

## June 21, 2005 Open House - Summary of Public Feedback

---

Eighty-two people signed in at the event and had the opportunity to view display panels, talk to staff (City of Calgary Corporate Properties & Buildings, Calgary Transit and Transportation Planning and consultants from Westhoff Engineering Resources Inc., Bunt & Associates and IBI Group), and fill out comment sheets or posting notes on 'graffiti boards.'

The majority of questions/comments centered on traffic concerns, transit and the importance of protecting the environment and watershed. Comments also included suggestions for amenities neighbouring residents would like to see built into the business campus' design.

The event was held at Cardel Place from 3:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Responses from comment sheets, graffiti boards and comments from staff have been combined and categorized within questions posed on the comment sheets:

1. [Is the proposed land use mix appropriate?](#)
2. [Are there other uses / amenities that would benefit your community?](#)
3. [Do you have traffic impact concerns?](#)
4. [How far would you be willing to walk from your home to an LRT station?](#)
5. [What amenities could be added to the existing park system to enhance the area?](#)
6. [Are you concerned about the stormwater management concept or sustainable development principles?](#)

---

### 1. *In your opinion, is the proposed land use mix appropriate?*

- **Yes** – 4 responses
- **No** – 1 response

Other comments:

- Good balance for business expansion and takes preservation of natural land into consideration
- There should be more space for retail, commercial and accommodation
- I am happy that they are considering green space. Pathways are good too, to connect to places like Beddington, etc.
- We would like to see a larger percentage of land set aside as wetlands/environmental reserve. Is light industrial development at all appropriate so close to an environmentally sensitive area?
- It should be developed in small parcels and sold to little business owners rather than big bulk owners.
- I would like to see bylaws in place before construction that will dictate how the area is to be developed (architectural guidelines) as well as bylaws dictating how the area is to be maintained (to prevent future deterioration). To keep the area clean and prevent future non-desirable businesses from eventually moving in.
- The plan and theme of Aurora Business Park is exceptionally well thought out. Don't change a thing! Great job.
- Very interesting, well laid out and explained by personnel
- Uncertainty about what '12' land uses were despite the pictures showing various types of buildings. Prefer more complete written description of the types.

## June 21, 2005 Open House - Summary of Public Feedback

---

- Many people wondered what would happen on the Qualico lands along 96 Avenue and suggested there should be some attempt to integrate their activity with the Aurora BP.
- Most people seemed content with the plan and happy to see the proposed business campus versus typical I-2 (outside storage/warehousing).
- A soccer field and complex would be a better use for the lands.
- How about you just leave it alone.
- I look forward to the 96 Ave road work and glad to see development. It will be nice to walk over and have a coffee in the new area.

### [Back to Top](#)

#### **2. Are there other kinds of uses or amenities not already mentioned that you feel would benefit your community?**

- **Yes** – 1 response
- **No** – 2 responses

Other comments:

- Waterpark for kids
- Will walking of your dogs still be allowed in the new developed areas. Will they still be allowed off leash?
- It's about time for the city to start thinking of the residents who made this community many years before business. Please ensure that what the residents require is complete before development begins. We are tired of council members taking sides with business before residents – eg. Stoney Industrial.
- I was hoping to learn about investment opportunities in the park.
- I am looking forward to some sort of beautifying of 96 Ave. I find it currently doesn't look very nice.
- The BRT service up Centre Street to Silver city Theatres is excellent. I was wondering if it could begin earlier in the morning – say 5 a.m. instead of 6 a.m. There is no very early transit service out of Harvest Hills right now.
- BRT looks like a great idea – cheaper and more flexible than LRT – can use existing roads
- I like the BRT service in Centre St. N.
- I think Centre St. North at the bus traps should be re-opened and zoned differently with the homes on the street. Maybe do a buyout and have just the road. No homes on the block.
- Are they getting rid of the bus trap on Centre St by Beddington Trail?
- Currently very happy with the Bus Service in harvest Hills, esp: 301 and 109.
- I look forward to some development on 96 Ave in the future. Eg. Grass, trees, nice buildings because it's not very attractive right now.

