



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Project overview

The City of Calgary is in the process of creating a new Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) for Bridgeland-Riverside. The original Bridgeland-Riverside ARP was adopted by Council in 1980 and is out of date in terms of policy and direction. The new ARP will establish a vision for the area and guide future redevelopment. The Bridgeland-Riverside ARP will address future redevelopment types (e.g. residential, commercial), pedestrian and cycling connections, transportation and parking, open spaces, building heights and densities, and design.

Communications overview

A comprehensive communications plan was developed to inform the community about the project and all of our engagement opportunities. Ongoing tactics employed throughout the life of the project have included;

- Project specific website (calgary.ca/bridgeland) that shares information about the project. The website also shares notices about upcoming activities taking place in the community.

The following communications tactics were employed to promote participation in our various engagement opportunities;

- Facebook advertisement and Twitter campaigns
- Postcard mail outs to 2,109 surrounding area residents
- Advertisements in the community association newsletters
- Information was also shared to external email lists via the Councillor's Office and Community Association.
- Bold signs were installed sharing event details.

Engagement overview

The first phase of public engagement took place in November and December 2017 through an in-person open house and online survey. The feedback received in phase one was used by project team to draft character area statements, a vision for the area, and draft land use concept and specific policy statements. Based on this feedback, The City has put together the [Phase One: Bridgeland ARP What We Heard Report](#), which captures all of the feedback we collected between November and December of 2017.

The project team returned to the community in Spring and Summer 2018 for phase two of engagement which included sharing the draft land use concept, the character area statements, vision for the area and a draft version of the policy. Project Team was seeking input from the community to help confirm work in Phase One, this work provided insight into further policy development.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Phase 2 Engagement Event Summary

The breakdown of all engagement events held between April and July 2018.

Community Advisory Group Meetings (monthly)

- Monthly meeting where the group provides local area context and insight to The City in drafting of the ARP.
- Numerous Workshops with CAG and city staff on key topics

Public Open House (April 30, 2018)

- 105 visitors

Online Survey (May 1 – May 21, 2018)

- 33 contributors and 61 contributions

Public Open House (June 25, 2018)

- 151 visitors

Online survey (June 25 – July 10, 2018)

- 31 Contributors and 115 contributions

This What We Heard report summarizes input received at all engagement events held between April 30, 2018 and July 10, 2018, phase two of engagement. This document does not contain decision made on items heard and input received in these events but it does provide you with a summary and themes of all input received.

What we asked

Between April 30 and May 21, 2018, we asked citizens to answer the following questions:

1. Are there any other core ideas that should be included and why?
2. Do the character area descriptions accurately describe how you envision the character area in the future?
3. Do the Building Blocks accurately reflect your vision for the Bridgeland-Riverside? Why yes, why not?

Between June 25 and July 10, 2018, we asked stakeholder to provide their input into the following questions:

1. Is there anything missing from the vision that you think should be included and please tell us why?



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

2. Are the building blocks (see definitions) placed appropriately within all the areas of Bridgeland? Please tell us why yes, why not?
3. Do you have any concerns, and comments about the future connectivity in Bridgeland-Riverside as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?
4. Do you have any concerns, and comment with identified open spaces, pathways, and parks? Please tell us why?
5. The following areas (see map) have been identified as potential rowhouse/townhouse locations within The Bowl & The Escarpment. Do you have any comments and or concerns with location of these and why? Are there any other potential locations for rowhouse and townhouse? Please tell us why?
6. The following building blocks have been identified in these character areas (Main Street, The Couplet, Edmonton Trail Residential), do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why?
7. The following building blocks have been identified in these character areas (West Riverside, The Bridges, East Riverside), do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regards to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why?
8. Are the proposed active frontage locations acceptable for these areas? If not, why?

What we heard

April –May Engagement

The following summarizes input received at public engagement events between April and May 2018. Key themes heard for each question answered are provided. In this section, numbers next to Key Themes indicate the number of times a comment has been associated to that theme. To read verbatim comments please see the verbatim section in this document.

Question:

1. Are there any other core ideas that should be included and why?

Summary of Input

Suggestions such as Bridgeland to include mixed uses, and a mix of densities was present in some of the feedback provided. Various densities are supported; however, higher buildings need to be assessed with the community's sloped topography in mind to maintain views of downtown and access to sunlight. Providing a safe neighborhood for all who live, work and transit via Bridgeland that includes residents, visitors, cyclists, pedestrians and motorist was of



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

primary concern for many respondents under this question. Emphasis on safety and crime reduction is important to maintain a healthy and socially active community. Comments that Bridgeland should be accessible to all regardless of income, age and abilities was collected. This included providing a variety of housing types at various cost points to support people from younger families to older seniors. Respondents also noted that Bridgeland should be walkable by all those who live, play, visit and work in the area. Comments received include a desire for a diversity of businesses to provide local services and goods. Emphasis on keeping and improving parks and public facilities is of importance to all respondents. As well as a desire to preserve buildings of historic value.

Key Themes;

- High Density Neighborhood (1)
- Mixed Use Neighborhood (3)
- Safe Neighborhood (7)
- Low-Medium Density Neighborhood (2)
- Importance of keeping existing neighborhood character (2)
- Walkable Neighborhood (3)
- Improve Public Facilities (2)
- Adequate Parking (1)
- Preservation of Historic Buildings and Character (not limited to 1st Ave only) (4)
- Emphasis on Greenery (1)
- Larger Grocery Store (1)
- Active Neighborhood (2)
- No more High Needs Services (1)
- Plan should not be built around transit access. (1)

Question:

2. Do the character area descriptions accurately describe how you envision the character area in the future?

Summary of Input

Generally, the Character Areas and descriptions were supported as shown. The names of some of Character Areas should be reassessed. Comment in regard to Increased density near the LRT was heard. Feedback to support and better integrate the institutional housing and senior housing in the East Riverside was heard. The importance of parks and open spaces could be better represented.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Key Themes;

- Support institutional and Senior Housing (1)
- Density around LRT (1)
- Maintain Character (1)
- Concerns over Shadowing (1)
- Adjustments to Character area boundaries (Bowl) (2)
- History in West Riverside needs to be captured (1)
- Mainstreet Commercial should not extend past 9th St. NE (1)
- West Riverside should be low- medium density (1)
- West Riverside road network challenges (2)
- "Bridges" area should be improved (pathways, parks enhancements) (1)
- Opportunities for East Riverside development (1)

Question:

3. Do the Building Blocks accurately reflect your vision for the Bridgeland-Riverside? Why yes, why not?

Summary of Input

With limited road access and current mix of housing forms, densities in West Riverside should be decreased to Neighborhood –Low rise. Concerns of adding additional height on the north side of 1 Avenue NE with better transition needed to lower density areas in the north was heard. As well as caution for the height increased suggested in the Bridges area. Concerns included parking, enhancements to park and amenities, and shadowing. Opportunities for increased density in the East Riverside area were suggested. Comments relating to preserving the history of the neighborhood were also received.

Key Themes;

- Concerns of height in Areas North of 1st Ave NE (4)
- Concerns about High Density (1)
- Concerns over shadowing and transitions between densities (3)
- No mid-rise in East Riverside (1)
- Decreased height and density in West Riverside to Neighborhood Low Rise. (4)
- Maintain 4 storey buildings on Mainstreet (1)
- Leave "Bowl" as is, R2 (1)
- New park spaces (1)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Transportation and connection Challenges (1)
- Retain Character (2)

June – July Engagement

The following are key themes that have been developed with input received between June 25 and July 10, 2018 on online and in-person events. [For more in depth responses and to read verbatim comments please see the verbatim section in this document.](#)

Bridgeland-Riverside's Vision & Core Ideas:

A vibrant urban neighbourhood with rich history and character that can be seen in its buildings' architecture, street grid patterns, and spirited sense of place shaped through a diverse mix of residents. Its central location in Calgary provides direct access to the river pathways, parks, the LRT, and downtown. Nestled in the natural escarpment just north of the Bow River, the area has beautiful views and tree lined streets. As it evolves, the community will build on its great public amenities, strong multimodal transportation connections, housing diversity, and vibrant main streets. Bridgeland-Riverside will celebrate its heritage and continue providing a dynamic place for its diverse residents and visitors to live, work, visit and enjoy.

Bridgeland-Riverside is a vibrant, urban community that will continue to celebrate its heritage, and character as it evolves, providing lively places for both diverse residents and visitors to enjoy.

Bridgeland-Riverside is a distinct inner-city community and will:

1. provide a **diverse range of housing types** to increase overall density in appropriate locations;
2. **integrate new development** into the **evolving community character** with that continue to serve the community needs to accommodate all age groups;
3. **preserve local history and historical buildings**, and support development that complements historic development patterns and architectural features wherever possible.
4. encourage **transit-oriented development** through guided intensification of the land near the Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station;
5. **support a mix of compatible uses** including retail, office, residential, live work units, as well as amenities such as parks, green space, and public spaces;.
6. create **vibrant and safe public realm space**, along the Urban, Neighbourhood Main Street through buildings and public space design;
7. enhance existing local amenities and prioritize **safe pedestrian and cyclist connection** network;



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

8. provide a **range of multimodal transportation choices** to facilitate efficient movement of all modes of travel;
9. encourage transit and active modes as the preferred transportation option, **and strengthening the connections** to the Bridgeland Memorial LRT station; and
10. encourage **community cohesiveness** shaped by a high level of engagement, social programming, and a diverse mix of residents.

Question;

Is there anything missing from the vision that you think should be included and please tell us why?

Summary of Input

The importance and desire for the preservation of heritage and the existing community character was heard. The desire for smaller local retail options, as well as increase safety and enhances parks and public spaces were heard. The need to address affordable housing needs throughout the community was commented on numerous times.

Key Themes;

- Preservation of community Character (2)
- Needs to encourage small spaces/units (1)
- Diversity in Retail Opportunities (4)
- Parking Concern (1)
- Development Application Process (concern) (1)
- Affordable Housing Needs (8)
- Increased Green Space (1)
- Diversity in Housing Types (old and new architecture) (1)
- Acknowledge existing demographic, density and zoning (3)
- Public Safety (2)
- Other (8)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Land Use Concepts

Question;

**Are the “building blocks” (see definitions) placed appropriately within all the areas of Bridgeland?
Please tell us why yes, why not?**

Summary of Input

In general, there are concerns with buildings over 10 floors, including shadowing, traffic, and parking issues they create. Input indicate that taller buildings should be placed closer to the LRT and in the East Riverside and especially along Memorial Drive and in “low-lying” areas of Bridgeland so that it does not block the views of downtown and the of Bow River. Main Street should be a maximum of 4 storeys to avoid shadowing to the north. Feedback that supports laneway housing and back yard homes was heard, however concerns of height and shadowing including addition of townhomes into the Bowl was received. Pedestrian and cycle safety and improved connections were requested.

Also, there is specific feedback that indicates that low rise limited neighborhood boundary should be 6 street NE and not 6A street NE. Input stated that the continuation of residential (detached, attached, limited townhomes) in 'the Bowl' was desired to help “maintain the character of the neighborhood”. Overall feedback indicated low density residential designations remaining in the Bowl. Input indicated that three storey single family homes are too tall as they shade yards, decrease privacy and don't add density. There are also comments that indicate making west end of McDougall Rd “neighborhood low rise” and not allowing high rises/high density on west end of 4th Ave N.E.

