



Western Securities response



UHCA letter

Stadium Shopping Centre Redevelopment Proposals by Western Securities: General Comments on Master Plan Workshop 2, held Nov. 13, 2013

1. Introduction. The organization of Master Plan Workshop 2 of Western Securities (WS) for Stadium Shopping Centre (SSC) redevelopment was better than the first workshop, primarily because there was room for *some* public comments and brief discussion. Yet it was still essentially a top-down event based on presentations by personnel employed by WS. Residents of University Heights (UH) who attended the workshop, and spoke of it afterward, regarded the workshop as unsatisfactory in format and content. Their criticisms and observations led to this assessment, in which we identify serious problems and emphasize that crucial questions remain unanswered. In particular, there were major problems with the poll questions provided for voting (some not well structured, some options not well defined, differences among options unclear), insufficient information was provided on the technically-oriented questions to allow audience members to make knowledgeable choices among the options provided, and insufficient time was allowed for consideration of options before each vote was taken. Further, drawing upon two City of Calgary documents, we focus on what constitutes City-Council-approved public engagement for land redevelopment. We argue that, thus far, WS has *not* followed Council-approved policies for its public engagement. We also request specific changes to the conduct of future workshops to make them more *effective*.

Thank you for the feedback on the format of Workshop #2. Constructive feedback is what helps define and refine future engagement process, thus we take the following comment very seriously; “Residents of University Heights (UH) who attended the workshop, and spoke of it afterward, regarded the workshop as unsatisfactory in format and content.” We take any and all discontent or positive reinforcement, for that matter, very seriously and make any necessary changes that we need to as we have in the past. For example, we heard through the attendees at Workshop #1 that they did not like the extended length of the first workshop and we heard that more information/more details were desired. We also heard that the small group’s allowed for too much influence over decisions. Hence, we changed the format of the second workshop to be more independent (voting), reflect more details, dive further into transportation, and maintain a very tight format to ensure that we did not go over the time allotment.

We will now be providing more information in advance of future workshops; specifically we will outline the format and intended outcomes. In doing this, we can hopefully better prepare workshop participants via setting expectations in advance. We will be posting information on our website and through direct email to our database.

We also understand that the University Heights community has “crucial answers that remain unanswered.” As the developer, we too have questions that remain unanswered by the City of Calgary. It is important to understand that we are not and have never withheld crucial information from the University Heights community or any other stakeholders throughout this process. But rather, we have been using the expertise of our design and engineering team, to focus attention towards the topics and content within the parameters of creating a masterplan that we can impact TODAY. Of course, as new information becomes readily available that impacts the decisions and conversations we have during the masterplanning process, we will share that information and the potential outcomes that it may or may not have on the work done to-date.

To-date we have answered all questions, which have been formally asked of us and will continue to do so. We encourage stakeholder communication and feedback and work to continually improve our processes and format.

2. Guiding Principles. The WS moderator of Workshop No.2 began by displaying a set of principles to guide the meeting. Initially the moderator refused to allow the Community Association (CA) representative to read a statement on behalf of the UH community, one that asked for a changed approach to the public engagement and requested *public* discussion of specific issues of concern. However, it was pointed out that the moderator's decision contradicted two of the WS guiding principles (Points 3 and 5 of the 'Rules of Engagement') that were displayed on the computer screen. These principles are also stated on page 3 of a 127-page pdf file entitled: 'Stadium Mixed Use: community outreach event #2' (henceforth simply Community Outreach Event #2), which was made available on the WS website after the workshop. Points 3 and 5 referred to the willingness 'to talk directly to each other,' and to 'support the expression of dissent.' After some audience discussion supporting the CA representative's desire to speak, the moderator allowed the statement to be read. The initial opposition of the moderator and the ensuing discussion certainly gave the impression that WS had intended the meeting to be primarily a top-down exercise.

We were disappointed that the decision was made to present the statement read by a member of University Heights in such a manner although we are pleased that many of the comments made in the statement were addressed, as planned, within the second workshop content. We, at Western Securities, have continually asked for feedback and as such, provided phone numbers, emails, and a website along with one-on-one conversations as a few means to do so. From our perspective, the purpose of feedback and opportunity for Q&A between workshops is to help us improve and refine the facilitation of the masterplanning process, which we are responsible for as the landowner and developer. Providing a "surprise" written statement at the beginning of a planned event when there was 6 weeks between workshops did not present itself as a genuine nor collaborative way to provide feedback or contribute to improving the process. We remain pleased that many of the comments/questions were addressed through the change of format and content.

We have also asked for further clarification surrounding the statement read at the second workshop. Is this a formal statement on behalf of the University Heights Community Association or the University Heights community in its entirety? If the comments are a formal representation of the community in its entirety, we would like to understand the process in which information and comments were collected to put this statement forward. This is important to understand to be able to refine or focus communication efforts throughout the remainder of the process.

