



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Project overview

In 2016 The City of Calgary started work on new Area Redevelopment Plans (ARPs) for the communities of Ramsay, Inglewood, and Millican-Ogden, as well as a Station Area Plan (SAP) for the South Hill area. These communities will be home to Green Line LRT stations, and because of that, it is expected that these areas will see increased development in the future. New ARPs and a SAP were developed to provide rules and guidance for future development in these communities; things like how to complement the local character, what level of density makes sense, and how to transition from high to low density or from residential to commercial within a community.

The Area Redevelopment Plan for Inglewood started with the vision and design concept developed as part of a 2015 Transit Oriented Development study and community design charrette. This initial vision was refined and expanded upon through subsequent public engagement in 2016 and additional planning work by The City of Calgary. In the spring of 2017, The City of Calgary produced a draft Area Redevelopment Plan for the community of Inglewood that looks to reflect community priorities, while also aligning with overarching policies such as the Municipal Development Plan and the Calgary Transportation Plan.

Engagement overview

In August of 2017, The City of Calgary conducted an additional round of public engagement in order to collect feedback on the draft ARP for Ramsay. The results of this round of engagement are collected in this report-back.

Engagement to collect feedback on the draft ARP was collected through two related processes: the Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee, and a broad public survey.

Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee

The Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee (ARC) was comprised of residents and volunteers from the communities of Inglewood, Ramsay, Millican-Ogden and South Hill/Riverbend who met to review and discuss the draft area redevelopment or station area plan in their community. This group was tasked with providing additional local context to the document and identifying areas of the document where they felt that additional focus was required. For most of the Green Line communities, this volunteer opportunity was advertised throughout the community and on-line, and interested participants were asked to submit an application to The City. After initial conversations with the Inglewood Community Association and in an effort to minimize stakeholder fatigue a similar, but slightly different process was followed in Inglewood. In Inglewood, The City of Calgary's Engagement Resource Unit worked with the Community Association and ward Councillor's Office to reach out directly to a group of individuals who could provide a wide variety of local perspectives. As a result, this group included resident home-owners, people who worked in the area, business owners, local developers or real-estate professionals, and community association members.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

The Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee for Inglewood met two times over the course of October & November of 2017.

1. The first meeting for the group included a detailed walk-through of the draft plan by the community planner who had developed it and then transitioned into the process of collecting feedback from participants on the draft ARP. Committee members discussed different sections and recorded their specific thoughts. A session facilitator also recorded high-level themes raised by the group and helped to ensure that discussion moved through all of the sections of the document.
2. The second meeting for this group provided participants a chance to add additional comments or clarify issues that had been raised earlier. At this meeting, participants also reviewed feedback that had been collected during the public, online, survey (described below) and helped to ensure that it was captured within the correct overarching theme.

Online Public Survey

From October 30 to November 14, 2017, an online survey was hosted on The City of Calgary's Engage Portal. This survey provided the general public with an opportunity to share their thoughts on the draft ARP. Participants were asked to review a PDF copy of the draft plan, and then, for each section of the ARP, asked to identify any areas within that section that could be updated to better fit the community context or meet community need.

What we asked

Both the Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee and the open public survey asked the same questions of participants. For each of the four primary sections of the ARP document (Land Use Concept, Open Space and Parks, Mobility, and Infrastructure and Environment) as well as for the document as a whole, participants were asked to:

- Identify any areas within this section that could be changed to better fit the community context or meet community need.

What we heard

Feedback collected from Inglewood Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee participants and through the online survey were combined. Similar responses were grouped together into themes and a summary statement describing the central idea or community concern were drafted for each theme. All of the themes and corresponding summary statements that emerged are listed below. For a complete listing of all verbatim input provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section at the end of this document.



Land Use Concept Feedback

1. Building Heights
 - Suggestions that allowable heights are generally too tall throughout the plan, with the concern that higher buildings will shade adjacent structures and open spaces as well as overwhelm the surrounding community.
2. Densification / Intensification
 - Tension between feedback that encouraged intensification and densification in order to ensure neighbourhood vibrancy, and feedback that was concerned that intensification would adversely limit residents' quality of life.
3. Community Character
 - Interest in maintaining a 'village' feel to the community, along with the suggestion that while heritage is part of the neighbourhood character, Inglewood is best thought of as an eclectic neighbourhood, rather than simply a historic one.
4. Tension between traffic flow and public realm
 - Strong feeling that 9th avenue cannot be both a regional traffic route to access the downtown core, and a walkable, pedestrian friendly main street.
5. Concern over Land Use Changes
 - Concern that changes made in land use designations in the plan will have negative impacts to local residents.
6. Brewery Site & Blackfoot Redevelopment
 - Interest in seeing greater discussion of Blackfoot and Brewery redevelopment areas, but suggestion that this may require a stand-alone process or plan.
7. Rowhouses
 - Generally supportive of allowing rowhouses in the community; however, there are a number of suggestions around potential limits or restrictions on their approval.
8. Secondary Suites
 - Some suggestion for additional areas where secondary suites could be allowed, but also some suggestions for additional limitations.
9. Heritage Conservation Approach
 - Concern that the heritage conservation approach outlined will not actually have the effect of preserving heritage buildings in the community. Some comments note that the outlined approach does not do enough for protection, while others fear that it does not do enough to incentivize development that preserves heritage.
10. Service Stations / Auto Lots
 - Suggestion that service stations or auto lots may be appropriate or beneficial within the right context.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

11. Building Accessibility

- Suggestion for specific policy language around accessibility

Open Space Feedback

12. Trees / Heritage Trees

- Interest in seeing greater protection for trees in the community, with special mention of heritage and fruit bearing trees.

13. Preservation of Open Spaces

- Interest in preserving or areas that may be currently not officially designated open space, but may be used by the community.

14. Park Amenities

- Some tension between an interest in greater recreational opportunities, preservation of natural space, and a feeling that some parks are over-developed.

15. River Access

- Interest in allowing for river access while minimizing environmental impacts.

Mobility Feedback

16. Pedestrian Safety

- Suggestions for increased and specific focus on pedestrian crossings and sidewalks.

17. Pedestrian Accessibility

- Specific suggestions concerning pedestrian accessibility for individuals with disabilities; curb-cuts and ramps, light timing, etc.

18. Pedestrian & Cycle Network

- General agreement on importance of pedestrian and cycle network within the community and connecting to adjacent communities, with some debate over the use of 8th Avenue as a cycle route.

19. Transit Network

- Interest in ensuring community is effectively served by transit.

20. Traffic Flow

- Suggestions to enhance traffic flow through the community.

21. Parking Concerns

- General concern that intensification and development will create parking challenges for existing residents. Some specific debate over the impacts of parking relaxation for heritage buildings.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

22. Infrastructure Upgrades

- Interest in seeing more detail around how infrastructure maintenance and upgrades would be conducted in order to meet demands of intensification in neighbourhood.