In addition to above, there are questions around 3plex developments being permitted in the Neighborhood – limited area and suggestion that they should be limited or not allowed in the Bowl. Transition between community mid-rise and neighborhood limited at 11th Street and 1st Ave should be further explored and explained. In addition to above feedback, there is input that indicated that there is a mixed of opinions in regard to “Homes for Heroes” in SE corner of Bridgeland.

Key Themes

- Amenities (new, retail, etc.) (6)
- Neighborhood Cleanliness and Noise (2)
- Need Transition between areas (8)
- Keep density around C-Train (2)
- Special Business Requirements (1)
- Mix of Densities (need for) (7)
- Pedestrian Connections (3)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Parking and Traffic Concerns (6)
- High Density Challenges (14)
- Designation Specific Comment (area) (27)
- Other (11)

Mobility (Active Transportation)

The plan area is served by major road, transit, pedestrian, and cyclist connections. The policies in the ARP are intended to improve existing connections, and make walking, cycling, and transit use more desirable choice in the community. The future connectivity maps identify potential future connectivity and potential future mobility improvement within Bridgeland-Riverside.

Question;

Do you have any concerns, and comments about the future connectivity in Bridgeland-Riverside as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?

Summary of Input

In general, there are concerns with vehicles shortcutting and specifically on 10th street, 12th street, 1 Ave N.E to Edmonton, and the traffic that comes from Memorial Drive during rush hours is creating issues for residents. Comments received indicated that bike lane on 1st Ave is a challenge for many participants and feedback suggested that the plan does not address connectivity of bikeways to LRT, St. Patrick Island and pathway system by St. Georges Drive, Zoo Bridge and 12th St N.E. A concern over safety and vehicle collisions at the intersection at 4th and 6A street was stated which poses a risk for cyclists and pedestrians. In general stakeholders feel that priority should be placed on safe pedestrian and cycle travel, slowing down residential traffic and having more crosswalks. Traffic calming measures is another area of input received, especially on 1Ave East-West. McDougall and on 6th and 9th are identified as challenging areas for cycle, pedestrian and vehicular conflicts, turning radius, blind corners, unloading to access LRT are identified as issues.

In general, input calls for more public transit, safer pedestrian connections and bike lanes (specifically concerns at main intersections), and traffic speeding. There are concerns with vehicles 'shortcutting' and driving through the community and comments of traffic calming needed.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Key themes;

- Multimodal Connections (Opportunities) (13)
- Parking Concern (9)
- Road and Transportation Challenges (20)
- Connectivity (15)
- Crosswalk Maintenance and Safety (9)
- Traffic Calming Measures (4)
- Pedestrian and Bike Safety (8)
- Bikeway (concerns) (5)
- Other (8)

Open Space and Parks

The parks and open space map identifies existing and proposed parks, open spaces and pathways. The policies in the ARP are intended to maintain and enhance the quality amenities that serve the community's needs, for the benefit, use and enjoyment of residents of all ages.

Question;

Do you have any concerns, and comment with identified open spaces, pathways, and parks as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?

Summary of input

Comments for enhancements to current parks and opens spaces included the need for lighting, seating, more trees, park equipment, and better maintenance for all seasons. Concerns that new development will bring the need for new park space and amenities were heard. Safe pathway connections to community destinations, LRT, across Edmonton Trail and 4 Street NE, and regional parks were identified as needing improvements. Also, a desire for better connection between Bridgeland and St. Patrick's Island via the LRT station and a new bridge was heard. The importance of maintaining school sites' parks and open space as an amenity for the community was heard. Also, keeping Bridgeland school as historical site and adding other sites to a list of heritage sites is important for community and stakeholders that provided feedback.

Key Themes;

- Heritage Preservation (parks and public bldgs.) (5)
- Park Amenities (new) (11)
- Bike Traffic Lights (add) (1)
- Additional Park Space (4)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Access and Pedestrian Connections (new) (9)
- Improve Park Maintenance (3)
- Dog Park (new) (1)
- Other (2)

The Bowl & The Escarpment

The Bowl: The area has a distinct street pattern of tree-lined blocks with back lanes, offering primarily low-density residential housing, and a combination of historic and infill houses. With a focus on maintaining the historical character, the area will continue to accommodate lower-density residential options as new development is integrated into the existing street pattern.

The Escarpment: Describes the residential area extending up the bluff. The Escarpment has steep topography, with a number of pedestrians and cycle pathways and connections winding up and to adjacent communities. The Escarpment supports slope-adaptive low-density residential housing alongside infill housing.

Question;

The following areas (see map) have been identified as potential rowhouse/townhouse locations within The Bowl & The Escarpment. Do you have any comments and or concerns with location of these and why?

Summary of input

Comments were received with concerns that the addition of rowhouses/townhouses will result in character loss, shadowing and loss of sunlight, will impact privacy, increased traffic and parking issues. Specifically, concerns that too much rowhouses/townhouses will make it a less family oriented community and especially on 4 Ave and 2 Ave N.E as these streets and alleys are very tight and adding new developments will just add to problems with traffic, parking and crowding etc. On the other hand, there is feedback indicating that the addition of rowhouses will add more diversity in housing and population in Bridgeland. In addition, there are comments indicating that rowhouses are a better option than having “giant single family infills”.

Key Themes;

- Character Loss (6)
- Rowhouses (challenge) (14)
- Rowhouses (opportunity) (5)
- Traffic and Parking Challenges (12)
- New Greenspace and Energy Sources (2)
- Amenities (new) (1)
- Zoning (area specific) (5)
- Improve Escarpment Connections (3)
- There is no Heritage Protection (1)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Community Interface (challenges) (2)
- R1R2 designation (stay in place) (1)
- Limit block size (townhouse) (1)
- Other (4)

Question;

Are there any other potential locations for rowhouse and townhouse? Please tell us why?

In general, this question received very little feedback. Those who support the rowhouses seem to think that areas around parks, areas near “edges” of community and 2nd and 4th Ave are great places for rowhouses. Those who oppose the rowhouse and townhouses believe that Bridgeland does not need rowhouses and townhouses as Bridgeland is an established community.

Key Themes;

Loss of Sunlight and Yards; shading effect of rowhouse, townhouse on adjacent property is a main concern for people and loss of existing character. (1)
In support of rowhouse; around park areas, edges of boundary, 2 nd and 4 th Ave a great candidate for laneway housing. (5)
No benefit to Community; this is an established community already, no need for rowhouse and townhouse (3)

Main Street, The Couplet, & Edmonton Trail Residential

Main Street: A commercial and social focal point of the community, the area is designated as a Neighbourhood Main Street. Mid-rise development along the Main Street offers a wide range of uses including retail, services, office, institutional, and residential. Public realm improvements will enhance the street to support commercial vitality, greater variety of employment opportunities, transit use, and provide goods and services to local residents.

The Couplet: The western gateway into the community, ‘The Couplet’ offers mixed-use, mid-rise buildings to accommodate a range of retail, services, offices and residential uses. Edmonton Trail and 4 Street NE provide multimodal connections north-south to and through Bridgeland, while a walkable pedestrian environment ensures safe and vibrant street activity.

Edmonton Trail Residential: The area is characterized by multi-residential, small scale commercial buildings and institutional uses. It is expected the area will intensify and increase in density over time, offering unique slope adaptive designed redevelopment.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Question;

The following building blocks have been identified in these character areas (Main Street, The Couplet, Edmonton Trail Residential), do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why?

Summary of input

Majority of the comments received in this section had to do with pedestrian safety and reducing crime in the area. Improving safety in the area was also linked with attracting future businesses to the area. Slowing down traffic, and having pedestrian friendly sidewalks was another area for improvement noted by all participants.

Feedback stated that Mainstreet is generally appropriate for Neighbourhood Low-Rise with maximum heights of 4 storeys in order to minimize shadowing impact to the north. Having 6 stories on main street was said to be too tall. Adding density in/on Edmonton Trail will make traffic through the area much worse. Also, concerns about transition areas between the community Character areas and how that will play out is important and needs to be looked at in the future.

Key Themes;

- Pedestrian Safety (8)
- Increase Density (height) (2)
- Decrease Density (height) (4)
- Traffic Concern (3)
- Building and Street Design (4)
- Consistent Zoning (Area) (1)
- Public Art Opportunities (1)
- Open Space and Parks to accommodate density (1)
- More Commercial development (1)
- Parking issue (1)
- Main Street (end at 10th) (1)
- Transition Areas (concern) (3)
- Other (4)

West Riverside, The Bridges, & East Riverside

West Riverside: The area offers a mix of residential options - unique character homes, low-rise multi-residential, as well as new infill development and higher density development closer to the Bridges and



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

the LRT. It provides safe local connections for pedestrian, cyclists and vehicles across the south-west side of the community.

The Bridges: One of the key gateways for residents and visitors, 'The Bridges' contains multi-residential developments with main level commercial along key streets and well-connected park amenities. Close to the LRT station, it will accommodate higher density, pedestrian-friendly commercial and transit-supported mixed-use development.

East Riverside: The majority of East Riverside is residential, assisted living and health care institutional-related uses. As the area redevelops a mix of multi-residential options will bring new residents to the area expanding the demographic profile. Mixed-use commercial will be located along key streets and improved connections will allow safe access to amenities. The area closest to the LRT station will accommodate higher density development.

Question;

The following building blocks have been identified in these character areas (West Riverside, The Bridges, East Riverside), do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regards to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why?

Summary of input

In East Riverside comments included a need for additional diversity in residential and mixed use options. Higher heights are supported near LRT and memorial, however a need for better integration of seniors and institutional uses currently existing was heard.

West Riverside comments supported the updated Neighborhood Low-Rise Building block changed from Mid-Rise. Concern for the heritage character sites was heard.

In all the areas, general concerns for development over 6 storeys and 10 storeys include parking, traffic, and shadows (on residential areas and parks).

Key Themes;

- Height Concern (shadow) (4)
- Traffic and Parking Concern (4)
- Request for More Information (2)
- Housing Diversity (more) (5)
- Safety Concern (1)
- Height in specific area (input) (5)
- New Retail Plan (1)
- Amenities (new) (1)
- Concerns with Institutional Housing (3)
- Interim Uses (availability) (4)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Bridges (no density/height) (2)
- West Riverside (support mid-rise) (2)
- East Riverside (support mid-rise) (1)
- Increase Height near Memorial (1)
- Appropriate Transition (1)
- Other (3)

Active Frontages

Active frontages help activate the street and provide interaction between pedestrians and building uses. Building frontages located along streets where an active frontage is identified should be designed to generate activity, provide natural surveillance, and create an interesting and comfortable environment for pedestrians.

Retail-Required Frontages: Provide active uses at grade, including but not limited to retail, personal services, consumer services, supermarkets and restaurants, and community service uses, including child care.

Retail-Ready Frontages: Ground-floor units should be designed to accommodate both residential and retail uses and will allow residential to retail conversion over time.

Question;

Are the proposed active frontage locations acceptable for these areas? If not, why?

Summary of input

Generally, areas shown were acceptable as active frontage locations. Concerns of increased pressure on parking with additional commercial uses, and the need for enhanced intersection safety for increased traffic and pedestrians on Edmonton Trail and 4 Street NE were heard.