We have a responsibility as the landowner and developer of the Stadium lands to lead a very well thought-out and purposeful process to the masterplanning. We take the time to put together exercises and methods to present content and collect feedback to ensure that the collective "we" are as productive in the masterplanning sessions as possible. Format and rules of engagement via a pre-

established process are not roadblocks to external expression of views or a “top down” approach, but rather quite the opposite.

We will continue to ask that any questions, comments or concerns be provided to us in advance of the workshops so we may incorporate them into workshop format and content but also to ensure that we are providing the right information to those who need it to participate in the process effectively. We have provided a written responses to every question / comment that was included in the statement which has been posted on our website for some time. If you feel that there are any questions that have been directed at Western Securities that have not been responded to, please advise at your earliest convenience so we can provide a response.

3. Development Options. Several WS speakers used computer screen displays to present information on various development options. Clickers had been distributed to the audience prior to the workshop so that the audience could vote on the options provided. The vote tabulations showing community preferences were then displayed on the screen. Unfortunately, what might have been a good idea for displaying opinions fell short in practice because of two issues. First, the WS engagement process required voting on initial impressions of what were frequently complex issues - issues which required more discussion and thought than was allowed by WS insistence upon a rapid response by the clicker vote. Second, there were many problems with the poll questions. Several questions were not well structured. In others some options were either not well defined or had differences among them that were unclear. Also, it was not possible to vote against all options listed, to vote for more than one option, or to vote for options that were not listed. Examples of these problems are provided next.

We agree that there were some areas of the voting exercises that could have been improved upon, however we feel as though this process generated some high quality discussion on several issues and was an excellent means of presenting certain elements of the masterplan. Please note that the masterplanning is not solely based on the tabulation of the voting system but rather acted as a singular exercise to facilitate discussion and provide information, which as we saw during the workshop, accomplished this. We actually received a lot of positive feedback on this exercise through the feedback forms collected at the end of the workshop.

[To facilitate understanding of the voting circumstances faced by UH residents and other stakeholders in making choices during the workshop, the Appendix contains 8 pages of scanned images of a printed handout distributed by WS at the start of the workshop. This handout specified the poll questions and the voting options for the different poll questions.]

a) The first question was: *Do you agree that the key issues we discussed in the last outreach included Land Uses, Massing, MR Transit and the location and character of Amenity Spaces?*

The possible responses were: Yes, No and Don't Remember. Surely 'discussing' the issues in the first workshop did *not* mean that the audience *agreed* with the presentations, or with the comments provided by the presenter, since the allowed time to consider the options was so short. Indeed, in the first workshop no public discussion among *all* members of the audience was allowed. Other issues that the community wanted to discuss, and that have been brought up during earlier stages in the SSC engagement process, were not allowed or even acknowledged. It was the considerable dissatisfaction of community residents with the conduct of Workshop 1 that led to the preparation of the CA statement which was read out at the beginning of Workshop 2. The absence of an option for voting 'no' on the

nature of the 'discussion' in Workshop 1 skewed the voting on the poll question and rendered the results unrepresentative of community views.

Engagement within masterplanning is centred on constructive discussion. The purpose of discussion followed by an exercise such as voting, is to provoke thought, perhaps explore a viewpoint that has not been considered and from there cast an independent, unbiased opinion. We agree that the audience within the first workshop were not supposed to “agree” with the content. That is the point. There was nothing to agree or disagree on at that point in the process, but rather simply discuss. Small group discussion took place in the first workshop as starting point as a means to allow every participant the opportunity to participate in the conversation. As you may have noticed in the second workshop, a larger group “forum” alienates many individuals as more extroverted individuals tend to dominate the “discussion.” As you recall, there were members of the Western Securities team present at each small group table at the first workshop. They were participating in the conversation, answering questions and taking notes. All of the notes collected at each table were used to formulate the questions asked at the second workshop. Again, we have committed an abundance of resources and experts to help create a constructive, unbiased format to the masterplanning workshops and hence may not always reflect a large group forum format.

You note, “Other issues that the community wanted to discuss, and that have been brought up during earlier stages in the SSC engagement process, were not allowed or even acknowledged.” Please let us know specifically what these are/were and we will answer immediately if we are the right party to answer the questions.

You also note “It was the considerable dissatisfaction of community residents with the conduct of Workshop 1 that led to the preparation of the CA statement which was read out at the beginning of Workshop 2.” As we noted above, it would have been appreciated if your comments/concerns about the first workshop were communicated in advance of the second workshop rather than during.

Further, opportunities should have been provided for Community residents to raise issues not discussed. Three examples can be provided for illustration. When will primary transit be provided and where will the transit stops be located?

Western Securities will never be in a position to dictate when the primary transit will be provided; the City of Calgary is the ultimate decision maker on this issue. To hopefully prompt some positivity around the issue, Western Securities and the surrounding communities and stakeholders have demonstrated alignment on this issue – it is something that we collectively want as soon as possible and should work together to encourage the City to implement as soon as possible.