23. Contamination

- Concern about environmental contamination requirements being met prior to allowing any residential development.

24. Flood Mitigation

- Concern that more could be done to ensure flood resiliency in the community, as well as suggesting limits on development in areas that have substantial flood risk.

25. Alternative & District Energy

- Interest in district and alternative energy split between comments in strong support and those concerned about the public cost of the plan.

26. Sound Concerns

- Interest in seeing more done to address noise concerns from traffic and rail.

Other Feedback

27. Relationship to other plans

- Interest in seeing specific references within this plan to other related City plans and documents.

28. Figures & Maps

- Suggestions for changes to included maps or figures.

29. Definitions & Clarity

- Requests for additional clarity or definitions within the document.

30. Planning & Engagement Process

- Suggestions around the planning and engagement process.

31. Nothing Noted



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Next steps

All verbatim feedback, as well as the summarized concern or idea themes have been provided to the Community Planning team working on the draft plan. In early March of 2018, The City of Calgary will share how they plan to address issues and ideas raised by the public feedback. This will include identifying:

- Which suggested ideas or changes may be incorporated directly into the ARP,
- Which suggested ideas or changes could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement,
- Clarification for which of the suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP,
- Which suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP, and why.



Verbatim Comments

Land Use Concept Feedback

- 1. Building Heights
 - Suggestions that allowable heights are generally too tall throughout the plan, with the concern that higher buildings will shade adjacent structures and open spaces as well as overwhelm the surrounding community.

Page #	Section #	Comment
38	map 5	Map 5, Page 38. There should NOT be any buildings on 9 Avenue (north side) that would shade the properties on 8 Avenue (south side). Reduce the maximum height along 9th avenue. It is an inappropriate height to maintain a rich urban character, sunlight access, and pedestrian friendly design. Density can be achieved without height, as proven in many areas in Europe.
37		In the other areas where heights in excess of 20m are recommended, evaluate options to provide higher density with lower total building heights. For example, the Example neighbourhood in Barcelona provides an FAR of approximately 4.7 with a 20m height. On pages 37 / 38, 40 meter towers are only providing an FAR of 4, which will result in large towers with significant separation distance, and 2 story podiums between. (Note, nowhere on the map on page 37 is an FAR of 5 indicated, but it is on the legend).
38	map 5	Pge 38, Map 5: this is the gateway to Inglewood and the height restriction should be 22.5m and not 28m as shown on the map NO MORE buildings in Inglewood that are more than 3 to 4 stories high. Carra shoved that Avli building through, even though the majority of residents were against it, and voiced their concerns. You all need to reel him in and inform him to keep his nose out of the Planning Dept.
	3.6.3	Comments in 3.6.3 are well crafted generally other than needing clarification on extra density around Character Homes. 8.5 m. may be a little low (suggest 9 m.) to accommodate typical roof pitch for the area. Target heights - Target heights are intended to incentivize heritage preservation. However, there are certain heights that are inappropriate for the community regardless of good intent. Anomalies include: i. Eighth Street has a 22.5 m. target height over a heritage building (McGill Block) and its parking lot which would detract from the building and shade Jack Long Park. This may even be an error as the part of the use is zoned Neighborhood -limited. ii. A 34 m. target height is proposed for the corner of Ninth Avenue and Eight Street, out of sync with the existing Avenue, also a gateway to Inglewood. iii. Two spots allocated 34 m. target heights in the Triangle lands. The Nash has been zoned as to 12 stories (as an early example of heritage density transfer) which is expected but the allowing heights that are twice the norm area is detrimental to area form. iv. Height of 22.5 m. is set for the whole block on the north side of Ninth Avenue between Ninth and Tenth Streets, but it should be only to the alley - we assume this is an error.



v. Height of 22.5 m. has been set for the property where the YW is to be built, it is not the height of the building.

No problem with the 40 M. beside the rail tracks (Matco land), provision needs to be made to step down the height of the Truck Stop (28 m.) next to the residential neighbors.

We need an overall height limit for the community. Excluding the height targets already mentioned, a 22.5 m. ceiling is suggested for commercial areas, 10 m. ceiling for residential (not the fudge factored 11 m. that we see increasingly).

3.4 3.4 The City ignored this in the approval of Avli building including ignoring the existing ARP and the wishes of the majority of the community in amendment of the by-law. Do not agree with the existing heights resulting from this exercise as shown on Map 3.

map 5 Map 5 do not agree with 22.5 meter height associated with approval of Avli.

38 map 5 Pg 38. Map 5. Future target height on the south side of 8 Ave to the back alley, between 9th and 10th St should be kept at 12 meters to maintain consistency of residential heritage character. Ditto on 8th St, between 9th Ave and 8th Ave (failing that, there would be a wall of new buildings facing the prominent heritage sites of the Dean House and Fort Calgary.

I thought there are restrictions to building height on 9th avenue. I see the new condos on 9th and 13th are 6 stories. Next 7? Then 8? We won't have any sunshine left.

I do NOT support the following:

"On December 19, 2016 a report was approved by City Council which directed Administration to: Advocate with Municipal Affairs for amendments to the Airport Vicinity Protection Area Regulation (AVPA) Regulation to allow for a range of low density residential redevelopment and small scale subdivision in all areas affected by the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 30 contour area, including Inglewood, and for a clearer and simpler process for site-specific exemptions for higher intensity developments; and Consult with the Calgary Airport Authority to seek its support for exemptions for higher intensity residential development in important intensification areas within the NEF 30 contour area in Inglewood."

In other City of Calgary plans the right to sunlight is recognized as a fundamental principle. Where is this included here?

3.6.3 8.5m not high enough for 2.5 stories. 9m is more appropriate.

3.6.3 3.6.3 c I Height likely 9m in height to accommodate steeper heritage pitch to roofs

2. Densification / Intensification

- Tension between feedback that encouraged intensification and densification in order to ensure neighbourhood vibrancy, and feedback that was concerned that intensification would adversely limit residents' quality of life.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Densification could be helpful to Inglewood in supporting all business that are developing as part of the main street program and make things more vibrant



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Encourage redevelopment of some of the abandoned and decrepit commercial and industrial properties with incentives or zoning bonuses

Not nearly enough density for an area this close to the centre of the city. I understand the wish to maintain the character, but the long term needs of the community will be underserved without clear goals to intensifying existing usages.

You are forgetting that we live in this community for the reasons you are going to change it. I don't want a pretty high density area. If I did, I would have moved to Mission or Kensington. You are forgetting one key piece, Inglewood has character that you are about to erase for the greed of the city. Shame.

29 Page 29 - I do not agree with the approval of row houses in Inglewood. It does not fit with the existing densification of the neighbourhood and will increase congestion. They are not consistent with the current architecture of the neighbourhood.

