



Millican-Ogden 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 Millican-Ogden started with a design concept developed as part of a 2015 Transit Oriented Development study and community design charrette. This initial concept was refined and translated into a draft policy plan through subsequent public engagement in 2016 and additional planning work by The City of Calgary. In the spring of 2017, The City of Calgary shared a draft Area Redevelopment Plan for Millican-Ogden that looks to reflect community priorities, while also aligning with overarching policies in 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 Millican-Ogden. 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. This volunteer opportunity was advertised throughout the community and online, and interested participants were asked to submit an application to The City. Members were selected for this committee by The City of Calgary's Engagement Resource Unit and were purposefully chosen to try to provide a wide variety of local perspectives. As a result, this group included resident home-owners and renters, people who worked in the area, business owners, local developers or real-estate professionals, and community association members.

The Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee for Millican-Ogden met four times over the course of October & November of 2017.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

1. The first meeting for this group brought together ARC members for Ramsay, Millican-Ogden, and South Hill/Riverbend to see a background presentation on the Community Planning process in The City of Calgary and to discuss the purpose and limitations of an Area Redevelopment Plan.
2. The second meeting for the group included only the Millican-Ogden community members and included a detailed walk-through of the draft plan by the community planner who had developed it.
3. The third meeting began 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.
4. The fourth 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 the public feedback that had been collected through the 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 Millican-Ogden 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. Community Character & Historic Resources
 - Concerns that heritage planning is missing as a section, that maintaining and encouraging character is not highlighted as important to the community. Also specific concerns related to “Oggie Ogden” art and lack of Lynnwood representation.
2. Building Blocks & Building Heights
 - Concerns about Building Block types and amount of density being proposed in specific areas. Would like more explanation of why density is being proposed in certain areas and to look more holistically at how to better integrate density within the community.
3. Southeast Calgary Resource Centre
 - Concerns regarding the future of the Southeast Calgary Resource Centre, possible relocation and how/when logistical concerns related to a move in location would be handled.
4. Legion Site
 - Concerns about identifying the Legion site as a potential redevelopment site because of barriers to economic feasibility of redevelopment due to private ownership of site, land cost, demolition costs and desirability of site with proposed underpass at 78 Avenue SE.
5. Seniors' & Affordable Housing
 - Would like to see seniors and affordable housing built into the plan and on specific sites within the community (e.g. the Millican Ogden Community Association site). Concerns with the way that seniors and affordable housing are addressed in the ARP and higher-level policy documents (e.g. Developed Areas Guidebook).
6. Active Frontage
 - Concern with appropriateness of Ogden Road SE being identified for Active Frontage without current and future traffic volume being addressed. Comment about possible extension of Active Frontage to Millican Road SE and 78 Avenue SE.
7. Safety
 - Concerns raised around lack of proactive police presence, desire for more police presence and possible police station added within community. Some concerns raised around potential increases to loitering, transient populations and crime with improved Transit access and transit stations and shelters in the community.

Open Space Feedback

8. Park/Playfield Redevelopment, Open Space and Parks
 - Concerns that the ARP identifies “open space” that is perceived as unsuitable or unusable for the public as there is already a lack of usable recreational spaces for local residents and the ARP doesn't address or look to improve usable parks and recreational open space for locals.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

9. George Moss Park

- Concerned with appropriateness of specifically identifying location of future seniors housing within George Moss Park as well as concern that there is not enough substance around the future vision of George Moss Park.

10. Recreation Facilities

- Clarification sought around the Future Regional Recreation Facility, its features, connection with Lacrosse facility and any known issues with the site.

11. Beaver Dam Flats

- Concern with lack of inclusion of Beaver Dam Flats and Old Refinery Park in the ARP and future vision for Beaver Dam Flats.