Key Themes;

- Crosswalk Safety (2)
- Mandate Scale of Commercial Space (3)
- Area Specific Feedback- Frontages (McDougall, 9th ave, 1st ave, Edmonton Trail to 7th Ave and along 12th street) (7)
- Parking Challenges (1)
- Not in Support (2)
- Other (3)



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Next Steps

Feedback collected during the in-person and online engagement in phase one and two will be considered as the City project team works to adjust the draft Area Redevelopment Plan and conducting technical review of the policy. We will be returning to the community to share the final policy draft in Fall 2018-Winter 2019 (date to be determined upon completion of policy update).



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Verbatim Comments, Bridgeland ARP

April 30th Open House

Comments on 'Character Areas' & 'Building Blocks'

The Bridges

- Love the bridges now. Worry about it getting too high rise. Like commercial additions
- Bridges and the escarpment area needs to be cleaned up, and not cause for it being a magnet for encampments addressed
- Riverside flooded in 2013. How is that being balanced with heavy higher density investment?
- We need to plan flood smart
- Ironically is able to use higher buildings near river, as they are not too close, and won't over shadow low rise housing, as that is going up hills
- Highly support more retail/security along corridor to C-train station
- I APPROVE HIGH DENSITY, LOTS COMMERCIAL (retail, restaurants etc.) in Bridgeland areas
- One side with your building block plan. Make good use of the transit infrastructure and bring more residents and businesses to the area
- The bridges uniform – height to level/roof lines. Create unique feel for the community
- Be careful how you plan to build in this rock bedded ground area. When it rains water collects under surface and flood happens
- Community High Density – 10 storeys. Plan as shown reflects a mis-guided plan to eliminate parking. Sub-surface water flow will preclude anything more than 2 floors of parking!
- Please be cautious with building in an area that is among to flood-cautious with density
- More retail development towards C-train station. To do that supports, safety for those using transit while encouraging less vehicle traffic

East Riverside

- Homes for Heroes. Too close to daycare use
- I support homes for Heroes. Better than people living on the street.
- Riverside is okay with 6 to 8 stories in the hill side
- No to homes for Heroes. Homes for Heroes is not a fit
- Follow the agreed- upon East Riverside master plan.
- Ironically is able to use higher buildings near river, as they are not too close, and won't over shadow low rise housing, as that is going up hills
- Access to Riverside is difficult – bounded on north by escarpment and South by Memorial.
- High density in this area sets up for poor outcomes
- Density must be smart
- Really dislike idea of more than 8-10 stories along the river and elsewhere in 'Riverside' and on 9th street



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- East Employment – intensive triangle. This should not be employment.
- Christine Meakin School. Could be better used. Site should be use a different building block. Should be residential uses
- Senior housing with related businesses for their needs- doctor, grocery etc.
- East riverside can accommodate. 10+ storey. Multi access
- East Riverside: The proposed high-rise buildings will further isolate seniors
- Work towards incorporate shops, restaurants, amenities that seniors can walk to!
- Density in East River side
- In alignment with East Riverside master plan
- Concerned that 10 story + along river will create further divide from river
- Improve community entrance aesthetic (mainly 12 street)
- Get rid of stop clustering social assistance and elderly care facilities in East Riverside
- Extend dog path down to 12 street NE (using closed school ground)
- Your map coloring shows high density in the area north of memorial where there is poor ingress/ egress
- Community High Density – 10 storeys
- Plan as shown reflects a mis-guided plan to eliminate parking. Sub-surface water flow will preclude anything more than 2 floors of parking!
- Please be cautious with building in an area that is among to flood-cautious with density
- A successful Riverside must integrate low-income housing. We are placing too much L.I in Riverside
- Yes, but developers seem to be bypassing the existing apartments
- More retail development towards C-train station. To do that supports, safety for those using transit while encouraging less vehicle traffic
- Homes for Heroes. Great idea but not in East Riverside
- There is nothing in this ARP that should override Homes for Heroes!
- Yes (Heroes)
- High density in strategic areas only that don't encroach on existing small town residential feel! (which is why alternate homes for heroes venue required)
- Why would they possibly put the homes for heroes in the corner by the freeway where the map shows high-rises are supposed to go?
- Keep densification close to Memorial Drive
- Less four story buildings
- Abide by approved East Riverside Master Plan
- East of Community Centre- too high

West Riverside

- 6 Storey okay in West Riverside
- West Riverside, difficult to accommodate. The added intensity due to traffic issues
- West Riverside should be kept as "Mid Rise" to not compromise views of the skyline.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Not 10+ stories. Maximum 10 stories
- Really dislike idea of more than 8-10 stories along the river and elsewhere in 'Riverside' and on 9th street
- Be careful how you plan to build in this rock bedded ground area. When it rains water collects under surface and flood happens.
- High density with mixed use commercial would be unsuccessful in West Riverside.
- It is seriously traffic- Due to geographic issues escarpment and memorial constrained and would negatively impact business success
- Concerned that 10 story + along river will create further divide from river
- Your map coloring shows high density in the area north of memorial where there is poor ingress/ egress
- Community High Density – 10 storeys. Plan as shown reflects a mis-guided plan to eliminate parking. Sub-surface water flow will preclude anything more than 2 floors of parking!
- Please be cautious with building in an area that is among to flood-cautious with density
- A successful Riverside must integrate low-income housing. We are placing too much L.I in Riverside
- Yes, but developers seem to be bypassing the existing apartments
- As a home-owner on McPherson Road, getting squeezed out by high-density housing. Will be forced to sell or be the last house standing.
- Keep densification close to Memorial Drive
- Less four story buildings
- High density in South-West would cause traffic concerns.
- McDougall can't handle all of that

Main Street

- Density on first Ave need to remain upward only 4 stories.
- Main street concept should extend west right to 4th street NE
- OK – as discussed in previous main street forum.
- Ironically is able to use higher buildings near river, as they are not too close, and won't over shadow low rise housing, as that is going up hills
- Keep buildings on North side of 1 Ave to 3 stories to allow sun light on 1st Ave. If walking pedestrian area then you need light
- Work/living opportunities near main street
- Too many high rise apartment's limit high density 1st Ave to 3 levels escarpment to 2 level max.
- Limit high density design to ½ current

Edmonton Trail Residential

- Area around Edmonton Trail could be high density if appropriate amenities come with it!
- Paved off of main road



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Too many high rise apartment's limit high density 1st Ave to 3 levels escarpment to 2 level max.
- Limit high density design to ½ current
- Mid Rise. No more than 4 storey. Due to traffic access
- Community Mid-Rise height seems to fluctuate
- 6 stories seems high

The Couplet

- Gentrify
- Corner Mall Macs, Liquor store clean up-safer more lights
- Can these area of "Couple" & "Bowl" have better names? The name may need to connect to the history of the area
- Couplet- might not make sense at North end where land use is all residential
- Yes. But the "Couplet" term is weird
- 2nd Ave NE of Edmonton Trail needs to be 6 story may not 10 because of school, church existing
- Community – High density on West side of South border (6 street-7Ave) too tall. Four storey more appropriate
- Too many high rise apartment's limit high density 1st Ave to 3 levels escarpment to 2 level max.
- Limit high density design to ½ current
- Mid Rise. No more than 4 storey. Due to traffic access
- Community Mid-Rise height seems to fluctuate
- 6 stories seems high

The Bowl

- "Bowl" is there a better name for this?
- Please stay true to the 'Bowl' being low density.
- No multiplexes
- Agree!
- RC-2, Zoning for the "Bowl" would be good for garage suites to preserve the character homes.
- Development should increase density, but preserve heritage.
- Keep developments focused on preservation of character in Bridgeland
- Row houses should be on a street-not an avenue- and be made up of multiple lots
- Neighborhood limited
- More difference between single 3 townhouses
- NE Private School site should not cut off park behind
- More green space in bowl
- Keep neighborhood limited as is
- No higher in Bowl
- No. Row houses do not belong in the limited neighborhood area and 3 stories blocks the light from people's garden



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

The Escarpment

- Row houses should be on a street-not an avenue- and be made up of multiple lots
- No. Row houses do not belong in the limited neighborhood area and 3 stories blocks the light from people's garden

Comments on 'Core Ideas'

Land Use & Built Form

- Other transit besides LRT! Need buses to serve low and medium density parts of community!
- Much more Senior friendly
- Mainstream grocery store
- We need to position low income housing for success. How will this design support success?
- More commercial services shopping for Seniors
- Why these names? Can we change these names?
- Centre Ave NE, for anything South and Centre Ave NE called "The Riverside"
- North of Centre Ave NE called "Bridgeland". **1910(?)**- settlements
- Grocery store needed
- Safety comes from knowing your neighbours. Beyond 4 stories seriously negatively impacts social connections
- Support offices/medical uses/pubs back in Bridgeland more variety
- Support local restaurant. Agree with supporting this idea
- Diversity of businesses, so not one type of use. (i.e. not all 7 restaurants next to each other)
- Local commercials use that are supportive and complimentary uses. (i.e. drug use clinic next to school)
- More medical (e.g.: labs) to help bring in more retail traffic
- Mixed use development. e.g. child care spaces increase access
- Too many yuppies here already, taking over the community association and blowing up the hospital.
- Make sure new development incorporate a sufficient percentage of low income housing so as to prevent gentrification.
- Ensure appropriate in neighborhood school and daycare spaces for future
- Main stream grocery store
- Densification but not too many high rises
- Keep building heights 'human scale', not like another East Village Bridges ideal!
- Maintain affordability – not all 1 million infills. Mixed income community is great!
- Density done right
- Not low income housing
- Success of mixed income family.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Be careful how you plan to build in this rock bedded ground area. When it rains water collects under surface and flood happens
- The land use “Community Centre” is confusing. Feels like it is Community Centre location
- Love seeing main floor commercial yes! Yay!
- Basically good
- Agree with density & done right
- LOVE EVERYTHING DENSITY!
- I am concerned by high density impacting the view 10+ stories is too high!
- NEIGHBOURHOOD + COMMUNITY MIDRISE < 4 STOREYS
- Neighborhood –limited –many of the new 3 storeys have raised basement (a lot above ground level) giving appearance of 4 storey (i.e. walkout)
- Flooding in the area, concern is with the development in the/on the rock terrain/impacts of water saturated
- Bridgeland such site should be bought by City.
- Adapt beautiful old building for offices and rest as parkland
- Revisit LAND use to limit high density
- Community High Density – 10 storeys
- Plan as shown reflects a misguided plan to eliminate parking. Sub-surface water flow will preclude anything more than 2 floors of parking!
- Please be cautious with building in an area that is among to flood-cautious with density

Mobility

- Fix bike path that stops on Edmonton trail hill. It should be continuous not just stop. Poor planning
- Other transit besides LRT! Need buses to serve low and medium density parts of community
- One way traffic on 1st
- Provide safe pedestrian crossing along 1 Ave NE
- Need to ensure that new development comes with adequate parking
- With LRT interruptions and shuttles along 9th street, why aren't there more benches for transit riders? Instead, they sit on the steps or planters on the condo complex like forgotten migrants. Why? Calgary transit? Why?
- Traffic calm measures for 1 Ave NE
- Need better street lighting in West Riverside (McDougall and McPherson roads) (Safety issue)
- Residential mixed housing needs to go beyond 2 bedroom Condo, 3+ to accommodate family living, more bike parking, less vehicle parking
- A frequent transportation options (bus), more often
- Bus services should be improved in the area (transit)
- Disabled friendly, mobility friendly area, has to be
- Transportation friendly(bus)
- Yes! Biking and pedestrian safety and infrastructure



