

WESTERN SECURITIES

ESTABLISHED · 1932

Final Stadium Masterplan Open House Exhibit, Nov 19&27, 2014 **Feedback Form Responses and Answers**

**Stakeholder responses have been organized into overall subject headings.*

Public Realm Presentation Board

- I think its great more people
- Concerns:
 - o Shading on public square
 - o I thought you said 10 story's max
 - o Traffic – will the traffic circle work?
 - o The school is applying for 15 more years as a charter which means this will cause bus congestion
- Plan looks well presented
- Useful – helpful to see realistic renditions of what it will look like
- Well-designed and nice to look at. Slightly concerned with winter condition: may be a logistic nightmare
- Excellent configuration and amenities
- Must have area for community use indoors with a use agreement embedded
- Concept looks fantastic – a definite improvement
- Well I guess love to build but do it as easily as possible for community so not under construction for years on end
- The earlier versions of rendering for public realm seemed a bit friendlier. I am finding that there's too much landscape in the development – even though the treatment of the ground is better then average, overall it still feels a bit harsh. – I would love to see a bit more softscape, or perhaps a bit more variation of surface treatment

Calgary Precedent Building Styles Presentation Board

- Pretty!
- Concerned in height of buildings adjacent to school grounds 12-14 floors block school grounds.
 - o Morning sun concerned re shadowing of public space
 - o Concerned re roads surround public space = safety concerns
- Buildings (some) are higher than McCaig tower, which is extremely high. Do you have concern that the public might not frequent the center if it's too dense and too congested.
- Inglewood, Mission and Bridgeland examples would look good at Stadium.
- Not too informative.
- Hard to know if it will end up looking like these.
- Beautiful design.
- Bridgeland seems to have it right. Definitely not "that 70's show" from Brentwood.
- Lower buildings allow more sunlight.
- No glass PLEASE.
- I think you are missing an opportunity here, wanting to have as many offices and rentals as possible – RATHER than actually building and selling some of the properties to stable, older, homeowners. I don't mind the hotel, even if it has a bar, because that will service the hospital and Tom Baker Centre.
- Building styles are really great and that will attract more residents.
- From the rendering the audience seems to be modern, modest and pleasant. Personally, I am not that thrilled about the super colorful blocks.
- Transparency on the Mazu and 2nd floors are very important.
- Styles seem OK, but awfully high in a residential area.
- Not my style! Please don't put in a bunch of glass towers like we have at Brentwood and at 24th and Crowchild Trail. Please consider sustainability, heat

efficiency and life span. Engineers are showing how glass towers fail after about 20 years. Good lighting from natural light is important but it needs to be done in a way that the building can last 100 years, not 20 years. Now that the problem is occurring more often buyers will be reluctant to invest in this type of construction. I would prefer to see more classic – like brownstones, or the style of the buildings in Garrison Green (for example). You want this place to have a neighborhood – welcoming feel, not a cold bunch of concrete and glass.

- None of these pictures show what styles will be used for the Stadium. So, it is irrelevant to show these. We will end up with building that looking nothing like these “examples” of styles, so these pictures are misleading.
 - o A scale model of the development showing styles would be useful. We have no idea what the stadium will actually look like from drawing that often change in detail from one session to another. Will there be a coordinating architectural style? Will it be unified to look cohesive, or a hodgepodge of buildings with different styles?
- Looking forward to more useful commercial stores. Love the grocery store.
- Excellent balance, design and site amenity integrated.

Other Comments/Suggestions

Phasing

- There are far more unresolved issued than style. This so-called Final Plan just ignores the congestion that the current plans will create. What about the current retail stores? No attempt is made to provide incentive so these stores could come back. One doubts that retailers will survive the development.
- The “Built Form” board needs to explain the phasing in a form that indicates the break out per phase.
- Construction in one phase – the entire project and other work – would be ideal. The city should rebuild the 16th ave and the 19 st intersection in one reason rather than over 2 or 3 years as currently suggested.

- Please ensure there is a high focus on safety during construction phase.
- Please ensure the grocer tenant is semi-secured before taking everything down and finding the new space new rent is too high for groceries stores to come back in.

General Comments/Suggestions

- Don't put a hotel beside an elementary school.
- Positive community change.
- Please register my email jonitor@telus.net let me know when residential complex will be available. John 587 890 8830.
- Fabulous.
- Very poor. There should have been a Community Forum to discuss issues that are still unresolved.
- Looks great!
- Why no public presentation of plans with presentation by WS, when the public ask questions and have answers from all participants. Why no specific details to parking, number of jobs created and number of residents? You have such estimates, why not show here? Why no for specific details? Estimates are fine.
- Too many issues missing on the presentation
 - o Nothing about underground parking, ok?
 - o Nothing about office parking, ok?
 - o Nothing about shadow effects on site?
 - o Nothing about walking to Foothills on a footbridge?
- I have something to say and that is, "Just because you can, doesn't mean you should." This development is too big for this space!!