Mobility Feedback

12. Ogden Road SE

- Clarification needed around the intended type of roadway planned for Ogden Road SE (e.g. number of lanes, intent to include of bike lanes, truck route, traffic volume and flow, etc.) and the relationship between the type of road, the impacts to business and the appropriateness of incorporating pedestrian and cycling elements. Concerns about the area identified as part of the Complete Streets.

13. 18 / 18A Street SE

- Concerns with the volume and speed of traffic on 18 Street SE, continued increases in volume rather than reduction in traffic with inclusion of the overpass and that although volume is deemed as acceptable to The City, speed has been raised by the community and not addressed. Community is concerned with safety presently and is worried problem will get worse with inclusion of LRT station.

14. 78 Avenue SE

- Concerns related to current and future use of 78 Avenue SE as a truck route along with traffic flow and pedestrian safety.

15. 74 Avenue & 72 Avenue SE

- Concern about traffic flow and intersections on 74 Avenue and 72 Avenue SE.

16. Lynnview Road SE and Millican Road SE

- Confirm intended future use of Millican Road SE and Lynnview Road SE and look at potential to be used as a pedestrian pathway and cycling bikeway.

17. Park and Ride

- Concern about the relationship between location of Park and Ride and impacts to open space and Ogden Road SE traffic flow and parking.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

18. Community Parking

- Underground parking suggested to maximize space, along with concerns it is too expensive and that on-street parking should be expected. Concern about the impact of parking removal on local businesses.

19. Connectivity

- Access and connections to Pop Davies Park and the LRT Stations is currently seen as an issue that is not well addressed in the ARP. Concern for overall pathway and bikeway connection in the area and gaps in ARP related to Regional Pathway.

20. Bike Lanes

- Concern about the inclusion and amount of bike lanes that are suggested in ARP.

Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

21. CP Plume Area

- Concern that development will not be realized in the CP Plume Area. Clarification about who would be responsible for remedy, etc. is needed.

22. Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area

- Concern that the term 'contamination' should not be used in document because remediation has taken place and the term 'reclamation' should be used to focus on more positive current and future state rather than negative past tense.

23. District and Alternative Energy

- Positive comments related to the use of district energy system overall and related to specific area

Other Feedback

24. Maps

- Specific feedback on updates or changes to maps.

25. Suggested Changes

- Specific feedback on updates or changes to wording in the document.

26. Process

- Clarification needed about the ARP process, the purpose of an ARP versus connected city-wide policies, who can provide input, how feedback is considered, etc.

27. Names (Neighbourhoods, Parks, etc.)

- Concern that generic labels such as "Neighbourhood A" have been used rather than formal community names that already exist. Alternatively, there is concern that formal names such as 'Lynnwood Park' have been created within the document without consultation or explanation of origin.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

28. Definitions

- Some terms used in the documents are not explained or defined and are therefore not understood (e.g. complete streets, transit mobility hub, live-work, formalized path).

29. Plan Boundaries

- Concern that historical aspects, such as South Hill being part of Ogden pre-Glenmore Trail, should be captured but are not. Concern that the Glenmore Inn lands should be part of the Millican-Ogden ARP versus South Hill.

30. Implementation

- Concern that the title "Implementation Plan" is misrepresentative.

31. Population Projections

- Desire to include population projections and/or future density targets.

32. Example Photos

- Desire to include imagery within Land Use Concept Elements section.

33. Station Location and Design

- Specific concerns about station location, station location consultation, and impacts to personal property.

34. Nothing Noted

- Comments that didn't address any concerns.

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,
- could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement,
- are already embodied in the draft ARP,
- may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP, and why.