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Extended hours for transportation
- There needs to be focus on pedestrian safety
- To turn Campbell Hill and across 1st Avenue
- Bike! Bike! Bike!
- More parking, angle parking
- Flyover project
- Since the school on 12 street is closed and there is no playground there, the 30 KM speed limit should be shortened
- 12 street and McDougall intersection needs to be a 4 way STOP.
- Going East Ave have to put your nose into traffic to see if your nose will be in the traffic
- McDougall needs re-paving, each year the pot holes get bigger
- Traffic calming needed
- Up 12th and 9th off memorial
- Cut through XZ
- Riverside is still using light/electric poles. How is that factoring into plans for high density?
- Riverside already deals with heavier social disorder
- How does this plan ensure success for all residents?
- High density, not more than 6 storeys
- Edmonton Trail North of 2nd Ave needs wider sidewalk.
- Protection for pedestrians
- Further North cars parked protection
- Could be off into residential
- More pedestrian access to the river (pedestrian overpasses) between Edmonton Trail 9th Ave please
- Path from Edmonton Trail NE just North of 4 Ave NE

Open Space & Parks

- Trees are currently being removed by new developments. We need Urban Canopy
- Support for green spaces and trees
- Improve access (pedestrian) to Tom Campbell's hill + mitigate high speed car traffic up the hill, not safe
- Pedestrian walking/leisure circle routes. Connecting green spaces
- Bridgeland school site private property
- NE Private School site should not cut off park behind
- More green space in bowl
- Hill up to dog park
- Concern for traffic here
- Bridgeland- School site is a private site, not parts space
- More access to small park East of Community Centre



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- If you want people to enjoy the outdoors provide recycle containers and definitely seat to meet your local friends

Online Verbatim May 1st – May 22

Question;

1. Are there any other core ideas that should be included and why?

Verbatim;

- I love this vision for my neighborhood. Definitely agree with high density housing, good transit and mixed use. Walking friendly spaces is important to me as well.
- Safety and crime reduction.
- Re-develop edmonton trail ne and 4th street ne. Currently there is also a pedestrian walk way that is extremely hazardous to people walking the street. i've notified the city of calgary to add street lights.
- The community has a significant amount of character that can be literally overshadowed by new development, which would also render the new street-scaping irrelevant. Allowing building over 3-4 storeys high should not be allowed in further master planning.
- Crime is a concern in the area and any crime reduction plans MUST be anti-carceral/policing with a focus on poverty reduction, education and rehabilitation.
- Concept maybe buried here within politically correct lingo...however all this planning needs to keep in mind mitigating crime, drug use, socially inappropriate behaviours due to proximity to downtown, transit, and shelters (eg, DI). These are realities.
- Protecting distinct single family areas. Improve public facilities such as pools, schools and other recreational facilities.
- Community cohesiveness requires real interaction. This is dramatically reduced when buildings extend beyond 4-4 stories and folks fail to connect on the ground. We must focus on low-medium density throughout Bridgeland. 4stories max.
- Parking is still needed. Residents may choose public transport but still need space to leave their cars. Please don't allow high density building without parking. Parking is also needed as a destination area for restaurants and the market.
- Fix the Westbrook LRT station please. Its an eyesore and full of homeless drunks. Unsafe to use. Please dont spend money on anything else till this is fixed.
- Preservation of historic buildings should not be limited to 1st Ave. Emphasis on trees, gardens or greenescapes would be a really nice and appreciated addition
- It would be beneficial for community to keep the historical character of being bridgeland. The design of buildings proposed in this area



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Do not build the plan prioritized too heavily on transit access. People do not necessarily conform to the City's ideal resident, rather, families and people of means do not find transit practical. Moderate the design and thinking to acknowledge this.
- Large grocery store maybe away from the busy memorial drive ... maybe persuade no frills
- I live in Bridgeland and I'm not against new development, but can you at least keep it in the same style as the old neighborhood so we don't lose our heritage identity? These new condos going up look like old communist apartment blocks.
- this seems really long pretty generic to me
- year-round activities;
- seems good. But concerned about the HOW? in terms of achieving this? When does the public improvement \$\$ come from is the density was already given away during mainstreets
- Stop adding to the high needs / socially dependent population in the community. We need market buyer homes. Over 20% of the Bridgeland Riverside population is dependant /low income which is hard on commercial & unbalances the "complete community" mandate
- the community has indicated that the intention of this plan is to double the population within the community. it the primary goal of the plan to increase the population
- I look around and am proud that my neighbourhood serves the city. the women's emergency shelter, the children's cottage, the immigration centre, low income housing. my neighbourhood cares and shares..that is another characteristic not mentioned.
- Support more retail and restaurant options and use designations that is lacking
- Yes, under "diverse range of housing types": add something about range of income. Housing for people with low or no income is important.
- Yes I would love to see exercise parks that have the cool new funky exercise machines that you can walk up to and use for free there is some exercise parks in the Northwest by Sait and the North Hill shopping center they are excellent
- We have a lot of housing for seniors in the community. We should be looking for ways to incorporate and welcome them to the active ways of our neighbourhood and not create and seniors zone where they are isolated. No more seniors housing until sorted out.
- Actually I live closely and increasing density is not what I signed up for when I bought my home. While a lot of the restaurants and quirky stores are great for this area putting in a large grocery store is insane as it will only increase traffic.
- Enforcement - lots of infrastructure for cyclists but they keep riding on the sidewalks which is dangerous.
- Focus on residents of the neighbourhood first to maintain quality of life rather than adding to congestion, pollution, etc by encouraging excessive growth

Question;

1. Do the character area descriptions accurately describe how you envision the character area in the future?



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Verbatim;

- West Riverside has a mix of low-high income and special challenges around social disruption which require greater emphasis on personal connection and knowing your neighbours. This is best facilitated through low-med (3-4 storey) density
- West Riverside has very difficult and limited points of vehicular road access, concentrating all traffic along one corridor. A better roadway plan must be developed if an increase of density is contemplated
- Yes
- for the most part yes. provide better connectin street with attractions/interests/businesses to link the station with the main street, linking to 4th street/edmonton trail and form a ring of main street in the community.
- yes
- Yes, however "the bridges" area needs to include more about the park, community centre and nearby field. How should that area be improved? Walking paths and ability to play sports, improvements to the green areas too?
- Would like to see an opportunity for temporary developments like Homes For Heroes Veterans Village on the CNIB lands while the community undergoes transition
- Yes
- I like these. I think you've identified the right areas to focus densification. I'm okay with somewhat increased densification throughout, the areas near the LRT should have the highest density. That area is a great place for highrises.
- Yes
- East Riverside provides an unprecedented opportunity for the City and Community. A small number of landowners, coupled with large parcels of underutilized land all within close proximity to transit offers a significant opportunity.

Question;

2. Do the Building Blocks accurately reflect your vision for the Bridgeland-Riverside? Why yes, why not?

Verbatim;

- Neighborhood and areas on the north side of 1st Ave NE should not have buildings taller than 3 storeys. This development will overshadow any improvements, and not be in character with the suburb particularly in neighborhood areas of 9 St - 10St.
- how are existing uses transitioned out to make way for what is being proposed? high density not preferred



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Up to 6 stories is too high on 1st Ave - should be 4 storey max unless they have sufficient depth to step back - shadowing of the bowl is not good. 10 plus along memorial drive - how will this avoid shadowing the whole community to the north?
- Do not agree with the neighbourhood midrise sections in the east riverside section of the map - alongside the purple and the community high density -
- West Riverside along Sth side McDougall should be changed from High Density (10+ storeys) to Neighbourhood Low Rise. The rest of this area is 3-4 storeys (other than Bridgeland place highrise, and that has not been successful) . Why change it?
- 6 story buildings along the current main street will diminish sun and friendliness of streetscape. Should be capped at 4 stories except south of 1 ave we're density makes sense
- Highdensity designation for West Riverside is inappropriate. It dwarfs many recent multifamily builds in area&creates overshadowed neighbourhood with fewer opportunities to connect. Isolated towers. Setting up poorer social outcomes 4 low-income residents
- West Riverside does not have the roadways to support the density proposed here, and this would decimate the existing single family homes (including the few historic ones). Please don't destroy this section of the neighborhood with high density
- do not support high density in west riverside. this will ruin the historic Riverside!
- sort of. Why is the bowl getting densified? We already did a zoning in this section in first block north of 1 av to accommodate townhouse. Why spread it further north? LEAVE IT R2
- Yes
- Makes sense but again why are the park / green areas not mentioned here? Although this is not a living space or "building" I think it is very important to think about how the park spaces need to be developed, maintained, improved and maybe even expanded.
- How is the transportation network being upgraded to accommodate the large increase in populations along Memorial Drive. There is a number of dead ending streets with no direct access to Memorial
- Yes
- Yes, I like this.
- The limited area needs to do more to preserve the original single family homes by reducing the number that are turn down and replaced by infills
- My concerns will be with all of this new development the bridgeland area will lose its charm. I would like to see a lot of the older buildings kept. This is why I moved to this area, we don't need another Marda Loop here.
- Please no more than 3 stories along the north side of 1st ave. 6 is too big of a jump from the homes directly to the north. South of 1st is better suited for higher density.
- The above building blocks appear to be in alignment with the East Riverside Master Plan that was collectively developed with the City, the community and the East Riverside Landowners in 2016/2017.
- 6 stories for 1st ave seems too high. Wou'd prefer 3-4 story max.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Verbatim June 25th Open House (post-it notes)

Question:

- 1. Is there anything missing from the vision that you think should be included and please tell us why?**

Verbatim:

- the advisory group are not happy with the decisions
- tax grab
- as a member of CAG I feel that a lot of important info we have provided has been ignored.
- no more character
- concern parking, affordable housing and development applications
- how can we encourage small spaces, not just chain stores. Small units, more store fronts per block.
- provide diverse range of commercial spaces also small frontages small CRU's
- Christine Meikle school needs 10 million just to be safe to occupy. Who would pay for this?
- Christine Meikle school as a historic part of the Bridgeland
- LIKE! Core ideas but how does design reflect these ideas?