With regard to the transit stop locations, again this is something where both Western Securities and the community will have little influence. Western Securities has committed to incorporating both the stop on 16th Avenue westbound as well as the stop on Uxbridge Drive southbound into the redevelopment. That said, it is the City that will provide requirements and details as to the exact locations and interfaces that are necessary using City guidelines.

What are the costs of the infrastructure investments, who will bear them and when will the investments be made?

These are all items will be primarily dictated and addressed by the City of Calgary. The costs will be a negotiation between the City, Western Securities and anyone else involved in the payment for such items. The investment timelines will be dictated by the City and implemented as infrastructure as required. It is important to note that the infrastructure items outlined in the Stadium ARP were (in some cases) based on the TIA which accounts for increases in traffic not only on the Stadium site but the whole surrounding area on 30+ year projections. Decisions to implement such infrastructure will likely not be based solely on the development that occurs at Stadium.

What were the rationales for the land use balances in the plan?

As noted in previous correspondence, the land uses balances were based on several factors including; community input, market conditions, urban planning and surrounding context, the ARP guidelines, WS ownership desires.

Why have no answers been provided to these and other questions raised by the community in presentations to City Council and earlier to City planners? Answers to these questions are of central interest to UH residents and should bear strongly on the inputs to any future plan.

Several of these questions have been answered previously. Please provide any further questions that you feel have not been answered and we will do our best to answer them in an expeditious manner. We also feel that the answers to these questions as well as the input from the UH residents and other stakeholders has had an enormous effect on the direction the masterplanning has headed. The ARP places very significant restrictions on the existing land use that is in place on the site. Over the past four years, Western Securities has agreed to massive concessions with regard to this site's development and is proceeding on this path to do its best to ensure that the redevelopment is vibrant, a high quality addition to the surrounding neighbours and institutions, a long term success for all stakeholders, and is viable.

b) Questions 2 and 3 tried to determine the preferences of community residents for different *Roundabout types* and for a *Complete Streets* design. A voting system which insisted upon rapid responses was not appropriate. Proper formulation of preferences required providing adequate information about the advantages and disadvantages of each option, then allowing considerable thought and discussion by community residents prior to voting. Instead, audience members were asked to vote upon matters for which little information was provided. In particular, few audience members seemed to know much about the advantages and disadvantages of Roundabouts (of different sizes) and Signalized Intersections, and of Complete Streets.

Thank you for this feedback. Your concern has been heard and more information about these items will be provided. It is important to note however, that much of this section was created for discussion purposes. Again, ultimately the City will determine the requirements for roundabouts, intersections, and streets.

Moreover, the questions previously raised by the community about the size of traffic increases at 16th Ave and Uxbridge Drive and along Unwin, as well as the increasing number of vehicles short-cutting through UH were ignored. Indeed, questions about, and criticisms of, the Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) have never been answered. On page 2 of the WS October 2013 newsletter, the number 1 issue of importance to stakeholders who provided input to WS on post-it notes was listed as: 'Traffic and Parking – traffic-impacting accessibility, traffic control, types of parking and impacts.' Yet there has been no discussion of such key issues. Indeed, on page 5 of the newsletter the transportation engineer (Bruce Nelligan) wrote that the TIA will not be discussed during the workshops, although certain other traffic issues would be. So stakeholder opinions on the importance of traffic issues were thus dismissed, *without* consulting those stakeholders. How is this an example of collaboration among stakeholders in preparing the Master Plan?

Please provide us with further clarification on this issue. As we have said, Western Securities has spent an enormous amount of time and resources commissioning a TIA from professional engineers. This TIA was reviewed and approved by the City Transportation department. Earlier in the process when we heard from the community that there was still concern regarding this TIA, we spent more time and resources having a formal peer review completed on the TIA by a 3rd party professional engineering firm that is very well respected. This approved TIA has reviewed and analyzed all requirements of the City and as the developer and landowner, Western Securities has to rely on these professional opinions. If there are ongoing issues from the TIA that have not been answered, please provide these questions as soon as possible so that we can respond appropriately.

b) For poll questions 4 and 5, the lack of information provided became more problematic when even more complex issues were at stake. The complexity is seen in the diagrams for these questions in the Appendix which show alternative interfaces with the community and the spatial arrangement for the best retail experience. In terms of the 'best interface with the community', the diagrams on the handout just show various buildings on the SSC site and no detailed connections with the community are depicted. The diagrams are also inadequate. Only one displays a bus rapid transit (BRT) stop, yet the Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) and supporting TIA were based on the concept of BRT to SSC. The required 'Complete Street' infrastructure is nowhere depicted fully on any diagram. Further, diagrams 1, 2 and 4 show at least one (partial) roundabout, while diagram 3 shows none. Only diagram 1 depicts part of a pedestrian overpass. WS provided only several minutes to try to explain these confusing diagrams and then asked community residents to vote on their preferences. How can this be considered effective public engagement when key information was missing? Furthermore, there was not an option for voting 'no', to express disagreement with the four options, all of which were confusing. To express a 'no' preference, the only alternative was not to vote. But since the votes were tabulated on the basis of those who did vote, a false impression of the opinions of community residents would be obtained by assuming that those who did not vote were indifferent among the voting choices. (Such an interpretation is common in judging the meaning of votes not cast in an election.) To gauge community preferences accurately required a 'no' option for voting. Similar criticisms apply to the retail question.