Parking/Traffic

- Concern Re: traffic! Parking.
- I am generally in favor of the plan and consideration for the community. I think traffic will be better after the development.

- Based on the density of this project, access to 16th is a concern and congestion, which is a current problem, must be resolved.
- Traffic flow remains a primary concern.
 - o Is parking adequate?
 - o Numbers are missing:
 - Number office – 200-300,000
 - Residences – 225
 - Retail - 60,000
- Sill concerns about the tunnels created by the buildings at the parkade entrance on the north end and at the NE area – discussed in workshop 3
- The proposed exit from the parkade -> Uxbridge may be safer because it sends cars right out of the site and not circulating around the plaza. Will the City agree to this? What happens at peak hours to traffic trying to get out and compete with existing traffic on Uxbridge? It would be helpful to see a simulation of this.
- Will be a lot of traffic on Uxbridge once all is built.
- How many underground parking stalls?
- How many aboveground parking spaces?
- There is inadequate surface parking.
- Extremely concerned about traffic at the end of Uxbridge. “Mixed Use” or not there will be more cars coming in and out of the site, and the right turn lane onto 16th will be gone, awkward entry/exit to gas station/Tim Horton’s remains. I anticipate having to use 24th to access community much of the time. Very unhappy about this.
- Major concern is traffic and access to and from 16th ave. How is the WHC protected?
- There will be access issues for delivery vehicles to the retail store, restaurants and hotels. There’s only one access point for most of them, off the roundabout. Some of those trucks can be quite big... trying to maneuver back and forward within the complex will be difficult to do safely, and will increase congestion,

because of the narrow nature of the construction – and with surface parking to negotiate to.

- Still not enough detail for my expectations, will have to wait now for the DP.
 - o Big need to do all the necessary diligence re: traffic now that we know the plans for Lot 1 and 7 replacement at Foothills Medical Centre Plus ~ 1854 cars in the Cancer Centre Project. That is massive when added to the parking required at SSC. We cannot look at your project in isolation.
 - o Not enough surface parking for quick trips could kill the businesses. My typical errand at SSC is 10mins or less, aside from visits to the restaurants.
 - o Circulation Slide #5 – use of alley between the church and the school is shown in the top right in orange as a local street and your bottom diagrams show the bike and pedestrians using this. I thought this area was restricted due to the concerns of the school and the church with car circulation being discouraged. Please clarify this. My conversation with City Transportation in Feb 2014 (meeting at the church) indicated that this section of road was an issue. Please don't send cars up there along with the bikes and pedestrians.
 - o Good illustrations of the MD
- Traffic is very scary! Bad enough now.
- This intersection is already so challenged!! The height of the buildings along the school playground is too high. It looks like a lot of glass, other than the one residence near the church.
- It will affect the restaurant/establishment that the already build in the area. The accessibility is the road and parking seem to be wrong.
- I'm happy to see the site is quite permeable – lots of street connecting, rather than a super dock cutting access through the site. To that point, make sure the connection by the parkade exit isn't narrow and dark. (Perhaps one wider path is better than 2 narrow ones.

Housing

- How would the proposed developments affect local housing market? Would any of the residential plans accommodate university students?
 - o Is the project funded privately or partly sponsored by the city of Calgary in either subsidies/loans/tax incentives?
 - o Great presentations by the way.
- Hope there are “high-class” residential units. Fear the impact of “student” residential or leases that will deter the current home owners from moving into or coming near the residential or business units.

Density

- There are too many buildings planned for this small space and not enough room for open spaces, and traffic to and from. It is too congested. The buildings are mostly quite tall and there will be a ton of people around! Traffic will be a problem getting in and out of the stadium, with only access via the roundabout. In winter, this will be cold and uninviting because tall buildings create shadows.... And cold -> ice conditions on paths (and that bridge over 16th). You need to look at the density issue you are creating. Too many people in too small a space.
- This massive development is shocking and frankly quite unbelievable considering land space. I whole-heartedly object. This project just keeps growing in scope. The height of the proposed buildings is totally unacceptable. It's a pity our city does NOT value green space.
- I feel the development is on average 2-3 floors too high perhaps (for the taller buildings) But overall, on the right direction.

Shadowing

- Still have concerns about shadowing on the central square and school playgrounds at times of the year/day other than those required by the city. At 9:45AM, November 13, 2014 there was a substantial shadow from the existing 1 story structure onto the playground.