Question:

- 2. Are the “building blocks” (see definitions placed appropriately within all the areas of the Bridgeland? Please tell us why yes, why not?**

Verbatim:

- clean up all the homeless, makes neighborhood look junkie
- mainstream affordable grocery store
- I like that height is stepped as areas meet
- keep west riverside as 3-4 stories as it is now, will keep with the look and feel of the neighborhood. High density should be around c-train station.
- no more high rises/high density housing on west end of 4th ave N.E. (i.e. 4th ave and 5th street). Traffic is already very heavy in this area.
- limited and low rise boundary should be 6th street @ center ave not 6A
- is there attention being paid to which businesses are allowed?
- overall the plan looks great
- love the vision. We need to ensure its walkable.bikable. Otherwise well have years of parking issues & traffic safety problems.
- more specialty retail desired x2



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- I agree! To many dental and optical shops-more stores like Steeling Home or some like in Inglewood!! Cheaper rent here still!!)
- I would like retail to be specialty, artisama, higher end. No restaurant chains.
- appropriate to have a mix of densities - it's a highly urban area, and, will be building for 100 years.
- as density increases flow ill conn. Cohesiveness be maintained/improved. We need "density done right"
- more consideration from truck delivery drivers. Esp when ther is comes to idling and enivne noise. Obey the noise bylaws not before 7 am.
- on Edgrove ave allow/encourage backyard suites as the lots are dual frontage
- no high rises in bridgeland 8-10 floor max. keep the high rises in the east village.
- gald that health care is going to be provided on AHS site
- encoruage densification through secondary suites and laneway houses in the bowl
- 11 A S.t park keep escarpment as public space.
- would it not be better to establish some parameters for the curent delta west property?
- When old Christaiin Meekle school is developed reflect name in area too much history lost.
- I am ok with more density but some long tem paring solution is needed
- 3 storey single family homes are too tall. They shade yards, decrease privacy and don't add density.
- you have not shanged much of anything ove the past meetings
- Mcdougall major east/west connectivity 9th st engage it do draw people to density
- connectivity of silvera municipal reserve how is this coonected to parks and ped ways?
- pedestrian connetions bowwalley home to LRT to esast frop off LRT
- Too much high density ruins the calmness of the neighbourhood, especially since the neighbourhood provides so many social needs (women's shelter, Chisholm low income housing, CNIB). I like that you have designated high density areas and won't make all of Bridgeland high density
- Great for West Riverside! Thanks for listening
- Concerned about increases in height in the bridges
- 3-4 in West Riverside is a good change
- Why have employment intensive on the Tom Campbell park? Dumb. Should be homes
- Community high density in this corner by the overpass makes the most sense
- Mainstreet tops at 6 storey for neighbourhood. Friendly look
- Speed bumps on Edm Tr to up safety for pedestrians / bikers, also lower noise
- Should have a maximum height of 10 storeys
- I like this plan for building heights. Tallest buildings are in spots that make sense
- 10 storeys will cast too much shade
- 10 storey max commercial at street level good



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- 10 stories too high! Casts ++ shadows. High vacancy rates already downtown and East Village. Even 4-6 stories casts large shadows

Question:

3. Do you have any concerns, and comments about the future connectivity in Bridgeland-Riverside as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?

Verbatim;

- 10 st N.E; one way desired, shortcutting issues
- more transit cycling, walking, less cars
- McDougall; activity between 12St to 9 st N.E. veh, transit,wider
- like the existing pedestrian pathway system!
- love the pedestrian brdige from Bridgeland to the Island @c-train
- more connectivity to St.Patricks island + greenspace
- regional pathway along memorial from LRT
- Bow Valley Lane; - pedestrian connection to east, - drop off
- pedestrian overpass to St. Patricks Island good!
- wooden steps W of McDougall better; mainstreet lightning
- 8st N.E. one way; remove make better connectivity
- too many trucks on 7A street ; open two way on 8A st.
- escarpment path (ped) north side of community
- cycling on 1 Ave not 2nd Ave
- pedestrian connection; woonerf?? East side (master plan)
- bike connection between LRT to 10 st N.E.
- there is a multi-dwelling on 6A st. N.E; not enough parking for tenants
- shortcutting memorial to 12st=) 1 Ave N.E. to Edmonton tr
- angle parking but mobility (bikes + vehs) more important
- more bikeway to 2nd Ave
- lighted crosswalk @Meredith +4st to promote safety
- nominal increase in on street parking, 2hr maximum parking in residential area of peak, restricted parking in res area peak
- if limited parking for new development restrict on street so owners are not parking on street for "N3" type property
- condos mulit res; no underground parking or w res park restrictions
- angle parking with island; landscaping greenspace
- maintenance important
- McDougall @ 6A @ 800 block staircase important (escarpment)
- 6th st @ McDougall ; turn radius, blind corner issues



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Memorial @ 9st. Off ramp= unloading new LRT, proper kiss and ride needed
- existing access to LRT + bus + pathway is good. - Edmonton trail bike pathway should be improved. - traffic signals at 12th street bridge (new 2 way traffic ramp) should be reviewed (2way flow is good !!)
- 2nd ave bike;stop sign every 2nd block (instead of every intersection)
- better bike connections from LRT; McDougall rd
- memorial @9st up improvements
- rowad bust Island ?? Poor dedign south of McDougall
- desire angle parking (McDougall rd)
- McDougall E -W connectivity issue (one way) remove one way
- convert close one lane on zoo overpass for bikes/pedestrians for wide area across w/planters
- residents take transit + bike downtown ut they still have cars, not enough street parking already no where for visitors
- 9th street @ McDougall; cycle/ped/veh conflict
- transport study required
- multi res condos; - no onsite parking
- restrict 12 st N.E. north of McDougall
- mobility route ' Edmonton to 1st ave to 9st to MacDougall to 12th
- slow down residential traffic, make more crosswalks
- 9A @ centre=pedestrian improvement desired
- prioritize safe pedestrian + cycle travel
- n-s bike connection to LRT desirable? 9st N.E>
- pedestriain connection grade issue
- 1 ave traffic calming should be removed. Doesn't help, poor snow maintenance
- traffic calming on 1 Ave E-W
- traffic calming should be removed. Doesn't help, poor snow maintenance
- 1 Ave bike way needs to be safer!
- memorial drive; through traffic short cutting over merge ramp (12th and memorial)
- do not desire bike pathway 10 st (S of 1 Ave N.E>)
- higher frequency, longer hours, better destination, better bus rt, #90

Question;

4. **Do you have any concerns, and comment with identified open space, pathways, and parks?
Please tell us why?**

Verbatim;



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Between Townsend St and Thomson Ave houses, runs a narrow trail - which is the original Blackfoot Trail - it is considered heritage land on the maps in Ottawa. The trail is completely overgrown and should be rescued and reopened
- Agreed, second to that! Preserve our heritage and it is a gain!
- Add a tennis court and basketball court
- Mountain bike park on east side of TCH
- Can pathways include some near-ground lighting?
- Bike path to the zoo. Bike path 12th Street NE. Bike path on McDougall Ave. Bike traffic lights between 30 Ave - 1st Ave NE
- Need to have a good lighting for all paths and park areas
- More stormwater gardens
- Not specific to parks and open spaces, but please maintain (increase urban capacity)
- Additional seating around parks (including the escarpment). Maybe a few picnic tables and benches around main Murdoch park
- A new bridge connecting directly to St Patrick's Island
- Buy some land make mini parks for community gardens, etc. (as neighbourhood densifies and is shadowed, backyard gardening will be impossible)
- Keep Bridgeland School and 11A St NE as public space
- Bridgeland School kept as historical site
- Pathway along bottom of escarpment between 6A and 7 St to promote dog walking circuit, improve safety etc. (north of) McDougall
- Connection from Ctrain direct to St. Patrick's island would be great
- More attention to McDougall Park. Accessible features with things for seniors to do
- Support proposed overpass linking LRT Stn to St Patrick's Island and to zoo. Consistency is key
- I agree with the need to extend the LRT bridge to the island
- I support the "green" bridge to St Patricks
- Please include specific urban forestry constraints for developers on public and City corporate land. We need mature visible trees in all areas
- More walking access to cross Memorial to get to the island
- Access especially in areas with higher than average low income housing or where taller, more dense buildings are being encouraged
- Optimize use of park space: pathways, benches, CPTED
- Gravel trail up north side of Tom Campbell's hill
- Improve maintenance of shrubs, pathways ... more than mowing
- More access points to Tom Campbell Hill from lower area of neighborhood from the north and west
- Increased density means increased demands on our parks. We need funding for public washrooms at our parks, increased lighting



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Question:

- 5. The following areas (see map) have been identified as potential rowhouse/townhouse locations within the Bowl & the Escarpment. Do you have any comments and or concerns with locaiton of these and why?**

Verbatim;

- there goes the character of the neighbourhood = high taxes, zero parking
- I do not like rowhouses chop and disconnect community
- I like rowhouses, they are beautiful + subtle diversification.
- strongly opposed to row housing in the bowl. There are already issues with people parking and walking downtown, so where will the extra density park? Also, issues with overnight garbage pickup, shading of neighbouring yards and lack of privacy.
- development of alternative energy sources fo ruse in residential housing
- no row/town houses. You would destroy the historical character and create more traffic and parking problems!
- intersection f 4th ave and 6A st need to be 4 way stop. Lots of speeding vehicles avoiding 1st Ave and many near accidents.
- development of greenspaces as food sources for low-density housing.
- we need a major grocery store.
- keep RCZ zoning for 6st east side north of mcdougall - much history
- rowhouses in identified areas is acceptable, but is it possible to put a limit on % of area within prescribed area? E.g. up to 50%?
- consider street parking. There does not seem to be enough parking space to accommodate the potential growth in traffic.
- no rowhouses it attarcts the wrong crowd.
- better traffic/speed control at bottom of escarpment (4ave). There are many near collisons at 6A and 4 ave.
- bought home in Bridgeland because of the historic charm of the old character homes-row houses will destroy the charm of our community. Worried city council is only concerned about \$\$\$- not community input. How did city decide location of new land use??
- rowhouses are a better option than gian baby single- family infills.
- increased denisty in the bowl + downtown?? Where will people park?
- bowl should include 6th street down to mcdougal - we have single family residential homes there too- that shoul dbe protected x2
- what is the random block of " the bowl" doing off the the side? Why is that part of "the bowl"?
- this rowhouse map basically crowds every area! That destroys the bowl.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- strongly opposed to row housing in the bowl. There are already issues with people parking and walking downtown, so where will the extra density park? Also, issues with overnight garbage pickup, shading of neighbouring yards and lack of privacy.
- strongly opposed to row housing in the bowl area. 100 yr old tiny homes dominated by new ugly row housing.
- I would like to see better enforcement of the "character" rule for new home design.
- RCG covers too much and too crowded ugly singles now.
- no- many concerns related to traffic plus congestion plus parking availability.
- row houses/town houses will help grow densioty we need.
- the character of the bowl will be destroyed b light blocking row houses that cover 50% more lot space than regular houses.
- love the rowhouses. Add diversity. Encourage back alley suites too.
- north side of 1 Ave N.E> - perhaps leave as low rise
- architecture to enhance natural features of the bowl and escarpment. E.g. head smashed buffalo jump?
- better utilization and make it a feature. Connect escarpment the whol way araround.
- please keep the walking along the escarpment. Plan looks good:)
- escarpment path!! From edmonton trail to tom Campbells w/ benches.