We understand from this correspondence that you found the second workshop content complex. We will work to refine the level of detail provided through specific channels to avoid confusion. It is though, important to note that these types of questions helped spur some great discussion at the event, which was the sole purpose. The actual tabulation of the votes is merely an exercise to spark conversation and thought. The votes will not solely dictate the direction of the plan. They are meant to reveal a DIRECTION. This is also why there was not an option to vote "no" because the intent was to encourage some kind of vote in order for the design team to then understand a specific view point that participants

leaned towards. This also explains why the diagrams were so different – they were meant to be different to spark thought and gauge direction. The “direction” is then used by professionals in several different disciplines to produce and revise the content as we move forward. Also, please note that all options of the masterplan will include the transit stop on 16th Avenue westbound and a pedestrian overpass.

How can one judge what layout is appropriate when the nature of the retail is not specified and when no information is provided on parking? To speak vaguely about ‘some’ surface parking is both uninformative and inadequate since suburban retailers in this city require an adequate amount of parking to survive. To formulate a sensible answer to the poll question required information on how much parking will be provided and will it be charged for?

We echo our response to this question that we provided at the workshop – that there will be some, minor amount of surface parking within the development and the majority of the parking will be below grade and/or in structured parking. It is in Western Securities interest to ensure the parking scenario functions appropriately. We will not make a commitment (nor is it reasonable to ask at this point) on how we will be managing the parking and how it is paid for at this point in the planning process. There will likely be some component of free parking for short term visitor parking and likely the remainder will be paid parking, however this decisions will be driven by a myriad of factors and could change at any point overtime (as in any development). These are decisions that Western Securities will make in order to ensure we can lease space as well as build and operate a successful facility.

More to the point, under City regulations and the ARP document there would need to be 1695 parking stalls (as listed on p. 49 of the Final TIA), although the UH community has calculated that the figure should be closer to 2500 parking stalls on the basis of the various land uses assumed in the TIA.

We have heard this comment previously and continually request the UH community members calculations so that we can provide an accurate response.

(In any case there will have to be more than the number of stalls listed in the TIA, since the City chose to base the ARP on the sensitivity analysis case of 20% higher traffic flows, not the base case flows for which parking stall numbers were estimated.) *Why was no information provided about these key issues before the vote was taken?* Why did community residents have to ask for such information again, especially since they have raised the issue several times in the past? Also, no information was provided at the workshop about whether parking will be free (as for Home Depot on 16th Ave, or at the Market Mall) or will be charged for. However, on its website WS recently addressed this matter: 'It is our intention to have some short4 term above grade parking that is free for quick in-and-out trips to retail uses.' But how much parking and where will it be located? Surely the number of parking stalls is critical to the viability of many stores. Free parking at Market Mall, Brentwood and North Hill will undermine retailing at SSC if parking at SSC is insufficient or costly. A related question is: how difficult will it be to access parking at SSC? If -during particular times of the day - traffic congestion increases within the SSC site or at the access points on Uxbridge Drive, many potential retail customers may choose not to visit SSC. Accordingly, the viability of this community shopping centre could be threatened, if not destroyed.

It is in Western Securities and the community’s best interest to ensure the viability of this project. We deal with retailers, office, and residential tenants on an ongoing basis and have been in this business for over 80 years. We intend on building this project for the long-term and need to ensure that it is successful for everyone involved and impacted. We are acutely aware that parking and access will be of

key importance to this project's success. Please trust that we hear you. If there are comments and suggestions from any stakeholder, please provide them as soon as possible. If there are questions that have not been answered, also please provide these as soon as possible so we can answer appropriately.

The architect also referred to the location of a new grocery store. Can any grocer survive without a lot of free parking? Safeway left the centre two decades ago. The long established Bon Ton meat store recently relocated, partly because the owner became convinced that in a redeveloped SSC his customers will not have enough free surface parking. A previous greengrocer could not survive. Is there any evidence that a grocery store, or any food store for that matter - other than a convenience store – will ever be viable in this location, given very limited free surface parking? Why have these key questions never been addressed?

It is the job of Western Securities and any potential retailer to ensure the project works for the retailers' needs. We are in discussions with several different grocers regarding the Stadium redevelopment and so far have quite strong interest in the development. These retailers have been provided the same information that has been provided at the masterplanning engagement workshops.

c) Poll question 6 stated: *Do you agree that all the options provide the potential for good connectivity?* The routes illustrated on the handout are a mixture of roads and paths, and the differences among them are unclear. How is 'potential' defined? Where is the connectivity to? Will WS fund infrastructure improvements to these routes? Will the post-flood, cash-strapped City be expected to fund the improvements?