Verbatim Comments

Land Use Concept Feedback

1. Community Character & Historic Resources
 - Concerns that heritage planning is missing as a section, that maintaining and encouraging character is not highlighted as important to the community. Also specific concerns related to “Oggie Ogden” art and lack of Lynnwood representation.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The plan mentions the historic importance of Ogden but offers next to nothing in terms of protecting the historic fabric of the community. An example is the lack of specific policy on historic protection under section 3. In contrast the draft Ramsay ARP has specific points on protecting historic character (i.e., 3.1.2). The Ogden ARP needs to have stronger wording on recognizing and protecting the historic fabric of Ogden.
	3.7	Section 3.7 is too brief and needs to be expanded into additional sections. There is nothing on Placemaking and Building Character or Historic Conservation (see below). A section on Heritage Conservation needs to added to the plan. See section 3.8 in the draft Ramsay ARP for an example of what needs to be included. Ogden is one of the oldest communities in Calgary with an important historic role in the city. The draft ARP glosses over this and offers little in historic preservation or policy.
19		P. 19 "Oggie Ogden" art is inappropriate-- it's quite hokey and does not conform to the public art policy Oggie is dated and unsafe. There is a reason CP took it down, let's keep it there. Oggie - Suggest reconsidering its use at the Ogden Greenline Station - CP took it down for safety reasons. Can the City of Calgary assure safety without having to build a high fence around it. Also, as Oggie is not an appealing piece of art, and with the goal of revitalizing Ogden Rd with the coming of the Greenline, it could be in conflict with this revitalization process (physical appearance and relevance).
23	3.3.4	Page 23, Section 3.3.4. Question the vision for 62nd avenue – area is already well established.
		Include when Lynnwood became a neighbourhood (1956?) / residential / community / development
20	3.2.4	Important that The City support unique architecture as opposed to approving DRPs at present: lots of infill coming up & all in dark colors. Lynnwood info inclusion is very important. Platform stations are named: Lynnwood/Millican, Ogden, South Hill. Provide short info on each. Please include a short write-up on the history of Lynnwood.
		No more CPR and train art in the neighbourhood. CPR does not support us a community, just had an office there.



Presentation of character guidelines? E.g. Inglewood consultation

- 2. Building Blocks and Building Heights
 - Concerns about Building Block types and amount of density being proposed in specific areas. Would like more explanation of why density is being proposed in certain areas and to look more holistically at how to better integrate density within the community.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		There is too much emphasis on low rise residential in the plan (particularly neighbourhoods A & B). It is too extensive (needs to be limited to frontage of 'collector' streets such as 18 Street and 76 Avenue. In particular, there is too much concentration around George Moss Park which is presently a mix of single and dual homes. The Ramsay ARP limits low rise residential to the frontage major streets, with none of the large areas that are seen in the Ogden APR (see the lack of low rise planned for around the St Anne Academic Center in Ramsay). This much low rise residential in one area is too concentrated and will dramatically change the character of Ogden. Residents (and community board) have been consistent in their opposition to these drastic zoning changes yet the City continues to ignore our valid concerns.
		The plan mentions an area of 'Neighbourhood – Mid Rise' in neighbourhood A with very little background. What is the vision for this area. This needs to be expanded in the plan. It seems odd to place such a concentrated amount of residential in a relatively isolated area of the community. If this to be for affordable housing then it should be stated.
		The Ogden ARP uses 'Community - Mid Rise' while the Ramsay ARP uses 'Neighbourhood - Mid Rise'. What are the differences between the two and why the use of one over the other for planning purposes?
		Overall - the density of this area should be increased, particularly closer to the planned LRT stations. This is particularly true for the planned station near Pop Davies park, where present density will not provide sufficient numbers for good use of this station, without a significant increase in allowable density in this northern node.
13		Map Page 13 Map section C Neighbourhood limited. And on page 14. Concern is the comment on potential for secondary suites. This area is zero clearance lots, with driveway which restricts parking. The area on the west side of 18 St has no back allies, again limiting off street parking. While there are some houses with illegal secondary streets, these generally attract some undesirable renters. This is creating parking problems, yards and driveways that tend to collect a lot of junk. Should really avoid secondary suites when there is lack of on street parking.
24	3.4.3	Page 24, Section 3.4.3. Question the live/work units along 18th street between 66th and 69th avenue. The exiting housing does not front 18th street; only their backyards. *See comments under section "Other" in regards to concern over "Life/work" concept. Building heights should be limited in area of LRT stations to 2 storeys, with fire suppression mandatory.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

I disagree with the max 2 story development idea, I think they need to add a lot of dense housing because with transit comes population. (I agree, me too).