Question:

- 6. Are there any other potential locations for rowhouse and townhouse? Please tell us where and tell us why?**

Verbatim;

- Keep the higher density housing close to bus stops and LRT, and not in the single family part of Bridgeland. Children play on the streets, and it is only a matter of time before one gets run over as the density increases
- Saturation levels of large townhouses have ruined neighbourhoods like West Hillhurst around Marda Loop area. "Keep existing low density housing in current areas – do not compromise it."
No

Question:

- 7. Do you have any comments and/ or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why? (West Riverside, Bridges East Riverside)**

Verbatim;



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- should be same height as radius (dominion building) concern about shadowing.
- angle parking for businesses so people can pick up, drop offs, deliver trucks, food delivery, have no where to park so they park on street blocking traffic
- concern about park shadow for community- high density area around Murdoch Park
- more detail on east riverside- not enough comment on. More specifics please major opportunities for neighbourhood growth and enhancement
- people stop in the middle of 9th st to wait for people from the train
- more detail on east riverside- not enough comment on. More specifics please major opportunities for neighbourhood growth and enhancement
- more diversity in east riverside
- east riverside master plan do it?
- consider "safety" issues under the flyover.
- parking
- align urban vision of the community with an urban vision for memorial dr.
- west riverside 4 storey standard, 6 storey as exception only for special builds
- parking needs to be considered & enough for residents & visitors to our area
- retail plans need to include a grocery store for the "common man"- only high end available this point
- the density is already quite high with the mid-rise buildings being built - no buildings higher than 6 stories
- 6 street from center to McDougall should be in the bowl block, not west riverside
- the bridges also includes a health care site to serve residents in the future
- please do not change height restrictions. < 7
- please no buildings over 6 stories. Will ruin appeal visual and otherwise of neighborhood!!
- connect 11st to memorial w/ RI/ RO intersection X2
- it is not best practice to have all marginalized/institutional housing in one place. DO NOT ALLOW THIS IN E PART OF COMMUNITY.
- there should be more diversity of housing in east riverside. No more institutional type of housing-it has created segregation x2
- east riverside could benefit from some mixed use - seems like an isolated area now. Might be improved where the bridges is fully developed?
- keep in mind what cars, c-train riders will see when they drive on the flyover, will it be neighbourhood like or concrete walls or multistory bldgs?
- this is reasonable map for west riverside. The 3-4 storey limit would lessen the impact on a difficult street (mcdougall) compared to the prior 4-6 storey proposal.
- east riverside should attract multi-generational/mixed residents to diversify.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Question:

- 8. Do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why? (Main street, Edmonton Trail and Couplet - Bridgeland)**

Verbatim;

- pedestrian sidewalk from bus stop north to 4th ave is directly besides road. Does not feel safe especially in winter when snow is piled.
- being handicapped + using a walker I don't feel safe walking down main street, slow down speed limit.
- main street; should be zone neighbourhood - low rise. With commercial on main floor x2
- currently the couples does not feel very safe for walking x2 (homeless issues, encampments)
- more high density housing/high rises in Edmonton tr res. Will make traffic through the area (especially west 4th ave) that much worse.
- main street - 6 stories is too much x2
- do high rise in couplet. Get rid off trashy strip mall

- main street; need to encourage/enable small community on north side of 1st. - 3-4 storey max please, we don't want a shady main street. Let in the sun??
- perhaps try and encourage "stepped back" design at higher buildings?
- I would love efforts to make Edm trail area more inviting. Lots of great old buildings. X2
- I think first ave from 11st. To 6st. Needs somekind + rich lightning possible upgrade the boulevards.
- low rise w/ commercial on main floor. X2
- slow down traffic on edmonton trail.
- must address safety to attract business x2
- edmonton trail to shelter is sketchy, CLEAN UP!!
- encourage more consistent zoning on north side of main street.
- Needs parklets and open space with that kind of density - public gathering spaces should be identified - public art locations etc.

Question:

- 9. Are the proposed active frontage locations acceptable for these areas? If not, why?**

Verbatim;

- Lights (crosswalk) at Meredith & 4th Street
- The intersection of 1 Ave & Edmonton Tr is run down. This is a high traffic (vehicle, bike and pedestrian) area and serves as a "gateway" to Bridgeland. Could definitely be renovated
- Mandate scale of commercial space to maintain affordability and diversity



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Retail frontages need to be considerate of residents - deliveries should be after 8 am!! And no delivery truck idling!
- Include the entire McDougall
- Opportunity for active retail east of 9th along Centre Ave
- No more tinted glass



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Open House Verbatim- Questionnaire Completed June 25th

Bridgeland ARP Open House Questionnaire , June 25, 2018

Vision & Core Ideas (Board #6)

Vision

Bridgeland-Riverside's Vision:

A vibrant urban neighbourhood with rich history and character that can be seen in its buildings' architecture, street grid patterns, and spirited sense of place shaped through a diverse mix of residents. Its central location in Calgary provides direct access to the river pathways, parks, the LRT, and downtown. Nestled in the natural escarpment just north of the Bow River, the area has beautiful views and tree lined streets. As it evolves, the community will build on its great public amenities, strong multimodal transportation connections, housing diversity, and vibrant main streets. Bridgeland-Riverside will celebrate its heritage and continue providing a dynamic place for its diverse residents and visitors to live, work, visit and enjoy.

Bridgeland-Riverside is a vibrant, urban community that will continue to celebrate its heritage, and character as it evolves, providing lively places for both diverse residents and visitors to enjoy.

Core Ideas

Bridgeland-Riverside is a distinct inner city community and will:

11. provide a **diverse range of housing types** to increase overall density in appropriate locations;
12. **integrate new development** into the **evolving community character** with that continue to serve the community needs to accommodate all age groups;
13. **preserve local history and historical buildings**, and support development that complements historic development patterns and architectural features wherever possible.
14. encourage **transit-oriented development** through guided intensification of the land near the Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station;
15. **support a mix of compatible uses** including retail, office, residential, live work units, as well as amenities such as parks, green space, and public spaces; .
16. create **vibrant and safe public realm space**, along the Urban, Neighbourhood Main Street through buildings and public space design;
17. enhance existing local amenities and prioritize **safe pedestrian and cyclist connection** network;



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- 18. provide a **range of multimodal transportation choices** to facilitate efficient movement of all modes of travel;
- 19. encourage transit and active modes as the preferred transportation option, **and strengthening the connections** to the Bridgeland Memorial LRT station; and
- 20. encourage **community cohesiveness** shaped by a high level of engagement, social programming, and a diverse mix of residents.

Is there anything missing from the vision that you think should be included and please tell us why?

Despite Pt. 9 it seems that transit “options” are designed for those who already have a car. With increased density how is everyone going to get downtown in years to come?
Grocery store!
Riley Park style wading pool – stray deck
I don't see anything that will preserve the heritage and diversity which is what attracts people to the area to begin with. All of the heritage homes are being replaced by big, ugly boxes, and the wonderful gardens are being pave over. Would also like to see more small “nursing homes” (i.e. residences for seniors) in the community, rather than large seniors warehouses
AHS has begun to state their intentions to redevelop their intentions to redevelop their property on Riverside site. This is known by The City and Community Association. What will compel to follow ARP as well as Municipal Development Plan? They need to be forthcoming about future major plans to all parties.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

BOARD #8

Are the “building blocks” (see definitions) placed appropriately within all the areas of Bridgeland? Please tell us why yes, why not?

(Please be specific if you have any comments/ concerns about the “building blocks” location)

Place a post-it note with your comments below.

No bicycle connection from 1Ave. NE to Ctrain Station. Provide a connection on 9 St. SE
Improved pedestrian connections should be provided on either 11 / 11A St. NE, south of McDougall Road NE
No 10-15 storey buildings. Mixed w/ other lowrise
Yes, however, the goals for each building block need to be respected. Too many developers seem to be ignoring the intent of the ARP. Would like to see community planning committee have a vote on unsuitable developments
Yes



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Mobility (Active Transportation) (Board #9)

The plan area is served by major road, transit, pedestrian, and cyclist connections. The policies in the ARP are intended to improve existing connections, and make walking, cycling, and transit use more desirable choice in the community. The future connectivity maps identify potential future connectivity and potential future mobility improvement within Bridgeland-Riverside.

Do you have any concerns, and comments about the future connectivity in Bridgeland-Riverside as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?

Perhaps we should discourage the use of cars both for the area and for the environment in general
I am concerned about shortcuts off Memorial on either 9 Ave NE or St Georges Drive up to 1 st Ave NE and then over to Edmonton Trail – or up through 10 / 11 St. North to 16 Ave. Also increased building density will increase traffic and parking issues
Putting an overpass / bridge from Ctrain to St. Patrick’s Island would be helpful and wonderful for all people to get over easier and enjoy
Main Street (1 Ave NE) – the speed limit should be lower due to pedestrian traffic
Looks ok, but pedestrian walkways need to have snow cleared in winter
Regarding AHS redevelopment in Riverside, 10 th Street is to be extended south of Centre Avenue. This is already a “collector” street, with speeding issues, and needs traffic calming (circles). Extending it will exacerbate this issue, by making existing issues worse



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Open Spaces & Parks (Board #10)

The parks and open space map identifies existing and proposed parks, open spaces and pathways. The policies in the ARP are intended to maintain and enhance the quality amenities that serve the community's needs, for the benefit, use and enjoyment of residents of all ages.

Do you have any concerns, and comment with identified open spaces, pathways, and parks as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?

Riley Park style wading pool and spray deck with shaded areas!
Not enough park space as it is, and higher density will only put more pressure on existing parks
Should be clear(er) that Bridgeland School yard is not to be developed (hopefully). Need other greenspace outside existing areas – preserve areas like this, including adjacent to designated institutional use



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

The Bowl & The Escarpment (Board #11)

The Bowl: The area has a distinct street pattern of tree-lined blocks with back lanes, offering primarily low-density residential housing, and a combination of historic and infill houses. With a focus on maintaining the historical character, the area will continue to accommodate lower-density residential options as new development is integrated into the existing street pattern.

The Escarpment: Describes the residential area extending up the bluff. The Escarpment has steep topography, with a number of pedestrians and cycle pathways and connections winding up and to adjacent communities. The Escarpment supports slope-adaptive low-density residential housing alongside infill housing.

The following areas (see map) have been identified as potential rowhouse/townhouse locations within The Bowl & The Escarpment. Do you have any comments and or concerns with location of these and why?

Concerned with loss of sunlight on adjacent homes
It would result in a loss of character in the neighbourhood. Trickle-effect of losing more of our historic homes
Concerned it would visually remove a lot of the green space (lawns, trees, etc.)
Lane homes and carriage homes may make more sense
Can we help maintain the character of the area by making house designs more appropriate and less brutal?
Does anyone living in these areas want any building over 4 stories? (I mean where you may build out this way in future.) I get the idea this is a plan that could change. e.g. – south of Radius is up to 15 stories – really?
Row houses should not be allowed in The Bowl. They do not fit with the historic character. Parking is already tight with people parking in the community and walking downtown; garbage pickup is already an issue, so where will the extra bins go? They will effectively cover 100% of a lot instead of 45%, so trees will be cut down; and they will destroy the privacy of neighbors due to rooftop decks
Yes. Do not like along streets with existing houses. Must be: (1) few in number; (2) very small scale (short and low-rise); (3) only at narrow ends of blocks where houses don't usually face. Where did this idea come from? Also see below

Are there any other potential locations for rowhouse and townhouse? Please tell us why?

Keep the higher density housing close to bus stops and LRT, and not in the single family part of Bridgeland. Children play on the streets, and it is only a matter of time before one gets run over as the density increases
--



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Saturation levels of large townhouses have ruined neighbourhoods like West Hillhurst around Marda Loop area. "Keep existing low density housing in current areas – do not compromise it." No



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Main Street, The Couplet, & Edmonton Trail Residential (Board #12)

Main Street: A commercial and social focal point of the community, the area is designated as a Neighbourhood Main Street. Mid-rise development along the Main Street offers a wide range of uses including retail, services, office, institutional, and residential. Public realm improvements will enhance the street to support commercial vitality, greater variety of employment opportunities, transit use, and provide goods and services to local residents.

The Couplet: The western gateway into the community, ‘The Couplet’ offers mixed-use, mid-rise buildings to accommodate a range of retail, services, offices and residential uses. Edmonton Trail and 4 Street NE provide multimodal connections north-south to and through Bridgeland, while a walkable pedestrian environment ensures safe and vibrant street activity.