The 300M TOD area for achieving FAR of 4.0 is too small, particularly east of the Inglewood/Ramsay station and does not encourage the development existing industrial/vacant land. Greater density in this area is necessary to ensure future health and viability of the community and would create much needed vibrancy. Too little density will not support the transit growth objectives of the MDP. Requiring development to achieve density only by paying into the Heritage Fund would be a disincentive to this area which requires significant investment and currently has no services or an established roadway access to support development. Density is required for transit to be successful and the 300 m radius is extremely limiting and does not support much needed new development to occur.

3.2 3.2 Generally agree with subject to caveat that quality of life of existing residents should not be sacrificed on the altar of increased intensity.

3.4 3.4 Generally agree but do not support intensification sacrificing the quality of life of existing residents to serve the interests of the merchants in attracting more traffic in people and vehicles to the neighborhood.

40 pg 40 need to support the school to encourage enrolment. development needs to encourage families to move in and settle in Inglewood. need development to support various incomes.

The arp should support the addition and improvement of site services in historically industrial areas (brewery/rail district) by supporting increased densities i.e.. 4.0 FAR without the requirement of additional financial contributions to the heritage (or any other) proposed fund. Current offsite levy requirements already pose a financial burden to redevelopment and adding further costs will make redevelopment of this area prohibitive.

2.1.3 2.1.3 refers to population increases. Concern that the map limits where these population increases could happen and that current FAR would not allow eventual targets to be reached.

3.9 Don't understand the rationale for the 300m circle.

The 300m TOD is more than sufficient for Inglewood. A major concern is the high number of single family homes that would be threatened if the 300m TOD is expanded.

Re: density - We will accept it but retain the right to say where it will go - including a 300m center from the station.



3. Community Character

- Interest in maintaining a 'village' feel to the community, along with the suggestion that while heritage is part of the neighbourhood character, Inglewood is best thought of as an eclectic neighbourhood, rather than simply a historic one.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.1.3	do not agree with 3.1.3 and parts of 3.1.4 - neighbourhood character should not be so prescriptive and should reflect current building types and technologies rather than falsely represent a specific moment in time
	3.4.4	disagree with 3.4.4 in regards to development being required to be of "historic" character; development should be less dictative of "style" which is subject, but should address good architectural principles of scale, proportion and use of high quality building materials.
	3.7.1	3.7.1 brewery/rail district - this is historically an industrial area that reflects a much different character than the rest of the community and was developed in different periods. The heritage character of the community (which exists only in specific pockets which have no relationship to this site) should not dictate the character or redevelopment in this area. Redevelopment should be allowed to incorporate existing industrial elements and styles which is different than found in residential/commercial areas of the community. Additional density should be granted for this area in order to encourage the preservation of historic resources where possible. Municipal heritage evaluation conflicts with provincial evaluation and determination of historic value and should not be used to dictate which heritage resources are worthy of preservation. Redevelopment of the brewery/rail lands should not be responsible for "mitigation" of rail impacts as there is no way for adjacent property to control. Rail impacts responsibility of rail and should not be a burden of the developer but structures should be sensitive to the proximity of rail with respect to noise and vibration.
		I have enjoyed living in this community for the past 11 years and I moved here because it was a small town in the middle of a big city. The city is going to destroy this feeling and sense of community with it's plans urbanize this beautiful area. I would have loved for the city to add more green space and less urbanization but this is not the direction the city is looking in. I will one day have to move out of this community as the city will have it's way and destroy the reasons why I picked this community as my home. Shame
		The emphasis on heritage and the historical character is overemphasized in the ARP. Inglewood is an eclectic community which has an historical element but one requiring new development to reflect only a single historical period distracts from the ability to achieve good planning and architectural form nor is it desired by all users.
	2.1.4	Be careful that this language doesn't limit the development opportunities around character. . Community is eclectic, rather than a character based on a single historical time-period.
	2.1.4	2.1.4 is an important statement that should be reflected throughout the planning document.
	3.1.8	Billboard policy should refer to context sensitivity and whether the billboard is free-standing (if it limits developability). Is there an opportunity to encourage appropriate, context sensitive, advertng opportunities.



2.1.6 Can we add "preserve village form and feel"?

Placemaking and Building Character - The Blackfoot Trail underpass is NOT a gateway. The first entry heading west into Inglewood is when one crosses the bridge over the Bow.

4. Tension between traffic flow and public realm

- Strong feeling that 9th avenue cannot be both a regional traffic route to access the downtown core, and a walkable, pedestrian friendly main street.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Additional comments from the BIA point out specific areas for improvement: a. The emphasis in 2.1 (Vision and Core Ideas) on vehicular movement "facilitate the efficient movement of all modes of travel through the area to meet the needs of both regional through traffic and the area's residents and users" is contrary to community perception or desire.
		b. Ninth Avenue and Main Street (3.4) is car-centric in photos and needs to articulate that permanent parking on the south side is beneficial to business and pedestrians.
	5.5	If "the city will not undertake actions to reduce congestion through drive land expansion" then why a new 4 lane bridge?
13	1.2	9th ave, is it a "commuter thoroughfare" [streets paragraph] or a pedestrian oriented street? Seems contradictory.
	2.1.4	Also refers to 9th ave as allowing for efficient movement of regional through traffic.
		Basic conflict between ninth avenue as a conduit for downtown traffic & walkable community corridor.
51	5.5	5.5, 2nd paragraph and 5.5.1.b - Making the new bridge 4 lanes (from 3) will go against this. No one wants a 4 lane bridge (CA, BIA, IDI).
27	3.4.1	3.4.1.c Safe environment for pedestrians... this fits the contradiction of 9th ave. Traffic thoroughfare or pedestrian high street?
13	1.2	Streets section - There is a contradiction between 9th ave being "the heart of the community" and a commuter thoroughfare. 9th ave cannot be both. A 4-lane highway to move traffic cannot also be a walkable high street for shoppers, families, etc. 3:30 BRT does not allow for pop-up patios, strollers, etc.

5. Concern over Land Use Changes

- Concern that changes made in land use designations in the plan will have negative impacts to local residents.

Page #	Section #	Comment
--------	-----------	---------



Map 3 Pertains to Map 3:

Rezoned areas - Proposed rezoning intensifications that no one was consulted on. Changes need to be discussed, particularly with those affected, to see if this is anything like part of a community-based vision. These include:

- i. The strip across the street from the YW has been rezoned to neighborhood – low rise, “transition” zone not necessary as the YW design steps down to homes across the street.
- ii. The entire area by the Fish Hatchery on 17A Street has been rezoned to Neighbor Center, runs over existing single family. Perhaps an RC-G zone would work here.

Zoning errors and unintended consequences:

Errors on the zoning map need to be addressed, corrected and incorporated - predominantly four areas of MG-C shown as Open Space.

Those land uses need to be revisited to establish exactly what the community wants especially in MC-G or park areas.

Areas rezoned without consultation including: 17th Ave - changed to Neighbourhood Low Rise from Single Family, Land west of 17A Street was rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre from single family

There is a lot of land use given over to social service buildings - consider a dialogue about whether the community is saturated with what almost always requires building relaxations.