3.2.4 Minimum of 4 stories removed. Hindering smaller developers from buying lands. Stipulation w// building code makes it more expensive when over 4 stories. Greater chance of success for getting development that fits within the community. DAG doesn't imply minimum heights for community mid-rise.

AVPA - Can you build 6 stories?

3. Southeast Calgary Resource Centre

- Concerns regarding the future of the Southeast Calgary Resource Centre, possible relocation and how/when logistical concerns related to a move in location would be handled.

Page #	Section #	Comment
17	3.1.8	Page 17, Section 3.1.8. Future Comprehensive Plan Area as per Area A of Map 3, page 13 – as this is the area where Calgary Housing is located, where can we assume the South East Calgary Community Resource Centre will be relocated and when relocation will be required; where will the funds come for the rent as at present Calgary Housing charges a minimal fee (less than \$10 per lease) and the three funders do not provide funds for rent.
31	3.7.4	Page 31, Section 3.7.4. Question the ability to identify a site for the possible relocation of the South East Calgary Community Resource Centre as the question of funding has yet to be addressed – will the City be covering the cost of rent if such a relocation is required as MOCA and the funders do not have such funds.
	3.7.4	"Location of resource center 600m" limits potential options of future sites. Should remove 600m. Walkable to station is nice but not necessary. Concerned with getting free space in a high value area.
	map 3	Area A. How did this get added? Was not in any previous draft. Area A has our SECCRC. Please correct.
	map 3	Need map to remove Future Comprehensive Plan Area as the SECCRC is there.

4. Legion Site

- Concerns about identifying the Legion site as a potential redevelopment site because of barriers to economic feasibility of redevelopment due to private ownership of site, land cost, demolition costs and desirability of site with proposed underpass at 78 Avenue SE.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The Legion should be turned in to a community recreation facility, with the Moca as lead tenant and free.
18	3.2	Page 18, 3.2: The old Legion site is privately owned so question how the following statement can be made: "This location is identified as a redevelopment opportunity to provide locally focused commercial services in a mixed-used format."



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

3.2.7 3.2.7 An under-pass in 78 Ave will change the character of Ogden Rd (truck route) South of 78 Ave and will not invite anyone to develop the old Legion site to Active Frontage.

Changes to 78 ave will put at risk any young children that may use this site.

3.2.11 3.2.11 This idea is not economically feasible for another 100 years! The current owner has tried to do something with it for over 5 years but done nothing but lose money. He showed me an appraisal that states the property is worth over \$ 9 M. Yet, any potential buyer would not only have to pay a lot of money for the land, this plan would require demolition of the building to build something that would fit the policies of 3.1.8. which have been torpedoed by this section of Ogden Rd becoming a truck route. This site should be removed from the plan's constraints and be dealt with separately if we ever want to see some development. It is a unique site and the City should be open to it being made useful possibly under its original (SP-CI) zoning.

5. Seniors' & Affordable Housing

- Would like to see seniors and affordable housing built into the plan and on specific sites within the community (e.g. the Millican Ogden Community Association site). Concerns with the way that that seniors and affordable housing are addressed in the ARP and higher-level policy documents (e.g. Developed Areas Guidebook).