### [Back to Top](#)

#### **3. Do you have any concerns related to traffic impact?**

- **Yes** – 3 responses
- **No** – 2 responses

## June 21, 2005 Open House - Summary of Public Feedback

---

### Other comments:

- Roadways should be complete prior to large traffic demands created by the business park.
- Country and Harvest Hills are established communities with Panorama still expanding. Traffic should be well distributed with Beddington, 96 Ave (make sure this connects to Deerfoot) and Country Hills Blvd.
- If there are already 3 traffic lights proposed on 96<sup>th</sup> for the business park – why not add one more at Harvest Hills Link to accommodate residents first. Put in sound barriers before construction rather than 30 years later.
- Build proper roads first to support number of tenants.
- Please have the roadways complete before allowing major tenants to move into the new business park. 96<sup>th</sup> and Airport Road, Beddington Trail and Country Hills interchanged needed badly.
- What kinds of implications will all this additional traffic have on the numerous children and other pedestrians in the area? Please ensure safe pedestrian access to the parks area (i.e. pedestrian overpass to cross 96<sup>th</sup> Ave.)
- Traffic is the resident's main concern!! Interchanges should be built to help flow.
- Would like to see 96<sup>th</sup> Ave extended to Deerfoot sooner.
- Get started on the 96<sup>th</sup> Ave NE connector road to Deerfoot as soon as possible. Priority #1.
- People were generally curious about the future LRT alignment and BRT routes.
- Some concern from citizens north of 96 Ave (in Harvest Hills) regarding potential for shortcutting and noise attenuation when 96 Ave is extended.
- Some concerns came up related to continued increase in traffic and noise to the regional road network. Buffering between the residential uses to the north and the Aurora Business Park was also mentioned.

[Back to Top](#)

#### **4. *What time do you feel would be a maximum time to walk to an LRT station from your home (multiple choice section with opportunity for comments)?***

**4-6 min** – 2 responses

**6-10 min** – 4 responses

**More than 10 min** – 2 responses

- The farther people have to walk in cold weather will decrease users due to inconvenience.
- Ideally less walk, but cost of LRT stations (and the time to add additional stops) means closer stations not practical.
- If there are connecting bus routes with main LRT station then being more than 10 minutes should be okay.
- Because weather conditions in the winter time.
- I think it would be unreasonable to be any closer. Where our house is now, I wouldn't want to be any closer than 10 minutes.
- I wouldn't want an LRT station with all the accompanying crowds/noise any closer to my home.

[Back to Top](#)

**5. What amenities could be added to the existing park system (i.e. washroom facilities, off-leash area, additional open space and pathways, etc.) that would enhance the area?**

- Washrooms – currently a good mix of paved and singletrack trails.
- Washrooms and off-leash areas would be great.
- A waterpark in the green space
- Ensure public access to these areas – pathway linking to existing residential areas and existing pathways.
- North end public access water park (lake). Like Sicome Lake in the South – the City needs this.
- Washroom facilities for kids who are riding their bikes. All of the above that you mentioned.
- We would want to see Nose Creek maintained as a wildlife corridor, and would prioritize minimal negative impact to any of the wildlife (flora and fauna), in the area as a result of this development.
- We think it's a shame that Qualico is intending to separate the wetlands/park area from 96<sup>th</sup> avenue with light industrial. Is there no way the city could purchase this land and preserve it as 'green space'?

[Back to Top](#)

**6. Do you have concerns or comments with respect to the stormwater management concept shown on the display panel or with respect to the sustainable development principles?**

- No
- More information should be displayed or better shown.
- Don't understand enough about it, so no comment.
- It would be great to see the wetlands managed in a fashion similar to those in Edgemont (to support a greater diversity of wildlife).
- Presenter noted having the following discussions:
  - regarding how porous pavement works and its effectiveness in the City of Calgary
  - The significance of integrating native plant species in the landscaping and BMP designs to reduce maintenance efforts and costs, to provide areas of treatment and detention, and to improve site aesthetics.
  - The function and explanation of bioswales
  - The incorporation of green roofs and the cost savings associated with them
  - Questions about where and if the BMP techniques are being applied in Calgary.
  - Really good ideas ... why are they not implemented yet?
  - What are the incentives for developments of individual parcels?
  - Where are the pictures taken from – location?

[Back to Top](#)