6. Brewery Site & Blackfoot Redevelopment

- Interest in seeing greater discussion of Blackfoot and Brewery redevelopment areas, but suggestion that this may require a stand-alone process or plan.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.7.1	I support what's proposed in section 3.7.1, would be great to see that area improved
	3.7.1	brewery/rail district - this is historically an industrial area that reflects a much different character than the rest of the community and was developed in different periods. The heritage character of the community (which exists only in specific pockets which have no relationship to this site) should not dictate the character or redevelopment in this area. Redevelopment should be allowed to incorporate existing industrial elements and styles which is different than found in residential/commercial areas of the community. Additional density should be granted for this area in order to encourage the preservation of historic resources where possible. Municipal heritage evaluation conflicts with provincial evaluation and determination of historic value and should not be used to dictate which heritage resources are worthy of preservation. Redevelopment of the brewery/rail lands should not be responsible for "mitigation" of rail impacts as there is no way for adjacent property to control. Rail impacts responsibility of rail and should not be a burden of the developer but structures should be sensitive to the proximity of rail with respect to noise and vibration.
		Discussion regarding Brewery development is vague. To start discussing zoning when it is all captured under Future Comprehensive Plan Area is disingenuous. Discussion about Truck Stop development may have been affected by the BRT stress on 19 Street.



3.7.2 Blackfoot Truck Stop - pg. 31. The BRT connector to Forest Lawn is a major challenge to adequately design a comprehensive, mixed used residential and light industrial purpose. More of the planned space and use of the BRT and future Green Line in that area needs to be made known now to reflect on this challenge.

Specific direction on the future of the ball diamonds should be mentioned, as this area has been heavily impacted by BRT construction, and is immediately adjacent to the future high density area of the Blackfoot Truck Stop.

7. Rowhouses

- Generally supportive of allowing rowhouses in the community; however, there are a number of suggestions around potential limits or restrictions on their approval.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.6.3	3.6.3 - Rowhouses - I believe there are instances in which row houses could be beneficial; however, not serviced by a laneway. For instance, at the beginning of New Street, there is a stretch of five homes that face the dog park close to 13th street. Why is this not considered for future re-zoning. The way the rowhouse section is written is prohibitive.
29	3.6.3	Pg 29, 3.6.3: need to include that any rowhouse development cannot contravene the Airport Vicinity Protection Area (AVPA) Restrictions and Land Use
	3.6.2	Concerned about "row housing" being mixed in with the current single family or duplex housing in the Walker Estate end of Inglewood.
	3.6.3	3.6.3 b.ii and c.iii contradict each other I believe that row houses should all be oriented in the same direction as other houses on the street regardless of whether it's a mid or end of block condition. There are too many overlooking concerns otherwise.
	3.6.3	3.6.3 Generally support, but again should be subject to neighbors' approval.
		And the City RC-G zoning rules need to be amended re townhome development, as proposed in the ARP.
	3.6.3	3.6.3 c iii Shell has the same orientation.
		Rowhouse development should be context-sensitive and context-specific. Most would agree with this if it fits within the heritage character.
		Discussions over the last year have been clear that rowhouses face the public street and minimize negative impacts on the adjacent houses.



29

Land use is the primary issue in the ARP. The draft report put together by [the Planner] captured the feedback he received, and he has done a very good job of modifying current RC-G zoning rules so as to fit the community's needs and deal with our concerns. Page 29 is particularly important in this regard, as it deals directly with height, orientation, shadowing, massing, and the minimum number of row homes in the middle of a block. This is currently set at 5, which may require some tweaking if wider row homes designed for families are proposed. However the intent of this section and this proviso is clear: we don't want, for example, three narrow 11 m tall row homes in the middle of a block. (which RC-G rules would allow unless modified by the ARP). We want a cluster of reasonable height row homes that together look good and fit the heritage character of the area. We also do not want, on an end lot, a reorientation so that four or five row houses now loom over next store's back yard, destroying the feel of their garden and placing it in total shade. Sections 3.6.3 and 3.6.4 as written are therefore extremely important. There are still some rezoned areas that require discussion such as the area on 17A st by the fish hatchery, which should perhaps be rezoned to RC-G. Some target heights on 9th Ave and in other specific sites will need review and would require a separate summary to discuss. Standard residential height should be 10m, with 22.5m for commercial areas (with some exceptions such as the Matco lands beside the rail tracks and the truck stop lands). Any DC zoning for heritage buildings needs to fit the height parameters already stipulated. Four areas of MC-G are shown as open space and this needs to be corrected.

29

R-CG Rowhouses in Inglewood - ARP page 29.

During the spring of 2017, the Inglewood Community Association and [the Community Planner] had a number of sessions where they discussed exactly what kinds of R-CG rowhouse construction would be agreeable to both parties.

It was agreed to allow for rowhouses along the public street, but not to allow for reverse orientation rowhouses on the end-of-block / corner property along the connecting avenue.

The wording on page 29 is very clear for rowhouses along the street, but not so clear for what can be constructed on an end-of-block / corner lot. The policy clearly states that along the street the rowhousing must be "part of a development containing no fewer than five rowhouses".

However no such guidance or clarity has been provided for the end-of-block / corner locations. In the policy the wording is inconsistent. Is block the same as public street? On a corner there is both a street and an avenue.

For example in the policy:

1) "Rowhouses shall have their primary entrance onto the public street"

2) "Rowhouses should have the same orientation as is common of other residential units on the block where they are located"

In the second point above, the word "should" needs to be replaced with "shall". The word "should" allows for misinterpretation.

Thank you for allowing me to provide this input to the process.

8. Secondary Suites

- Some suggestion for additional areas where secondary suites could be allowed, but also some suggestions for additional limitations.



Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.6.2	3.6.2 - wondering why the secondary suites, including backyard suites, is so specific for the either side of 9th Avenue. I believe there are other instances in which secondary suites and backyard suites would be an appropriate use of properties. For example, there are a stretch of properties along New Street which are serviced by a back alley that runs along Nellie Breen Park - why aren't these considered?
	3.6.2	The zone for additional secondary suites should be widened beyond just what is proposed in Section 3.6.2 Also what do you mean by 9th Ave SE where this document 3.6.2 encourages relaxation for secondary suites --- there is a big difference in the blocks closer to downtown than the currently quiet single family blocks east of 17St SE.
	3.6	3.6 – 3.6.2 does not indicate on what basis they may be granted. Should be subject to neighbors' approval and other restrictions.