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The current Moca building should be turned into seniors housing or sold for housing, maximum 3 storeys.
3.7.2	3.7.2	In general the aging population of the Community lacks the means to access seniors' housing. The word "affordable" should be inserted and the plan should indicate ways to make such development attractive. "As-is", the plan is "pie-in-the-sky".
		I would like to see protection of affordable housing. These folks need opportunities too, under the future comprehensive definition in the guidebook, it doesn't list affordable housing. I think affordable housing should be designated.
		Suggestion: consider lands of the MOCA Hall and Office. Tear these buildings down due to their age and rebuild as a building complex with senior housing on floors 2 to 4 and main floor to function as the MOCA offices and hall with hall space, break out rooms and kitchen. Also add basement space for other community uses.
3.7.2	3.7.2	Clause C "Seniors housing 200m from transit". Remove this. Handcuffs developers to where seniors housing should go, limits the options. However, should be encouraging more transit.
		Can affordable housing be dictated by an ARP?
		Where would the MOCA hall and office go if this occurred?
		If the City Charter is looking to address affordable housing and protecting it. Would this affect the ARP? I think having affordable housing near transit is very important.
		What, if any, is the plan for the CHC site? (Seniors living?)



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

6. Active Frontage

- Concern with appropriateness of Ogden Road SE being identified for Active Frontage without current and future traffic volume being addressed. Comment about possible extension of Active Frontage to Millican Road SE and 78 Avenue SE.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The draft plan talks of making Ogden Road the neighbourhood center with active frontage from 69th south to 74 Avenue. Frontage should be extended north to Millican Road and south to 78 Avenue.
	3.2.5	3.2.5 The Plan gives no recognition to the fact that Ogden Rd is a very busy artery and not compatible with attractive Active Frontage. To make it more attractive, traffic volume will have to be reduced. As much as that is possible, this traffic will find alternate routes through the Community and the Plan does not deal with this.

7. Safety

- Concerns raised around lack of proactive police presence, desire for more police presence and possible police station added within community. Some concerns raised around potential increases to loitering, transient populations and crime with improved Transit access and transit stations and shelters in the community.

Page #	Section #	Comment
19		HIDDEN -- P. 19 "heated waiting areas" in my experience promote loitering and antisocial behaviour. Monitoring and enforcement would be required
		Mostly agree with the first point, but think the shelters should be kept – especially with Calgary’s winter/winds. Enforcement is expensive, perhaps cameras and adequate lighting would be best.
		I agree with increased police presence, not because of homeless people, but because there isn’t enough as it is.
		Would CPS be willing/afford a community police station?
		The bike path that serves Millican-Ogden area from downtown can be a boon to workers living in this area and to the south and working down town. However, it has also led to a drastic increase in transient or homeless people walking or biking into the area. On any street these people can be seen going through recycle bins, and garbage bins, and store or shopping plaza garbage bins.
		I think the largest gap is the lack of Police patrolling the area. When police are in the area it is largely responding to a call and not on a proactive basis. The location of the Lynwood LRT station is relatively remote. I do believe there are a number of transient people using the bushes along the west ridge of the area above where the LRT station will be built which could lead to a lot of pan handling. As well, being remote, there may be problems with vehicles being prowled, damaged, or stolen as well as other criminal activity. I would hope this is well addressed.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Open Space Feedback