The "potential" is to substantially improve the existing conditions while maintaining existing pedestrian and bike movements. The connectivity that Western Securities will be responsible for are all of the areas contained within the site as well as those outlined in the ARP such as the Complete Streets. We will ensure that the pedestrian, bike, transit and auto connections on the site are enhanced and redeveloped to improve movement to and from the site. Items that are not outlined in the City policy documentation or guidelines will not be the responsibility of Western Securities, however Western Securities and the surrounding stakeholders will likely be quite aligned with the expectation that the City provides some off-site improvements given the level of development in the surrounding area.

After redevelopment, many of the main routes near SSC will see increases of 50% in traffic flows above current flows according to the TIA report.

The redevelopment of Stadium Shopping Centre will increase traffic on the adjacent transportation network. The mixed use nature of the site with residential, office and retail will create many opportunities for internal trips which will have no impact on the adjacent transportation network. Furthermore, the proposed improvements to more sustainable modes of transportation including transit, walking and cycling in the area will help reduce the reliance on automobiles.

What measures will be taken to cope with increased traffic? Answers to these questions are of utmost importance to community residents. Responses to poll question 6 were not meaningful because audience members had inadequate time to consider the options and were not given appropriate information to come to informed conclusions about the consequences of each option.

There are several measures outlined in the ARP (and associated TIA) that are aimed at dealing with increased traffic. Some of these items include; requirement of a mixed use development (this helps

disperse travel patterns throughout the day), substantial infrastructure upgrades to the 16th Avenue and 29th Street/Uxbridge Drive intersection, new intersection designs for the access points to the site, and improvements to the quality of transit stops in the area.

d) Poll question 7 about different pedestrian amenities was also puzzling because most amenities would seem necessary. In addition, no economic rationale was provided for the viability of retail options. Especially puzzling were the architect's comments about locating a bike shop in SSC, where none has been before, and his observation that crime would be solved by high density. How many bike sales/repairs would be needed to sustain a bike shop? How could a bike shop survive financially during winter? Can anyone cycle on 16th Ave from the SSC and survive along the crowded Trans Canada Highway? How many people - without a death wish - can be expected to cycle on 16th Ave or 29th Street NW or Uxbridge/Unwin/University Drive/Underhill during winter?

The economic viability of retail uses on the site will ultimately be determined by the retailers. However, Western Securities has a long history as a retail landlord and understands the requirements demanded by retail users. It is in all of our best interests to ensure that there will be viable options for retail uses on the site.

Have WS analysts ever visited this site at rush hour or in winter? What crime - existing or potential - would be reduced by high density development? Few UH residents can remember any serious crime at SSC.

Western Securities "analysts" include the owners of the company who were part of building the Stadium Shopping Centre in 1962, long before many of the residential houses in the area. We have a very long-term vision and intend on owning and operating this site for years to come, unlike many other developers in Calgary.

e) For poll question 8 on the 'best open space', voting was again highly restricted by the options provided. The diagrams on the handout were hard to understand, partly because the full site and surrounding areas were not depicted. Further, the diagrams on the computer screen for this question did not seem drawn to scale, despite the assurances of the presenter, and no scale was specified. The green spaces illustrated seemed too large relative to the area of SSC, but -- without a scale on the diagram and the ability to examine the issue more closely -- the issue could not immediately be resolved. Voting for one of the four options was *not* appropriate, without more time, information and public discussion to consider advantages and disadvantages of all options.

We are disappointed to hear that you did not feel there was sufficient information. The architect's explanations were meant to provide some of the detail in conjunction with the plan. As with all of the questions, it was made clear that the information was posted on our website right away for further review and comment. If there are any outstanding questions, please advise so we can respond appropriately.

4) **Shadowing.** Shadowing views were presented for June and March/September. Unfortunately, winter lasts a long time in Calgary and shadowing around SSC ought to have been shown for at least December for community residents to learn of the shadowing from the planned buildings on the site *they* will have to live with in the depths of winter. How could the presenter not know, or not speculate, that community residents would be most concerned about shadowing when the sun is lowest in the

sky? Omitting this information unfortunately raised concerns among community residents and suspicions that bad-news information might purposely have been suppressed. Again no time was allowed to question the presenter on the methods used to determine shadowing. Given the substantial heights of the buildings considered, the shadowing effects shown on the computer screen diagrams for June and March/September seemed very small. Also, shadowing will depend on where various buildings of various heights are located. Unless decisions have been made about this placement one cannot properly assess shadowing problems.

The shadowing information provided was chosen as it is standard industry practice to do so. It also addressed the requirements of the ARP. Western Securities acknowledges that the shadowing would be different and more intrusive at other times of the year. The site has a height maximum of 14 stories and the architects have spent a significant amount of time working to design the site to minimize the impacts of shadowing.