9. Heritage Conservation Approach

- Concern that the heritage conservation approach outlined will not actually have the effect of preserving heritage buildings in the community. Some comments note that the outlined approach does not do enough for protection, while others fear that it does not do enough to incentivize development that preserves heritage.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.9	Section 3.9 Heritage Conservation does not go far enough. It is full of haphazard, normative approaches to conservation that repeatedly fail in Calgary. I'd like to see some real conservation efforts implemented.
		The proposed Heritage Fund is too limiting and any such fund should be used to fund other much needed amenities (urban parks/plazas/public art). It is unlikely that a developer would be encouraged to pay into a fund only for heritage which benefits other property owners directly.
		Agree that the fund is limiting; however, everyone wants heritage, but only heritage owners know how expensive they are to maintain. Need to provide some tools if we want them to remain vital and maintained.
		Target heights - Target heights are intended to incentivize heritage preservation. However, there are certain heights that are inappropriate for the community regardless of good intent. Anomalies include: i. Eighth Street has a 22.5 m. target height over a heritage building (McGill Block) and its parking lot which would detract from the building and shade Jack Long Park. This may even be an error as the part of the use is zoned Neighborhood -limited. ii. A 34 m. target height is proposed for the corner of Ninth Avenue and Eight Street, out of sync with the existing Avenue, also a gateway to Inglewood. iii. Two spots allocated 34 m. target heights in the Triangle lands. The Nash has been zoned as to 12 stories (as an early example of heritage density transfer) which is expected but the allowing



heights that are twice the norm area is detrimental to area form.

iv. Height of 22.5 m. is set for the whole block on the north side of Ninth Avenue between Ninth and Tenth Streets, but it should be only to the alley - we assume this is an error.

v. Height of 22.5 m. has been set for the property where the YW is to be built, it is not the height of the building.

No problem with the 40 M. beside the rail tracks (Matco land), provision needs to be made to step down the height of the Truck Stop (28 m.) next to the residential neighbors.

There needs to be a “bookmark” put in to accommodate heritage overlay districts or smaller areas when rules regarding them are rolled out.

Regarding the protection of Character Homes in Neighborhood - Limited areas, relaxations to height should not be allowed in Heritage Density Transfer. This could easily exceed the Neighborhood Category sizes.

3.9 Not a fan of this as it pits the interests of residents against one another. Would not want increased height approved in an adjacent building to me in order to benefit a heritage building elsewhere.

The City has to ensure that if a Special Character homes/building policy is implemented that any extra density granted is really earned.

3.9 This needs to incentivize heritage preservation. Not sure if it will.

35 How much density can be transferred to other sites (p 35)? Will this allow for FAR and maximum heights greater than what is illustrated on p 37 / 38? If so, how much? It seems there is a purposeful lack of information on what is possible between the heritage bonus and the maximum FAR. The ARP should clearly define this as this will be a major issue in Inglewood, and developers may intentionally leverage the bonus mechanism to achieve their own objectives for profit.

Heritage overlays can be perhaps bookmarked into the heritage section for future implementation (Edmonton has 7 such areas).

Target Heights – Need to look at places where this has worked, but comparing apples to apples (what has worked in Vancouver may not work here). Need to strike a balance between driving developers away and creating an actual market for density for this to work. Don’t forget about the CHA; lots of good and diverse insight.

Need to consider property tax abatement policy for heritage preservation.

3.9 3.9 - Heritage Conservation - Why is the property tax incentive off the table? This would work effectively, esp. in the immediate short term vs. density transfers.

3.9 Heritage density transfer and details on the community heritage fund.

10. Service Stations / Auto Lots

- Suggestion that service stations or auto lots may be appropriate or beneficial within the right context.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.1	3.1 Generally support except: 3.1.7 –as don’t agree with reference to auto service centres and service stations and 3.1.9 – implementation should be optional and should be justified if economically viable absent any incentives (i.e. no cost to public).



3.4.3	3.4.3.b do not agree with this. Would much prefer a car lot next door to me than the Avli building.
3.1.7	Does the 'should' in 3.1.7 have the unintended consequence of limiting the development of a gas-station (which the community needs).
3.1.7	Does this statement refer only to 9th street or to the whole plan area? (Auto Service Stations)
3.1.7	3.1.7 - Ensure original concept in previous ARPs to limit auto oriented uses is maintained. (Are new auto centres/service-stations discouraged throughout the whole community?)

11. Building Accessibility

- Suggestion for specific policy language around accessibility

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Make sure each new apartment building or row housing has wheelchair accessible units and wheelchair accessible access to the building i.e. no stairs, no steep inclines

Open Space Feedback

12. Trees / Heritage Trees

- Interest in seeing greater protection for trees in the community, with special mention of heritage and fruit bearing trees.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		There is no mention of protecting trees in the Molson brewery area. There are huge trees which are crucial to community history, character and wildlife. Preserving large trees need to be a cornerstone of all new development. Trees are essential to the pedestrian experience.
		There is no mention of heritage trees and there needs to a policy in place
3.14		Under 3.14d the mature trees should be identified as to value, for example an old poplar that is going to only last another 10 years vs an oak or elm. I find we often plant too large of trees near buildings in our urban environment (then they get big and cause hazards/damage during storms). Preserving large trees need to be a cornerstone of all new development. Trees are essential to the pedestrian experience.
		There is no mention of heritage trees and there needs to a policy in place The new ARP should link to the Infill Guidelines
		There is a need for a better and clearer policy on the preservation of heritage trees, and there are precedents from other cities we could follow.
		Parks – Better policy on heritage trees is needed. Regardless of resistance from Planning on this, precedents exist in both Toronto and Vancouver. Some details remain to be firmed up.
		Preserving large trees need to be a cornerstone of all new development. Trees are essential to the pedestrian experience.
3.1.4		Landscaping section should refer to a heritage tree policy



3.1 General Policy 3.1.d - Mature trees will likely be captured in heritage tree policy elsewhere.

24 Pg 24. No mention of edible food in this including edible fruit trees/shrubs (not just veggies)

13. Preservation of Open Spaces

- Interest in preserving or areas that may are currently not officially designated open space, but may be used by the community.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Zoning errors and unintended consequences: Errors on the zoning map need to be addressed, corrected and incorporated - predominantly four areas of MG-C shown as Open Space. Those land uses need to be revisited to establish exactly what the community wants especially in MC-G or park areas.
44	map 6	Map 6: Page 44. The green belt, between 2200 and 2300 blocks of 16 Street SE (AKA the old Blackfoot Trail right-of-way) is indicated on Map 6 as "park". Although signage indicates an off-leash dog area, the location is not actually zoned as park. A development is currently underway on the westside of this area (corner of 15A Street and 23 Avenue). As this area is not protected from development, it should not be included in any open space (park) inventory.
		There is insufficient information in the plan to provide direction on Open Space and Parks. There is no reference to Bend in the Bow, which is a long-range redevelopment plan for Pearce Estate Park, the former Ball Diamonds, Inglewood Bird Sanctuary, and the woodlands.
		Do not develop the river bank with parking lots. We need parking somewhere, but that is not the place (no "wernoof"). Once green spaces are developed, they are gone. They add so much to the area and the city. The short term money grab is not worth it.
4.1		4.4 With respect to 4.1 and 4.1.3, those resident most directly impacted should be consulted.
		open space and park map - areas by the community centre and school have been slated for high density development. This should be reflected on this map
		negative space in Inglewood not being used. need to take inventory of land and use restrictions before more development goes in. misuse of land. green spaces that are being used by community are being slated for development of high rise structures while dead space remains unoccupied and unused. organic green spaces promote healthy communities and families. losing touch with that with so much quick development.
		Park land is very important. Appreciate focus on this area.
		Keep existing green spaces and PARKS INTACT. Do NOT develop or interfere with the park behind 8 avenue, 12 and 13 streets. Carra wants a laneway to go through our beautiful park. He is all for development and density. Leave that park ALONE.
		Do NOT build a laneway behind 8 avenue, 12 and 13 streets. Again, another one of Carra's ideas. Stop him interfering with our beautiful parks.