8. Park/Playfield Redevelopment

- Concerns that the ARP identifies “open space” that is perceived as unsuitable or unusable for the public as there is already a lack of usable recreational spaces for local residents and the ARP doesn’t address or look to improve usable parks and recreational open space for locals.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		While Ogden has an abundance of open space, much of it is unusable for recreation or is limited in its opportunities. The Ogden ARP needs to address this in the objectives rather than pretend residents have a wealth of parks to use when reality is different.
		One obvious example is the lack of parks and recreation opportunities for residents south of 76 Avenue. Open space is either unsuitable (steep slopes) or of limited use (private school yard). How open space and parks are to be added in this area needs to be addressed in the plan. As an example, children playing basketball are forced to use hoops in the parking lot at the former Ogden School site due to the lack of park space.
map 5		Map 5 needs to more accurately reflect the present use of parks in the community. Pop Davies Park is identified as the only athletic park which I feel is incorrect. George Moss Park (3 ball fields, tennis courts) and Lynnwood Park(4 ball fields, soccer fields) are athletic parks in all but name. Both provide regional recreational opportunities at the expense of opportunities for local residents. This is a major issue in the community and the plan needs to address how local recreation needs are to be met.
		DUPLICATE - Putting the Pop Davies LRT station at the top of Lynnwood Ridge (including park-n-ride) would serve the greatest number of users, also allowing for development of an urban park to revitalize the area.
	4.2.4	"Ball diamonds, playing fields"... add "and parking lot." I would very much appreciate if current green-spaces could remain intact as this is one of the most appealing features of this area. Old trees, wide streets and large parks are indicative of why people chose to move there.
35	4.2.5	Pg. 35 4.2.5 This statement is vague. Opportunities for community connectivity through the escarpment. This escarpment is frequented by vast species of wildlife and therefor residents must be consulted prior to any land disturbance. Any developments other than maintaining parkland will be strongly condemned. This area is a critical wildlife belt and needs to remain undisturbed. Can we require a wildlife assessment and designate areas as wildlife areas? Consider +15 across park to eliminate ability for slips, trips & falls given winter climate.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

9. George Moss Park

- Concerned with appropriateness of specifically identifying location of future seniors housing within George Moss Park as well as concern that there is not enough substance around the future vision of George Moss Park.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		I believe there should be a strong push to use a corner of George Moss for Seniors Housing
		The section on adding senior housing to George Moss Park needs to be removed from the ARP. It is biased towards adding housing to the park prior to any public consultation. I find its specific inclusion in the plan disappointing. This is a planning/community issue that is separate from the ARP. Too often statements such as these have a tendency to become fact.
		The plan mentions several times the importance of George Moss Park in the community redevelopment but only provides a brief outline on what is envisioned. This park presently offers very little to local residents (small playground, old tennis court) with and is used almost entirely as an athletic park. There are not even any paths or sidewalks in the park. George Moss has the potential to be jewel in the community but its present use and policy in the ARP does nothing to achieve this.
35		P. 35 George Moss Park should not be considered for seniors housing. Ogden Road would be more suitable. Recreational opportunities in George Moss park should be re-evaluated and updated. A skateboard park would be an excellent addition. The flat area could double as an excellent base surface for the temporary ice rink that locals have been pouring for many years.
	4.2.1	Not clear, does everything need to face NE? Needs clarity or to be removed.

10. Recreation Facilities

- Clarification sought around the Future Regional Recreation Facility, its features, connection with Lacrosse facility and any known issues with the site.

Page #	Section #	Comment
36	4.28	The Future Regional Recreation Facility presents an opportunity to add local recreational features that are badly needed in south Ogden. Policy that mentions including such features need to be included in the plan (page 36, section 4.28).
36	4.2.8	Page 36, 4.2.8. Future Regional Recreation Facility – will this facility be part of the proposed Lacrosse facility and if so, can we know the reason behind the delay in the Lacrosse Association in moving forward.
36	4.2.8	Future Regional Rec Facility. Lacrosse was to build there but apparently problems with the site. Is there contamination/land problem?



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

11. Beaver Dam Flats

- Concern with lack of inclusion of Beaver Dam Flats and Old Refinery Park in the ARP and future vision for Beaver Dam Flats.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Beaver dam Flats and Old Refinery park need to be included within the ARP. Why have they been excluded. These regional parks are an important part of Ogden and should be addressed in the plan. Pretending they do not exist does a disservice to the parks and community.
		Although it mentions abundant open space and parks, there has been little use of Beaver Dam park because of the cleanup and damage from flooding and not just the flood a few years ago but in a lot of years. Access to Beaver Dam park for the elderly is very limited if not accessible at all for the elderly. Because of lack of Police patrols, the Park is often subject to vandalism and youth drinking parties. Leave the flats alone.
56		Bow River - Parks has deemed this a naturalized area. It is not a recreational area. It used to be that, would like to see that again. (Remove title of recreational area, as this is no longer a recreational area).