5) **Turning Lanes and Traffic.** There were also brief comments by the Traffic Engineers who conducted the TIA. The presentation was dominated by information about the addition of extra turning lanes at the Uxbridge/16th Ave intersection. Yet the TIA showed that even with these lanes the level of congestion after redevelopment would be virtually the same as at present. This crucial information was again just ignored.

Information was not ignored but rather, a TIA was commissioned (as well as Peer Reviewed) from professional engineers and was reviewed and approved by the City Transportation department as part of the Stadium ARP process. This approved TIA accounts for the Calgary Transportation Plan (CTP) and has been reviewed and analyzed based on the requirements of the City – Western Securities relies on these professional opinions. As has been suggested on several occasions to members of the University Heights Community Association, if there are specific ongoing issues from the TIA that have not been answered, please provide these questions as soon as possible so that we can respond appropriately.

In any case the community has frequently observed that the underground parking structures, which are likely to be constructed at SSC, will involve additional congestion generated by cars entering and leaving the structures. This congestion will likely spill over onto Uxbridge Drive. Were these questions about traffic congestion ever noted by WS and the City? Will community residents ever get answers to them?

Some parking structures in Calgary experience congestion in the peak periods as traffic enters or leaves the site. Queuing into the parking structure can be avoided through design of the entry system. For example, the pay and display system or the ParkPlus system do not require drivers to stop at a gate or take a ticket upon entry. At this time, the exact location of the parking structure entry and the payment system has not been finalized. Traffic analysis of the parking structure entry and exits will be conducted at the detailed design stage.

It was also puzzling to see the Complete Street display (page 42 of the WS document Community Outreach Event #2'). The diagram shows Uxbridge Drive with three lanes in each direction beside a central median, with a traffic lane and bike lane and a parking lane on each side of the median. How are six lanes going to be fitted into this area? What cyclists would want to use a central lane with parked cars and moving cars/buses/trucks beside them at a congested junction? How sensible is it for the City even to consider allowing bike traffic during rush hour which slows down all road traffic and raises serious safety issues, particularly at roundabouts? How can city planners and traffic engineers support this concept, especially given the harsh weather of winter in Calgary?

The Stadium ARP stipulates that Uxbridge Drive be built as a complete street and the design team will be working closely with the City to design the exact the configuration of the street. We welcome all community comments regarding the design of Uxbridge Drive in accordance with the City of Calgary's complete street design guidance. The complete street diagram discussed during the workshop shows the City of Calgary standard for complete street design for an arterial road. The right-of-way of Uxbridge Drive provides the required space for this design to be implemented. Complete Streets are meant to balance the needs of all users of a street, providing a safe and comfortable environment for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Uxbridge Drive is an important cycle route linking the University of Calgary to the Bow river pathway system. Complete streets provide dedicated cycle lanes, in addition to the dedicated vehicle travel lanes. These lanes diminish vehicle/cyclist conflicts, while maintaining vehicle flow. Complete streets encourage increased cycle and pedestrian mode share, resulting in less single occupancy vehicle use which helps reduce congestion.

6) **Voting.** The previous points show the community's concerns with the questions posed, the options allowed for voting and insistence by WS upon rapid audience response. These issues mean that it is completely inappropriate to use the votes recorded in Workshop 2 as evidence of any community opinions. The instant reactions that were recorded were not based on adequate information from the speakers, discussion of alternatives, or time to consider the advantages or disadvantages of the options.

The masterplanning process is essentially a "map." Exercises take place that provide outcomes that lead to other activities to get further outcomes from and so on. It is a process that will lead to an eventual end. Our engagement approach is not based on a one-size-fits-all approach, as we have a diverse range of stakeholders and we also want to encourage both group discussion and individual thought to gather unbiased feedback. As noted, the actual tabulation of the votes is merely an exercise to spark conversation and thought. The votes will not solely dictate the direction of the plan. They are meant to reveal a DIRECTION.

7) **Critical Information.** During the workshop far too much information critical to community residents was ignored, downplayed or apparently not considered relevant. Many residents of University Heights and surrounding communities have a great deal of knowledge and experience in the content areas considered. They want to assist development planning. But their genuine concerns about the problems they have raised regarding the development are constantly ignored. They need answers to the questions that are important to them. ***Unless these questions and issues are addressed during subsequent phases of the Master Planning process, the redevelopment plans will be poor and will cause major problems. These problems are not only related to the increased traffic and short-cutting through the community and the viability of retailing in SSC. More generally they are problems will affect the city as a whole because of the predictable serious traffic congestion that will occur, especially at the critical Uxbridge Drive/16th Ave intersection and surrounding roads.***

Western Securities continues to have a strong will to work with this community and answer all questions and comments that are put forward. If there are items that you feel have not been responded to, please advise at your earliest convenience.

