer the question I posed: what is the City's operating definition of the first principle "have a positive impact on the immediate area"? Specifically are you able to share the evaluation criteria the City uses when an elementary school is in the immediate area?

Related questions include:

- who decides if the developer thinks something is a net positive impact and those in the immediate area disagree? What are the types of concerns that are weighed?
- are we able to ensure that sun studies on the proposed development are carried out for the entire year, not just sample days, to ensure that sun shadowing is not occurring to a significant degree? (As an aside, our family is building a house, and it took minimal time for our architect to conduct year-round sun studies on our proposed build; presumably it should be similarly easy for year-round sun studies to be done on any proposed development).
- how does the City decide if any concerns or issues we raise are valid? Have redevelopments immediately adjacent to elementary schools occurred before and established any precedents of which we should be aware?

- what happens if a proposal has good and bad things? Does the City attempt to ensure net positive, or does the City, in a case like this, ensure that there are some "no-fly" zones for which no worsening can be accepted?

In addition to these questions that will improve our understanding of how the City assesses redevelopment, I would like to hear your reassurance that the CBE and University School Council will be assigned a particularly important status. Given that we are immediately adjacent to the redevelopment site, we would expect that your office will naturally be seeking out our perspective at all stages and not be simply waiting for us to provide feedback. I ask for this relationship as there may easily be nuances or phases about which we are ignorant and we are relying upon your office to ensure that the needs and interests of the children are (1) explored, (2) identified, and (3) carry weight.

As it happens, my daughter noticed all the bold signs about the meeting today and asked about them. I told her that there was a proposal to build a new structure that - according to my interpretation of the filed documents - would be the size of Market Mall minus The Bay, which would be many stories tall.

She thought about it and said, "But Daddy, that would block out the Sun. The Sun is really important tous in the playground. The Sun makes it fun and bright and warm" So, it is with the strong desire to ensure that this community school has a preserved high quality access and learning/growth environment that we are engaging in this process. I was pleased to read that an "improved interface" is of top priority. I hope we can take that to mean that preserved quality and access for the school is part of this priority.