Edmonton Trail Residential: The area is characterized by multi-residential, small scale commercial buildings and institutional uses. It is expected the area will intensify and increase in density over time, offering unique slope adaptive designed redevelopment.

The following building blocks have been identified in these character areas (Main Street, The Couplet, Edmonton Trail Residential), do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why?

The amount of traffic trying to get in and out of downtown especially with increased development up Edmonton Trail to 16 Ave and in Crescent Heights
Sorry to say – but downtown Calgary and so far the East Village are dominated by sterile high buildings. I hope you do not permit highrise, by that I mean over 6 or 7 stories. Also rental apartments will detract from the neighbourhood too.
Attempts have been made to make under the 4 th flyover more inviting. I see it as a work in progress and there is potential if it could get funding – a toe hold
No issues
Get rid of liquor store – prohibit use in this area in acceptable uses (land use bylaw). Are a magnet for undesirable activity in this area



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

West Riverside, The Bridges, & East Riverside (Board #13)

West Riverside: The area offers a mix of residential options - unique character homes, low-rise multi-residential, as well as new infill development and higher density development closer to the Bridges and the LRT. It provides safe local connections for pedestrian, cyclists and vehicles across the south-west side of the community.

The Bridges: One of the key gateways for residents and visitors, 'The Bridges' contains multi-residential developments with main level commercial along key streets and well-connected park amenities. Close to the LRT station, it will accommodate higher density, pedestrian-friendly commercial and transit-supported mixed-use development.

East Riverside: The majority of East Riverside is residential, assisted living and health care institutional-related uses. As the area redevelops a mix of multi-residential options will bring new residents to the area expanding the demographic profile. Mixed-use commercial will be located along key streets and improved connections will allow safe access to amenities. The area closest to the LRT station will accommodate higher density development.

The following building blocks have been identified in these character areas (West Riverside, The Bridges, East Riverside), do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regards to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why?

The proposed height of Dominion is far too high for the area. Creates too much shading
80% parking isn't enough in areas where the main ground level is retail
No over 10 storey high bldgs should be allowed in that block (The Bridges was circled on form)
The high density block in East Riverside may not be too bad as it is down the hill and close to the Ctrain
Need to ensure there is adequate lighting so that pedestrians are safe
See comment about AHS under "missing vision", at beginning of questions; also under Transportation



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Active Frontages (Board #14)

Active frontages help activate the street and provide interaction between pedestrians and building uses. Building frontages located along streets where an active frontage is identified should be designed to generate activity, provide natural surveillance, and create an interesting and comfortable environment for pedestrians.

Retail-Required Frontages: Provide active uses at grade, including but not limited to retail, personal services, consumer services, supermarkets and restaurants, and community service uses, including child care.

Retail-Ready Frontages: Ground-floor units should be designed to accommodate both residential and retail uses and will allow residential to retail conversion over time.

Are the proposed active frontage locations acceptable for these areas? If not, why?

Don't like the idea of combining residential and commercial. Residential neighbourhoods should be quiet. There are many establishments on 1 Ave NE that do not appear well used. Why not make that area more pedestrian friendly?
Nice mix of areas. Looks good
They are acceptable
OK



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Online Verbatim June 25th to July 10th

Via Engage page; www.calgary.ca/engage

Question:

- 1. Is there anything missing from the vision that you think should be included and please tell us why?**

Verbatim:

- What are the appropriate locations for density? Based on what rationale? "Evolving community character" misses the mark - we like the current character - how are you defining that and protecting it. So much wrong with these core ideas - not enough space
- Acknowledge existing demographic profile in the area. The City has not noted existing affordable, institutional and social housing opportunities and has replaced it with higher density residential and commercial priorities. Allow for transition of uses
- Where has the affordable housing gone? Why has the Homes For Heroes village not been included?
- Diverse housing type should include older style architecture and not cookie cutter infills and condos. I would like to see maintenance and creation of green space in this vision
- diverse employment types to encourage local business.
- Within the East Riverside block – there appears to be no social housing any longer. Where would this be relocated. CNIB appears to be re-located where would they be? The area should incorporate Homes For Heroes.
- Within the East River block, we must ensure the relocation of our veterans into something safe and healthy. Homes for heroes would be a great fit!
- Where does this include Homes For Heroes?
- I think there is a significant need for social housing in this area, specifically the Homes for Heroes development.
- There is absolutely nothing here about nature, parks, trees only about concrete, concrete. How about "ensure the existing canopy of trees is protected and that every new build has a tree/landscaping plan. Set aside space for new parks in the denser environment.
- List seems comprehensive and well thought out. Maybe a water park of some sort. Outdoor pool?
- Encourage a diverse range of businesses, not just dental/medical.
- Retaining the 'small town feel' by restricting density to appropriate areas such as Riverside and closer to the train or Edmonton Trail
- Respect the current stakeholders, home owners, choice with regards to either accepting or rejecting the, the proposed zoning changes to the areas where they reside, as well as the type of development including actual plans not vague concepts.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- I would like to see the area being utilized for interim uses, like the Homes For Heroes village while the area undergoes redevelopment over the years. Given the existing demographic in the area I feel the city should be supportive of affordable housing
- I have found that public safety is becoming more of a concern both in terms of traffic - pedestrian interactions and in accessing the river pathway system.
- Strive to be a safer community
- I think it is important to consider affordability and the role density plays in giving everyone an opportunity to live in this great area.

Question:

2. **Are the “building blocks” (see definitions placed appropriately within all the areas of the Bridgeland? Please tell us why yes, why not?**

Verbatim:

- Yes but some spots where more stories could work in West Riverside. Also Bridgeland Place is not marked properly or considered - what is the future of this site?
- Building block appropriateness should be supported by transportation, site servicing, topography, etc. Land Use Concept should allow for interim uses (i.e. Homes For Heroes)
- what provisions are in place for temporary land uses? There does not appear to any explanation of how is to pay for all of this dream plan and one would think that adding a village like Homes For Heroes would be a great interim solution.
- No. I don't support high density in the bridges. I support it to the west. what is the height on the employment-intensive?
- Within the East Riverside block there does not appear to be a proper transportation plan. Where is the Homes for Heroes project?
- Where is the Homes for Heroes project?
- High density buildings should be limited to the land directly abutting Memorial drive and not encroach into the neighborhood.
- No - anything above 3-4 storeys on Main St east of 9 St NE will negatively affect the neighbourhood
- This looks good, but why are 3plex developments being permitted in the Neighbourhood - Limited area? These types of developments should be limited to the other areas (i.e. not in the single family zones).
- Yes, continuing to have residential (detached, attached, limited townhomes) in 'the Bowl' will help maintain the character of the neighborhood and hopefully we can blend/step down the density into those areas.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- I am very much in support of the decision illustrated here to make the west end of McDougall Rd "neighbourhood low rise". Makes sense for existing dwellings, and is sustainable for the area in terms of density.
- We feel the R1 and R2 designation should remain in the bowl. We also feel that any changes that involve the lands owned by and adjacent to the Delta West school, should become R1 or R2. Tyndall pk, upper grassland and pathways unchanged.
- Homes For Heroes village should be included in the SE corner. Higher density residential along the south end of the plan area are accessed by dead ending streets which could cause traffic issues. Can the proposed high densities be supported by this plan
- How is the transition between community mid-rise and neighbourhood limited supposed to look at 11th street and 1st ave? This transition seems stark, plus, homes on 11th face each other, not 1st Ave.
- 10 stories or higher is too in some of the areas of the Community-High Density. 10 stories works where the elevation is lower, but not further up Edmonton Trail where there is already shading from downtown during the winter.
- We would like to see more community high density along memorial as it would allow for suites that could look out over the river.

Question:

3. Do you have any concerns, and comments about the future connectivity in Bridgeland-Riverside as you see them on the map? Please tell us why?

Verbatim;

- Need to be able to turn right from the zoo (St George's Drive) into Bridgeland and presently cannot. Bridge at C-Train to St Patricks Island. Escarpment pathway needed. Have you ever biked up 10th ST? it's pretty hard. Bikeway on 1st? No 2 Sharrows
- App F notes the future improvements are unfunded with no identified plans for implementation. When will the city provide the connection of Bow Valley Dr without securing the ROW or funding? Has a TIA been done to confirm road will meet needs of density?
- " - Density is concentrated in the south end of the plan area. How will the dead ending streets along Memorial Drive impact traffic flow in the area."
- you should be able to bike on all streets in Bridgeland
- Within the East Riverside Block - How will the dead ending streets along Memorial Drive impact traffic flow in the area and how does this impact the new development of Homes for Heroes .
- Where is the Homes for Heroes project?
- Your map has nothing at all on roads.
- 1st Ave bikeway only good for confident riders, not younger (school) kids. Plan also lacks connection of bikeway to St. Patricks Island and pathway system by St. Georges Drive/Zoo Bridge/12th Street NE



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- 10th st is already fairly narrow where it bends at the top of the hill. Adding a bike path to this street would make this worse.
- 1st av is already crowded with traffic. Don't put a bike lane on an already crowded street, put it on center or 2nd ave
- Improving access to train (safety, lighting, ramp improvements) and then continuing that connection onto St. Patricks island would provide a much needed connection!
- Please continue to develop the pedestrian connections from along mcdougall rd to beneath the underpass towards the Reconcil. Bridge. Beautification, proper lighting, and traffic control will encourage pedestrian traffic to the core and keep our area safe.
- Like the potential pedestrian/cycle overpass on to St. George island. Would provide a better route to get on to the pathway and avoid traffic.
- Traffic calming measures should be a priority. Motorists often cut through the neighbourhood to avoid congestion on Memorial Drive.
- Where will the funding come from to build these road connections ? Has a Transportation Impact Assessment been done to confirm the proposed road network will meet the needs of the area?
- will the sidewalk along memorial drive between St George's Drive and 9th ave remain?
- The intersection at 4th Ave and 6A Street sees frequent multi-vehicle collisions. Reconfiguring the traffic flow should reduce the risk to cyclists and pedestrians using it to connect Renfrew to the downtown and river pathways.

Question;

4. Do you have any concerns, and comment with identified open space, pathways, and parks? Please tell us why?

Verbatim;

- School buildings aren't parks and shouldn't be marked as such. Useless park in SE corner should be linear park. Who named Hollywood Bowl? That's not a community name. Lots that you have marked in unusable escarpment - need some parklets on Ed Trail/ 4
- The zoo isn't a natural area.
- I do not see any of the proposed parks you are referring to on this map. As you increase density, space must be left aside for new outdoor spaces and parks or the ones that exist will be overrun.
- Community park on 2nd Ave (Tyndale Park) is always used as a dog park because it's fenced in and not marked as "no dogs allowed". Dog owners seem to need more alternatives so they stay off playgrounds/soccer fields, etc.
- Having more continuous pathways connecting these green spaces would be beneficial.
- We love our parks! Consider community planning to use vacant lots before developing. Many are an eyesore and have sat for years. Proper fences with murals, community gardens, etc...



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- We strongly feel the limited open spaces, pathways, and parks should remain and never be put up for sale. Open, green spaces provide solace from the hustle and bustle of urban living. Natural areas should remain as such with limited change.
- There is no official pathway on the hillside above 6A Street. This park needs better paths to stop erosion and allow for safe travel across the bluff.

Question:

5. The following areas (see map) have been identified as potential rowhouse/townhouse locations within the Bowl & the Escarpment. Do you have any comments and or concerns with locaiton of these and why?