Mobility Feedback

12. Ogden Road SE

- Clarification needed around the intended type of roadway planned for Ogden Road SE (e.g. number of lanes, intent to include of bike lanes, truck route, traffic volume and flow, etc.) and the relationship between the type of road, the impacts to business and the appropriateness of incorporating pedestrian and cycling elements. Concerns about the area identified as part of the Complete Streets.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Ogden road should be made in to a 3 lanes each direction, with one-lane dedicated for parking and/or bicycle lanes.
		I am deeply concerned as a business owner in Ogden and a resident with the potential negative impact the long vision will have on the community. Am concerned with the redevelopment of Ogden Road and the placement of tracks across Ogden road as they will impede the great traffic flow Ogden road has. More than 30% of my business is as the result of commuters passing through community by car on their way home. If anything is done like tracks at grade across Ogden road this will cause traffic that chooses Ogden road as an alternative to Deerfoot from downtown to Douglasdale to look for other routes.
		Some assurance that traffic in the area won't increase to annoyance levels. We've seen a substantial increase in area traffic since the opening of Quarry Park.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

5.5.4 5.5.4 Where will the very high volume of traffic go that will be further restricted? As much as items a - i sound nice will there be a commitment to funding these and other promises with the adoption of the Plan?

map 9 Map 9 shows the 'Complete Streets' for Ogden Road ending at 76 Avenue while text states it is to 78 Avenue. Needs to be clarified.

44 The section (page 44) on Ogden Road states that (a) there will be one permanent lane of travel in each direction; and (b). on-street parking during off-peak hours. Does this mean Ogden Road will have four lanes of traffic through the community? This another example where the ARP appears to be hiding major changes to the community. In addition there should be specific points on enhancing the pedestrian experience along Ogden Road (lighting, wider sidewalks, etc.).

Community needs Ogden road to remain open as is without bike paths or other things that will hurt it traffic flow. The Strain if it must cross Ogden road should do so through a tunnel under it.

5.1.2 5.1.2 High commuter volumes on Ogden Rd and a Truck Route South of 78 Ave do not make for pleasant walking or bicycling along it.

13. 18 / 18A Street SE

- Concerns with the volume and speed of traffic on 18 Street SE, continued increases in volume rather than reduction in traffic with inclusion of the overpass and that although volume is deemed as acceptable to The City, speed has been raised by the community and not addressed. Community is concerned with safety presently and is worried problem will get worse with inclusion of LRT station.

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

I'm glad 18 St is mentioned. It's a huge alternate route for traffic to/from Riverbend and Douglasdale. Some assert that it's due to the lack of opportunity to make a left turn onto Ogden Rd north but that does not explain the traffic returning south during afternoon rush hour. I understand there will be traffic signals installed at 76 Ave and Ogden Rd. I'm not convinced this will solve the problem.

There is far too many people cutting through the area, particularly on 18 St. SE. from Ogden Road/Millican Road to and through Glenmore Trail. The corner of 18 St. SE and 66 ave S.E is extremely busy during school opening and closing hours, and during morning and afternoon rush hour. There is rampant speeding along the whole 18 St.. This includes the Playground/School zone in front of the schools on 66 ave and south along 18 St.! As well, during these hours crossing 18 St at the few true intersections is next to impossible with poorly marked cross walks, lack of cross walks. As well the intersection of 18 St and 69 Ave SE turning South bound on 18 St from 69 Ave is very difficult at the above times. There should be 3 way stop or lights controlling this intersection if the traffic cutting through continues. I don't think opening of the Glenmore overpass at Ogden Road and to the east has made any difference as the traffic cutting through is going North and South. This is made much worse when Deerfoot Trail is grid locked.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