8) **City-Council-Approved Public Engagement and WS Engagement.** Apart from the content dealt with at the Master Planning Workshops, concerns were raised by community residents about the WS

public engagement during the workshops. Public engagement issues have been examined in a recent document prepared by UH residents entitled "*On Public Engagement during Land Redevelopment Planning in Calgary.*" Some highlights of this document are relevant here. City-Council-approved policies for public engagement can be found in two recent City of Calgary documents: the 2009 Municipal Development Plan (MDP); and a document entitled '*engage!* Policy' - policy number CS009, and approved by City Council on May 27, 2013 (EP). Relevant images from those city documents appear in the Appendix to the UH public engagement document, allowing the reader to verify the quotations from the MDP and EP that are made in this short review.

On its website, WS refers to the following brief definition of engagement by the City from EP (page 1): "Engagement" at The City of Calgary is defined as: purposeful dialogue between The City and citizens and stakeholders to gather information to influence decision making.

This definition is very general but information in the MDP and EP provides additional meaning and structure. Using quotations from the MDP (p. 2-28) and EP (pages 1, 4 and 5), the UH document discusses the meaning of public engagement more fully. If selected parts of those quotations from the UH document are merged, then a succinct summary of the Council-approved characterization of engagement can be provided: ***"Local planning studies will ensure the necessary resources and timeframes to undertake community planning projects in a manner that is responsible, thorough, transparent and includes participatory community planning and consultation ... Stakeholders are considered partners in the decision-making process, including collaboration on analyzing issues, building alternatives, identifying preferred solutions and making recommendations, and ... a process that results in joint recommendations"***.

Key words in this summary are: "necessary resources and timeframes, responsible, thorough, transparent, participatory community planning, **partners**, collaboration on analyzing issues, building alternatives, identifying preferred solutions and making ... joint recommendations." An obvious question arises: How does this characterization apply to the public engagement by WS? After two Master Planning Workshops, the WS public engagement process for SSC redevelopment does not appear consistent with this characterization. Why? Because WS set the dates for the workshops, specified the agendas, formulated the only options to be considered for voting (none of which it specified prior to a workshop) and provided inadequate information about the options to be voted upon (options that sometimes lacked clarity or required technical knowledge to understand). WS also disallowed or cut short adequate public discussion of all alternatives, did not solicit community suggestions for options, provided too little time for discussion and thought prior to voting, and refused to discuss questions of central importance to the community. In short, the UH community has *not* been regarded as a true 'partner' in the public engagement, either in the details of the City-Council-approved public engagement policies or in their spirit.

Suggestive of the way in which the workshop was conducted is the lengthy 127-page WS Community Outreach Event #2 document posted on the WS website after the meeting. While not everything in the document was presented and discussed in the two-hour workshop, much was. It was far too much for audience members to try to absorb, listen/participate sensibly in discussion about, determine preferences for options listed and then vote. Moreover, community concerns about issues not discussed

in Workshop No 2 (or in Workshop No 1) were not solicited by WS or even acknowledged. Will the remaining WS Master Planning workshops deliver more of these same approaches?

Given the time, effort and resources that have gone into consultation with the University Heights community and surrounding stakeholders over the past 4 years, it is truly disappointing to read the above noted. Western Securities feels as though there has been a significant failure by all parties to clearly define scope and roles to all stakeholders. The fundamental facts that the Stadium site that has an existing land use in place that we never intended to change and that we could have just applied for a project Development Permit several years ago, and how this translates into City of Calgary processes and requirements has never been clear to many members of the surrounding communities. This is a frustration that we hold as well. Many of the quotes in the UH residents document (On Public Engagement during Land Redevelopment Planning in Calgary) were written and presented completely out of context as they were intended for City lead public consultation events for area planning. Despite this fact, we are dedicated to continually working towards and ensuring an appropriate, transparent and effective public engagement and will always request feedback and work towards improving everything we do.

9) Greater Effectiveness. Future workshops can be made more effective if WS follows City-Council approved public engagement policies. The following specific steps will also improve the process.

i) Before a workshop, specify the questions to be discussed at the workshop and the options, providing sufficient lead time to allow community residents to think about the issues prior to the workshop and, potentially, to formulate options for discussion and voting.

During the past two engagement events, Western Securities (and our expert team of consultants) did not feel it was appropriate to provide detailed information in advance without explanation. There are several reasons for this, but mainly the purpose of presenting content and questions during a physical event rather than in advance is to spark unbiased discussion and thought. We are not expecting participants to be “experts” in each professional discipline that contributes to creating the content for the workshops. We are trying our very best to relay complex information in a way that a) Has been requested of us and b) That our team of professions feel is relevant to the masterplanning phase of this project. This is why we provide ample opportunity to ask questions between events and in a variety of forums (online, email, in-person, over the phone, mail, etc). When and if we decide to execute an independent survey or series of questions (which in fact, we already did), we will ensure that it’s objective and role within the engagement process is very clear.

ii) At each workshop, provide clear and unambiguously different options for voting.