14. Park Amenities

- Some tension between an interest in greater recreational opportunities, preservation of natural space, and a feeling that some parks are over-developed.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Specific direction on the future of the ball diamonds should be mentioned, as this area has been heavily impacted by BRT construction, and is immediately adjacent to the future high density area of the Blackfoot Truck Stop.
		More active uses should be encouraged in the park areas, frisbee golf, replacement ball fields (two removed during Bus Expressway construction)
		Keep the green spaces green! We don't need fancy art or more playgrounds. And we don't need less trees or grass! For a city that wants things green and is supposedly "environmental", how about replacing the trees that you tear down every year!! And not just in the rich areas of the city. Oh yeah, we notice!!
		Inglewood has an excessive amount of children's playground for its population. Future parks and open spaces should be urban in nature and provide for a variety of activities to support a wider age range.
	4.2.3	How is the potential future development and use of Harvey Passage and Pierce Estates Park accounted for in this document?

15. River Access

- Interest in allowing for river access while minimizing environmental impacts.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Proper area to pull in and out of the bow river for tubers
		The completion of the massive development of Harvey Passage may have a serious impact on Pearce Estate Park, and how there is to be a "sensitive interface" remains a mystery.

Mobility Feedback

16. Pedestrian Safety

- Suggestions for increased and specific focus on pedestrian crossings and sidewalks.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Widen 9 avenue sidewalk ASAP - also sidewalk slopes badly between 12 St. and 11 St.
47		pg 47 - need to revamp pedestrian crossing on 17th ave and if bus transit stop goes in at blackfoot diner need to improve crossing at 9th ave by lou's autobody and possible lights at that location.
		Fix the sloping sidewalk on 9 ave., between 12 and 11 st. One must walk leaning sideways to balance on the existing sidewalk.



More discussion of pedestrian safety

2.2 Sidewalks described at the bottom of this paragraph aren't actually that is there, now or what is afforded by section 3.4

3.4.1 Concern that things like the 'safe and convenient environment for pedestrians" are not actually reflected in the other policy documents that shape this street; streetscapes master plan, transportations plans, mainstreets

Pedestrian safety on 9th and 12th street is key. Needs to be improved.

17. Pedestrian Accessibility

- Specific suggestions concerning pedestrian accessibility for individuals with disabilities; curb-cuts and ramps, light timing, etc.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Curb side access to the LRT is a MUST! People pushing a wheelchair can NOT do huge ramps even the ones with the lesser incline without causing serious injury to their backs and shoulders long term.
		Also, if looking at the community please correct the incline of the ramps at the corners, walk around and look! An example is the incline at the corner of 16 street se & 14 Avenue se. Try pushing someone bigger than you up that! OMG torture, half the time we use the road!
		There are a lot of persons with disabilities in the community.
		Have more ramps/sloping intersection sidewalks to help seniors who have walkers, wheelchairs and/or canes.
		There are many seniors in Inglewood with walkers, electric wheelchairs and canes. Pedestrian walk signals on lights at 12 st. and 9 ave. should be longer. Presently, even a young person can only get halfway across the street when the light changes to yellow and only gives seconds to get to the other side. Would like to see lights installed at 9 ave. intersections instead of pedestrian crossings. These are dangerous. Lights are safer.
		Traffic safety can work with Greg Hart of the program Safe & Smooth

18. Pedestrian & Cycle Network

- General agreement on importance of pedestrian and cycle network within the community and connecting to adjacent communities, with some debate over the use of 8th Avenue as a cycle route.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		I may have missed it but I find the connection between Walker Estates and the west side of blackfoot trail doesn't appear to be raised as a concern. How can we increase walkability/bike ability to the new train station? I have to go so will try and submit more later!
		Glad 8 ave is being recognized as a cycle connection



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

A key piece of mobility is the connection from Inglewood over Deerfoot to Forest Lawn. This is a dangerous route for pedestrians and bikes on a good day. On a winter day when the city neglects the sidewalk its just dangerous.

47		How is a regional pathway (p 47) on 9th avenue considered feasible? This seems far fetched and is not explained in any detail. I imagine that this is merely a pipe dream. If so, delete it.
		Pedestrian access directly to the Inglewood community east of the proposed station is critical and necessary to support redevelopment east of the transit station. The brewery/rail area has the ability to provide much needed density in support of transit ridership and MDP goals/objectives but improved connectivity is essential.
5.3.2	5.3.2	Signage for Cycle connection along 8th Avenue should be minimal. 8th Avenue is too narrow for a bicycle lane.
5.2.1	5.2.1 –Map7 –	any cycle connection along 8th Avenue SE should not interfere with parking and vehicular traffic along this street.
5.3	5.3	The intent should also be to encourage cyclists to be courteous and adhere to vehicle regulations. Amongst other things, signage might be required to encourage this.

19. Transit Network

- Interest in ensuring community is effectively served by transit.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		I cannot see the Inglewood/Ramsay station servicing Inglewood properly. Don't forget that giving access to transit isn't only from and towards downtown; I would like for example to access the whole main street easily, but most of it is a minimum of 10 minutes away from the station. Not efficient for businesses and workers.
		Potential Impact of BRT on 19th Street traffic - we are told that no access to development will be allowed from 19 street.

20. Traffic Flow

- Suggestions to enhance traffic flow through the community.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The implementation of bus-only/bike lanes along 9th Avenue has been an unmitigated disaster. Under the current schema, traffic is choked at rush hour morning and afternoon. The lanes need to be mixed use all the time to ensure traffic flows smoothly without being diverted into nearby residential streets. As it is, the only ones benefiting are the police who mercilessly ticket people who are only trying to avoid traffic by driving in what are essentially unused lanes - there aren't that many buses/bikes using them.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Also, the lights at most intersections along 9th need to be timed appropriately or eliminated to ensure again that traffic flows. Presently, overlong delays, especially at intersections adjacent to rail crossings are an ongoing source of delay and aggravation.

Consideration should be given to connecting the north/south zoo road (west side of zoo) over the river to 8th street SE. This road could be then connected to an overpass which will take traffic from memorial drive to 9th ave by Fort Calgary and the overpass can go over the railroad tracks at 8th street to allow traffic to also go onto Spillar Rd. This would reduce the amount of traffic travelling on 9th ave through Inglewood.