Verbatim;

- How many lots deep are rowhouses? Rowhouses should be on the perimeter but not in the center or make the whole thing rowhouses bc developers are going to apply for mid-block the way you have this. What's the rationale? what justifies this amount?
- The bowl and escarpment should include neighborhood low rise.
- My concern is that there is much talk about the historical significance of the area and the houses but absolutely nothing is being done to protect anything. We don't even try to encourage new builds to fit in with existing styles - mostly anything goes
- There are many concerns with this. The area can't accommodate row/townhouse like this. For example, residents already drive single file on 6A street north of 2 Ave. It is a narrow street and can't accommodate more vehicles. We can't treat this like 10 St NE
- I don't understand why this one chunk on the SW corner is also part of the bowl but not the other homes SW of Langevin School.
- any additional single , townhouse or condos added to this area will be a challenge for parking. I pay yearly for a AAA pass with 30min free parking. i want the 30 min free parking taken away.
- Having some restrictions on how many townhomes/block or where they are placed in blocks would be helpful - would have to have too much of a Garrison Woods cookie cutter feel with whole blocks taken over.
- Concern with 4 Ave NE as traffic and alley way are very tight already.
- Concerns to much row house/townhouse making it less family oriented community. Concern with 4 Ave NE and 2 Ave NE as these streets and alley way are tight, parking will be an issue.
- Future comprehensive plan, "vague" we want the R1R2 designation to remain in place for us as well adopted for the FCP site! As homeowners, stakeholders our wishes should be respected and not tossed aside for not fitting into the vision of the unaffected
- Don't like that row house/town house are in the middle of "The Bowl", it makes the community feel boxed in.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Having townhomes on avenues (particularly 4th) doesn't make sense with alleys. Area can't handle that density with narrow streets. 6A Street also too busy as is (without forcing townhomes).
- how is Community - Mid Rise intended to interface with the single family homes on 11th Street? It is supposed to face 11th? Will the alley's be taken away to allow for bigger blocks?
- The 6A Street and 4th Ave intersections sees frequent multi-vehicle accidents. Increasing density along both 4th Ave and 6A Street will probably lead to increased pedestrian, cycle, parking and vehicle conflicts.

Question:

6. Are there any other potential locations for rowhouse and townhouse? Please tell us where and tell us why?

Verbatim;

- You may as well do it everywhere at this rate. Issues is loss of yards and sunlight - - you have too many already - east/ west riverside can have some too
- I support row houses throughout the area to support the missing middle for families in Bridgeland. There shouldn't be additional restrictions to what are in the land use bylaw.
- Why do we need this? We already have the right to build duplexes. Lots are not deep in Bridgeland. Reorienting houses from streets to avenues is problematic with the alleys. Would be short rows/townhomes, little benefit, high costs to current residents.
- Corner lots on North end of Streets to limit shadow lines on neighboring properties.
- Rowhouse and townhouse should be around park area as there are more space to handle the traffic.
- Potential location are around parks because there's more space to work with to handle the increase in people and traffic.
- Why do we require three storey rowhouse and townhouse in traditional R1 and R2 neighbourhoods? That is not a positive nor a wanted change to those who call this area home.
- Row house/ town house should be on the edge of the the boundary area because they appear to be in by parks to handle the increase volume in traffic.
- This is an established community. Maybe more in other areas with a "cleaner slate" like Currie barracks? Why townhomes? Could achieve similar densification goals without this by simply adding another floor to high rises by ctrain line.
- how about the rest of 1st ave east of the community mid-rise. Would be a better interface.
- 4th Ave and 2nd Ave are great candidates for laneway housing. This might be a better approach than row or townhouses.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Question:

7. Do you have any comments and/ or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why? (West Riverside, Bridges East Riverside).

Verbatim;

- 255 characters for feedback on 3 areas? This survey really sucks. East riverside needs to restrict high social needs, institutions and low income as it is already saturated -needs mixed use and mixed demographics and high density. Could be higher densi
- Timeline for transition of uses should allow for interim uses where the City knows the land is not available for a number of years (i.e. CNIB has 99 yr lease - allow Homes For Heroes).
Transportation network needs to be confirmed to support the blocks
- " - Timeline for transition of uses should allow for interim uses where the City knows the land is not available for a number of years (i.e. CNIB has 99 yr lease - allow Homes For Heroes)."
- don't support high density in the bridges. it's too tall. i support row houses throughout the community to share the load of density throughout the community. i support mid rise in west riverside where it's on the map.
- i don't support the employment without having a maximum height.
- Timeline for transition of uses should allow for interim uses where the City knows the land is not available for a number of years such as the case with the CNIB lands and the opportunity to build Homes For Heroes
- Where is the Homes for Heroes project?
- Again, high density tall buildings should be restricted to land right on Memorial drive and not encroach further into the neighborhood.
- All these building blocks are too low they will not allow for a future inner city neighbourhood which is diverse. Need more density to ensure a viable Main Street.
- Your drawings completely misrepresent the current environment known as the bridges. There are only 2 sites left to develop in the bridges. To show this area as high density is very misleading. To allow 15 storey buildings here ridiculous
- East Riverside: why is the High Density block not closest to the LRT station as described in the text but smack in the middle of East Riverside, having Community High Density bordering on Neighbourhood Mid Rise?
- This is where the denser development should go. Any denser development north of 1st Avenue NE should be scrutinized very closely.
- Diversifying East Riverside and mixing in medium density housing in all of these areas would be great.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Agree with the commitment to keep West Riverside a mix of residential options, including maintaining character homes that make it unique, not overdeveloping, and committing to improving safety of local connections for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Concern with the main street (1Ave NE) the building should be zone for Neighbourhood -Mid Rise to keep consist with what is already there and not to create less sunlight for those people walking down mainstream to shops.
- No comments or concerns at this time. Concepts as generally not too threatening. Actual plans are more likely to cause concern and comment. Surveys are important, but only worthwhile if they respect the concerns and wishes of those they serve.
- Include Homes For Heroes in SE corner. The City should allow for interim uses where they know the land is not available for a number of years.
- There needs to be a focused effort on designing the transition from Memorial Trail into Bridgeland. The road design and buildings along 9th Street and 12th Street need to help that transition.

Question:

8. Do you have any comments and/or concerns for any of these areas in regard to the building blocks that have been applied in those areas, please tell us why? (Main street, Edmonton Trail and Couplet - Bridgeland)

Verbatim;

- Needs parklets and open space with that kind of density - public gathering spaces should be identified - public art locations etc
- Looks good.
- I would like higher density in this area, which would help reduce crime and vagrants. I like the mixed use idea.
- If Edmonton/4th is to considered residential and pedestrian friendly we need to slow down traffic. I don't think it needs to be slower than 50km/h, but it needs to be enforced. There is no reason to be going 60-70 UPHILL. This will also reduce noise.
- Mid Rise storeys are too high and should be limited to 4 storeys to maintain the community and allow most people to actually a garden (light shading is an issue!)
- The Couplet: "while a walkable pedestrian environment ensures safe and vibrant street activity": this area is currently the worst for both walkability and safety. The sidewalk along Edmonton Trail is scary and in winter it's sheer ice.
- Main street lacks the parking to support commercial buildings. Especially the plaza between 8a and 9st. Reduce the width of that plaza to put in parking, and convert the barren lot across the street into the plaza area.



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

- Why isn't there more commercial development on the North side of 1st Avenue NE?
- The Main Street should end at 10th where there is the main road up to Renfrew so that it doesn't infringe on the residential feel on the Bowl.
- Main street should be consistent with what already exist there. Should be zone for Neighbourhood low rise.
- As we are not directly affected by the "building blocks" in those areas, I do not feel it is fare for us to offer comment on them.
- will the alleys be removed along main street to allow for 1st ave - facing blocks?
- Generally, these building blocks look fit the character of the areas. My only concern is how the transition between the areas will play out. Eventually, Bridgeland might need to follow Kensington/Sunnyside and block off through traffic on more streets.

Question:

9. Are the proposed active frontage locations acceptable for these areas? If not, why?

Verbatim;

- i don't support it in locations with new buildings - how are they supposed to convert?
- This map is random. Did anyone with a planning background work on this project. Ple
- Frontages should be limited or eliminated east of 9 St NE - the plazas should be the end of concentrated retail and micro businesses only east of this
- Will existing residential homes along 1st Ave upon development have to have mandatory retail on the main floor? Seems crazy - why not leave the choice to a home owner? If this is someones land and they want a new house, they should be able to build it.
- Retail spaces need parking. There aren't enough stalls for the existing shops and the cars overflow into illegal spaces. Adding more shops will make this worse unless parking space is properly supplied.
- There should be more retail/shops/restaurants/etc. on the North side of 1st Avenue NE.
- Yes. Edmonton trail and 4th street need a lot of TLC as a main gateway to our neighbourhood with great potential to attract businesses that serve the local community and bring visitors. Try to maintain character but encourage safe, welcoming spaces.
- Yes they are.
- Generally these acceptable locations for active frontage. One improvement would be to extend active frontages up Edmonton Trail to 7th Ave and all along 12th Street (by the zoo).



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

Open House Evaluation Form, June 25th, 2018

Session Evaluation Form					
Please check the statement that best describes your opinion	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
The session was a good use of my time	4	4	1		
I am satisfied with the opportunity to participate and provide input	2	7			
I received enough information to provide meaningful input	2	6	1		
I understand how my input will be used	2	5	1	1	
The format was an effective way for The City to collect input	3	5			1

Session Comments/General Feedback

Comments
Serious concerns about the proposed Dominion (Bucci) development. It is a major change from the current Bridges development plan. It is also not an incremental increase. More than doubling the height of a proposed building in this community is excessive. Surely, allowing an increase of a couple of stories would be a far better approach.
I really like the change in diversity (moving to lower density / height) in West Riverside. This ARP color-blocking matches the 3-4 storey building currently on the streets (McDougall Rd area). Please do not move to higher height in this area. Every resident I have spoken to in area (20+) want 3-4 storey development.
The City has a planning agenda. The City asks community for feedback but doesn't take recommendations of community committee seriously. The City has their own agenda and they will get the result they want despite community engagement



Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back
What We Heard Report – Fall 2018

<p>Need more parking in area overall - underground. Don't care for bike path along 10th Street south of 1 Ave - move west to 9th Street into the more commercial area and away from single home areas</p>
<p>Need to have specific people at open house, regarding specific major developments, affecting large area of community. Specifically, future redevelopment of AHS properties on side in Riverside</p>
<p>Where did this concept of row housing in "the bowl" come from? This will not maintain the character of our neighbourhood when a 3-storey mega block goes in beside small 100+ yr old houses. 10+ storeys in Bridgeland is a poor idea (parking shortage and pedestrian crossing difficulties).</p>
<p>Caution against 10-15 storey buildings - do we really need them for our community to be vibrant and happy? Parking - where do people park if there is over build? Kensington is an example of many weird parking rules or limited parking</p>
<p>Good core ideas. Would be nice to have more development but also need to watch the heights as we don't need another downtown.</p>
<p>I would like to say that the AHS property represents an important resource to the community. It will provide a range of employment opportunities, stable and higher paying for residents. Workers will help support local businesses too. The health care services will be available to all residents. I'm glad they're going to develop the property</p>
<p>Possibly change name of First Ave., maybe an Italian name / 1 Ave. Donations - put name on bench / who donated</p>