Western Securities believed this had been accomplished however will continue to work to improve in this area.

iii) Provide adequate information about each option, and be prepared to answer questions about the options. Encourage public discussion to inform the choice of preferences.

Western Securities will continue to work towards improving and refining this area.

iv) For each question, include a "no" option.

The votes will not solely dictate the direction of the plan. They are meant to reveal a DIRECTION. This is also why there was not an option to vote “no” because the intent was to encourage some kind of vote in order for the design team to then understand a specific view point that participants leaned towards.

v) Allow community members to suggest their own options and discuss them publicly, with input from WS and the City. If WS or the City believes such options to be unwise or infeasible, they should provide *evidence* to support their opinions.

Western Securities has and will continue to request feedback and input from all stakeholders on everything we present. Community members have been encouraged to do this and Western Securities has received no such feedback that has been reviewed. It is our job and the job of the expert design and engineering team we hire to provide a realistic starting point and options from there that can be impacted.

vi) Allow sufficient time during the workshops for audience members to formulate their preferences and then vote upon all of the available options.

Western Securities believed this had been accomplished however will continue to work to improve in this area.

These steps are legitimate expectations of community residents for effective public engagement because of the long-term consequences of the SSC redevelopment for the UH community, as well as surrounding communities, and for the city, because of the location of SSC on one of the city's major traffic arteries. Moreover, following these steps should ensure that community preferences will actually be revealed when voting occurs. If it is not possible for WS to follow these steps, then WS should explain to the UH community, one of the most important stakeholders in this planning process, why it cannot follow these steps.

10) Conclusions. Although UH residents appreciated the opportunity to learn more about the proposed redevelopment of the Stadium Shopping Centre site, the conduct and structure of the workshop and the number of unanswered questions remaining at the end of the workshop left people disappointed and disillusioned with the process. Not surprisingly, UH residents are frustrated with the public engagement process, which has not followed City-Council-approved engagement policies. UH residents have the right to expect the type of public engagement specified in the policies that City Council has approved. More effective engagement sessions by WS should be organized, based on these Council-approved public engagement policies, and following the particular steps specified above.

It is very clear that some members of the UHCA are disappointed with a number of unanswered questions and process. Western Securities is committed to investing more time in understanding, specifically, what changes can be made that will meet the needs of the UHCA moving forward but also meet the following criteria:

- 1) Maintain parameters on what we are here to do - masterplanning of Stadium Shopping Centre
- 2) Not alienate other stakeholders participating in the masterplanning process
- 3) Consider and respect the timelines and resources Western Securities has identified as part of the masterplanning process

We have already begun this process with the UHCA on identifying the first step of the move forward plan.

Appendix

The WS Printed Handout on Eight Poll Questions and the Voting Options

The remaining pages consist of scanned images of the printed handout provided by WS to audience members at the start of Workshop No. 2. This handout specified the 8 poll questions provided during the workshop and the voting options. There are some inconsistencies between the original printed pages and their corresponding electronic versions.

The latter can be found in the pdf file (SSC Community Outreach Event No. 2) available from the WS website. One difference consisted of small diagrams that did not appear in the handout. A major difference arose for poll question #2. There were *three* options on the printed hand-out: A) Compact Type; B) Semi-Compact Type; and C) Don't Know. In the WS pdf file (page 47) there were *four* options for poll question #2: A) Signalized; B) Semi-Compact Roundabout; C) City Standard Roundabout; and D) Don't Know. Voting was carried out while the audience members were referring both to the printed version of poll question #2 and its electronic version on the computer screen. Due to differences in the voting options between the printed handout and the electronic version displayed on the screen, the voting results for this poll question are obviously meaningless. The differences were *not* identified during the workshop and *not* mentioned, probably because audience members were having difficulties trying to understand the advantages and disadvantages of compact roundabouts, semi-compact roundabouts and signalized intersections. WS did not provide adequate information about these alternatives during the workshop.

Western Securities recognizes that one of the poll questions on the handout was different from the question posed at the workshop and posted on the projection screen during the workshop. This was due to a change made after the handouts were printed only hours before the workshop. The version from the workshop was clearly outlined during the workshop and posted on the website after the event as well. We apologize for any inconvenience this may have posed.

The voting process and information collected as a result of that process (both the poll results and the discussion that evolved out of the voting exercise) are very meaningful to the masterplanning of the Stadium lands. Western Securities began the masterplanning process clearly stating that we would be working WITH stakeholders to create a plan. That means taking steps towards the creation of a plan. In this case, it involves a number of workshops, amongst other two-way communication activities with community. It involves engineers and architects testing discussion and outcomes that arise out of our public consultation against what is possible and what it not according to a variety of variable and parameters. "Masterplanning" is meant to hone in on what the collective "we" can influence and change to create the best plan possible. Our process thus far has been nothing but transparent in our goal to come to this conclusion. Of course, there are many questions that go answered and that will arise as we move through the process, but that it is the reason for their being a process.