Barriers to an open grid street network should be removed south of 9th avenue to increase all modes of mobility. (see map on page 9)

Build an overpass or underpass at train crossing at 8 st. There should be no more flat rail crossings in city. Stop CN from testing their horns and engines in Inglewood, or any other in-city crossings. This should be done in low-population rural areas.

It would be nice if we could do away with 200-car trains blocking intersections for extended periods of time.

5.5 Street Network - Need to open up street network south of 9th avenue to ensure pedestrian/cyclist/vehicular mobility is enhanced.

21. Parking Concerns

- General concern that intensification and development will create parking challenges for existing residents. Some specific debate over the impacts of parking relaxation for heritage buildings.

Page #	Section #	Comment
30		pg 30 - blackfoot dinner slated for bus transit stop. need to incorporate appropriate parking as neighbouring community will suffer from people parking on streets and will increase traffic in our area. may need to think about creating residential parking passes in our area to deter people.
	5.6.2	Also I am very concerned about density being increased without parking issues being addressed. Already in Inglewood there are streets with a solid line of parked cars in front of the houses with no room for more if we were to increase the density. This is not adequately addressed in 5.6.2. I think it is unrealistic to assume the additional density can be addressed by making the neighbourhood "walkable" and "transit friendly".
	5.6.1	This refers to section 5.6.1(e), which states that Parking relaxations should be granted when historical buildings are being protected. These parking relaxations are currently being granted in terms of a "visitors permit". This allows the vehicle to park anywhere (i.e. 2 hour zone, restricted permit zone) for any length of time. Perhaps instead of taking away parking from residents, issue these vehicles a "special permit" to park in an designated area. The allowances for these parkers is far to lenient as it is basically a 24 hour license to park anywhere.
		c. The community is working on a parking update with the BIA - more on this will be communicated soon.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

5.6 5.6
Parking policies for the community of Inglewood SHOULD have as their primary goal, sustainable parking for Inglewood residents.

5.6.1 5.6.1 e.
Giving historic apartment dwellers street parking further exacerbates the residential parking situation.

There is more traffic in Inglewood but the traffic enforcement by the Parking Authorities has not kept up. For example the 2 hour parking limit on 8th Ave SE east of 12th St. is taken advantage by people parking there all day and more and no one gets a ticket.

The east lane of 12 St SE between 9th Ave and 8th Ave is regularly blocked by vehicles accessing Spolumbos Deli and Meat Processing Facility. This causes a hazard to people turning off 9th Ave onto 12th St SE .

There have been injuries to seniors walking on 12th St SE by Spolumbos vehicles accessing the street from the alley and not watching for pedestrians.

The Parking Authorities must take a greater interest in this area and increase their patrols and enforcement capacity.

Perhaps the time has arrived for a new approach to a parking framework for Inglewood. A parking study undertaken recently by Kasian Design, through Bunt and Associates, for a proposed development at 1006 9th Ave SE points out some important factors. This study points out that Calgary's restaurant parking requirements are significantly higher than for any other Canadian municipality. It states that they should not be applied to restaurants in Inglewood, and should be modified. The central point about a parking bylaw like the existing one is that if it is too draconian it gets ignored. We need something more reasonable that can then be fairly applied. The draft ARP does indeed say that "parking requirements may be evaluated on a site-by-site basis" (p53) and "reductions may be considered" but the standards they are being compared really need to be more realistic in the first place. What will also need further elaboration is exactly how, in the case of a historic building, parking relaxations are to be granted. (p53.) Does this mean residents can park anywhere, including on permit only streets? Does it mean an allocation of spaces in a CPA lot? In the case of any major new development it does seem important to undertake a study similar to this one done by Bunt and Associates, and also to develop parking alongside the CP rail tracks as appropriate.

5.6 5.6 Do not support this. Quality of life in the community should not be sacrificed to the merchants' desire to attract more traffic to the community. We recognize merchants pay business taxes, HOWEVER, the residents pay taxes to live in this community and have reasonable expectations that their quality of life will be preserved.

5.6 Parking concerns are not addressed with enough specifics and details.

9th Avenue needs permanent parking on the south side. Would be great to have reduced traffic to encourage pop-ups and family friendly pedestrian/high-street experience.

Parking relaxations are absolutely needed for heritage buildings to be successful both as retail and residential.

Parking framework could be larger than Inglewood. Consultation with CPA possible?

We still need parking in a TOD neighbourhood. The lack of parking in Kensington has been very detrimental to businesses. Parking alongside CP rail tracks are definitely appropriate.



Parking sub-committee has been struck and will have more input. There has to be link from the mainstreets study to the ARP.

Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

22. Infrastructure Upgrades

- Interest in seeing more detail around how infrastructure maintenance and upgrades would be conducted in order to meet demands of intensification in neighbourhood.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		There are constant water main repairs throughout Inglewood money should be set aside to repair water storm and sanitary mains in the redevelopment areas as they are ancient and likely holding back the envisioned intensification.
		No mention is made of electricity infrastructure. There is a need for a plan to have electricity under ground, just as in other developing districts of Calgary. Now, when construction is proceeding with public and residential projects, it is not only an opportunity (financial & organizational), but also a requirement to have a plan and timeline in place to accomplish a visually non-intrusive electric infrastructure.
		Population density places stress on sewage infrastructure - sufficient pipelines to treatment facilities. Is there a plan to match needs with projections?

23. Contamination

- Concern about environmental contamination requirements being met prior to allowing any residential development.

Page #	Section #	Comment
31	3.7.2	Pge 31, 3.7.2: consideration as to environmental contamination requirements should be met prior to allowing any residential development

24. Flood Mitigation

- Concern that more could be done to ensure flood resiliency in the community, as well as suggesting limits on development in areas that have substantial flood risk.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		And how about reinforcing the banks along the Inglewood side of the river. The Zoo looks like a fortress now and our banks are being eroded at an alarming rate. But no one from the city is doing anything about this issue.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

The plan completely overlooks the fact that the existing Inglewood flood wall is no longer sufficient for flood protection in the long term. What is the point of allowing intensification if it is not protected from flooding? If the brewery site and the Blackfoot site are allowed to intensify without additional protection, I imagine that the finish floor elevations in this area will be very high, and this will detract from the overall quality of the public realm. The Loblaws site in the East Village is an excellent example of what this actually looks like -- retail development completely divorced from the streetscape due to a fortification of stairs, ramps and retaining walls.

The mitigation for flooding is not a priority as nothing has been done to secure the banks and make Inglewood less prone to flooding. With the fortification of the Zoo, it will send the waters directly into Inglewood impacting us in the future. This is a drastic change and one the city has neglected to ensure that Inglewood is just as protected as the zoo across the river.

6.5 I believe this should have been to page 60 as that is where the section ends
 Section 6.5 - We may want to consider a statement to ensure densification in the floodway goes not go beyond what is outlined in the ARP. A majority of Inglewood is located in the flood fringe so densification beyond what is outlined in the ARP could have a negative impact on emergency evacuation in the event of a flood. We cannot count on a project like the springbank dry dam being completed in the near future. Further densification may need to be linked to future works.

General concern about the Inglewood flood wall and bank protection. ARP may not be the palce to address upgrading the bank protection, but is there a document to reference river bank protection (as this is a provincal areas)?

59 11 Page 59 - Map 11 - If there is another flood of similar magnitude to 2013, this map will become out of date. Is there a way to update maps in the ARP if there are significant changes?

25. Alternative & District Energy

- Interest in district and alternative energy split between comments in strong support and those concerned about the public cost of the plan.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	6.1	6.1 Renewable and low carbon technologies should only be considered where justified economically on their own (without any public money), as well as technically, which means that there is no need for a specific policy as they should attract investment on their own merit.
		This section is full of "should" recommendations, which are not statutory in any way, and "should" be reworded to be more restrictive and encourage sustainable development.
		Flood mitigation and development with that risk considered is essential. Having an energy district system created is a very good idea, but planning for it must start immediately, if it is to be beneficial in the medium term, so it can be accommodated and new buildings and developments be obligated to engage with it. Again, additional density will be required throughout the subject area to make an effective energy district system feasible.

26. Sound Concerns

- Interest in seeing more done to address noise concerns from traffic and rail.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Page #	Section #	Comment
30		pg 30 - sound barrier along blackfoot from traffic due to BRT noise along blackfoot should be considered.
		Build an overpass or underpass at train crossing at 8 st. There should be no more flat rail crossings in city. Stop CN from testing their horns and engines in Inglewood, or any other in-city crossings. This should be done in low-population rural areas.
		City needs to address new process for managing noise complaints in railyard. 3-1-1 is not working.
		CP Rail's ongoing flagrant flouting of judicial orders to cease/desist their noisy and polluting activities in the overnight hours is utterly scandalous. Is there no way to hold what has become a very, very bad neighbour to account? Horns blasting at 3 am, shunting activities, load testing... These are not only noisy, but actually unhealthy to all those living in the immediate vicinity. Remember, this situation arose as a result of the consolidation of CP's many diesel servicing activities in one place - Alyth. It's an outrage that this situation is allowed to persist.

Other Feedback

27. Relationship to other plans

- Interest in seeing specific references within this plan to other related City plans and documents.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The new ARP should link to the Infill Guidelines
		Much of the main Street issues will be dealt with in a separate document which should be linked into the ARP
		There is insufficient information in the plan to provide direction on Open Space and Parks. There is no reference to Bend in the Bow, which is a long-range redevelopment plan for Pearce Estate Park, the former Ball Diamonds, Inglewood Bird Sanctuary, and the woodlands.
		There will need to be an explicit linkage of the work being done for the Mainstreet study to the ARP. The issues on 9th Ave are complex, and include parking, bus lanes, the needs of cyclists and pedestrians etc. My own view is that the current draft of the ARP is correct in not trying to put a cycle connection all the way down 9th.Ave. It shows it moving off 9th Ave onto either 8th Ave or the bike path itself along the river. This is wise. As a cyclist I can say that I never go down 9th heading West beyond 14th St. It's too dangerous, unfair to traffic and you risk being hit by a car door opening. The business community needs to have permanent parking on the south side, and pedestrians are protected by it. Crossing over 9th Ave even at the lights can be a risky business, and so even though there will always be through traffic on 9th it HAS to be controlled. A 40km speed limit would really help. (Have you been to Banff recently? It's 30kph!).
		3. Transportation - There needs to be a link to the anything derived in the Mainstreet study (parking, number of lanes or anything else), from the ARP.



As noted there has to be linkage between the ARP and the Mainstreet's planning. Traffic flow down 9th Ave, the needs of businesses, and the safety of pedestrians are major issues. A more holistic approach to parking is needed.

Where doe the streetscape masterplan get referenced in this document?
Does the infill guidelines document get referenced in this document?
Need references to the streetscapes master plan
Why can different business units have connectivity in this document if their policies affect these policies (transportation and 9th ave).
Clarify linkages between Mainstreets, DAG, ARP.
Parking Strategy?
How does this document connect with the street-scape master plan for Inglewood? Can the master-plan be referenced in this document? (ie, 9th ave Mainstreet in particular?)

28. Figures & Maps

- Suggestions for changes to included maps or figures.

Page #	Section #	Comment
19		The map on page 19 has an incorrect green space by 15A St SE (plans to put in senior housing). b. Ninth Avenue and Main Street (3.4) is car-centric in photos and needs to articulate that permanent parking on the south side is beneficial to business and pedestrians. Some height issues need clarification and there are some errors on the current maps. Please keep community members informed when new flood maps become available.
	3.4	Images here don't actually capture the essence of a pedestrian friendly community space. (Is there something from the 9th ave masterplan document that could be used?)
	3.4	Photos look car-centric. Should 1200 block be better, or better yet, what 9th ave could look like from the street scapes master plan.
	2.2	Rendering shown does not seem appropriate to show "the heart of the community".
10		Brewery figure 2 on page 10 needs to be replaced. The site has not looked like that since the 1950s or earlier and subsequent expansions have modified these structures.
17	fig 4	Where/what is this?

29. Definitions & Clarity

- Requests for additional clarity or definitions within the document.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	4.1.4	4.1.4.b – not certain what this means.
	5.4.2	5.4.2 c. Circulation Please clarify. I don't understand what this means.
	3.2.1	3.2.1 and 3.2.2 - References to Hurst Road, most of 11th Street and 26th Avenue are in Ramsay.



Inglewood ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Can we have definition?

3.1.8 Clarify what is meant by Stations (only LRT, or also BRT)?

30. Planning & Engagement Process

- Suggestions around the planning and engagement process.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		I understand that the Inglewood ARP is close to finalization but will be held up until the completion of three other community ARP's. I want to say that I believe the Inglewood ARP process should not be linked to the others and should be completed as quickly as possible given the amount of activity and development being proposed in the community. Thank you
		this survey was sent out by the City without any prior communication to the Community. This is really inappropriate to give such a short timeline for turnaround, as it produces a lot of resentment. Put the shoe on the other foot, simply COMMUNICATE!
		The new ARP cannot leave the community in a lesser position than currently exists. Rights that exist now, such as the link to the Infill Guidelines, must remain.
		This survey was poorly advertised for Inglewood. I only found out about it in the last few days. There were no signs or flyers.

31. Nothing Noted

Page #	Section #	Comment
		no comments
		for the most part, I am in agreement
	3.3	3.3 No comment
	3.5	3.5 No comment.
	3.7	3.7 No comment.
	3.8	3.8 No comment.
	3.1	3,10 No comment.
	3.11	3.11 Generally support, but not certain what is intended by 3.11.2. Care facilities should be equally distributed throughout the City and not concentrated in certain communities.
		no comments
		ok
		Good.
		no comments
		ok
		Good.
		No additional comments.