The traffic needs to be deterred from using 18a street. We need to stop the flow of unnecessary traffic using this street. The traffic using this street as a "cut through" is causing major concern for people and children on the street. People in this area have taken to using the back alleys to walk to get mail, bike or stroll the neighbourhood due to the high volume of speeding traffic on 18a Street. This has been brought up at the C.O.W.'s that were held in the last couple years and it seems to fall on deaf ears. The neighbourhood is losing faith that our concerns will be addressed in this new A.R.P. The volume of traffic using 18 street and 18A street (between 62nd and 66th avenues) may fall within the acceptable volume amounts for the what the road can physically handle based on the city's guidelines but it is traffic that doesn't need to be there in the first place. This will only get worse as people begin cutting through the neighbourhood to access the C-train station at the bottom of Millican Road. Please address this unnecessary traffic volume NOW before it gets worse. It is the single biggest threat to the character of Lynnwood/Millican Estates/Ogden. If the area is considered a shortcut to another location it will never be thought of as a destination.

45	5.5.7	Page 45, Section 5.5.7 – Important to have a pedestrian crosswalk at the top of the hill of 18th street SE to ensure pedestrian safety when crossing.
	5.5.7	18th street and Lusander Dr. needs pedestrian crossing. Currently a dangerous crossing for pedestrians. I wonder about a more complete description of "Full Street" as it may apply to 18 Street SE. There is a need to cut back on short cutting that results in speeding on this street. I am sure there are ways available to limit traffic on 18 Street SE. It was hoped that with the completion of the interchange at Glenmore and Ogden Road the short cutting would decrease. I have seen the reverse and if anything it has become worse.

14. 78 Avenue SE

- Concerns related to current and future use of 78 Avenue SE as a truck route along with traffic flow and pedestrian safety.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		78 Avenue is identified as potentially being extended east of the CPR tracks with the eventual closure of 69 Avenue. Is this a done deal? I have seen City designs for the road showing the planned extension. Where is the public consultation? What is envisioned? Will there be ped/cyclist access? How/if will commercial trucks access the road through Ogden? Will it the follow the policies in the draft ARP.
		Attended the community engagement where residents spoke about 78 th . Would love to see trucks using 31 st street via Barlow trail.
		Will the trucking route be changed to only allow trucks coming off Glenmore trail into 78 th ?
		Should the 78 underpass under the tracks be realized, it is important to make this a vehicle only route and not a truck route as it goes through an established residential community. No community in the City of Calgary would tolerate the creation of a truck route down one of its residential streets. The City of Calgary should not expect for it to be okay for Ogden residents as they too are Calgary residents.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

15. 74 Avenue & 72 Avenue SE

- Concern about traffic flow and intersections on 74 Avenue and 72 Avenue SE.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Interface at 74 Avenue and Ogden Road needs to be addressed within the Street Network. This intersection will be an important cross point for residents accessing the Ogden LRT station but there is no mention in the document (that I could find). At the very least this intersection requires a signalized pedestrian crossing. Including the avenue within the Complete Streets (George Moss Park to Ogden Road) should also be considered.
		In consideration of 72 Avenue SE as a direct connection and gateway to the Ogden LRT Station (Section 5.5.6, Page 45) and potential for use as a future transit route (Section 5.4.4, Page 44), improvements to 72 Avenue SE should additionally include bulb-outs at intersections to calm traffic and provide protected pedestrian crossings with access to George Moss Park.
45		P. 45 Interesting that 74 Ave is not mentioned. It desperately requires traffic calming measures as it is used as a "shortcut" to/from Ogden road and runs along George Moss park and is a playground zone.

16. Lynnview Road SE and Millican Road SE

- Confirm intended future use of Millican Road SE and Lynnview Road SE and look at potential to be used as a pedestrian pathway and cycling bikeway.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	map 8	Map 8 identifies a section of Lynnview Road for future closure but there is no text outlining what is envisioned. Aside from the obvious questions that need to be addressed in the ARP (Why? When?) there is question if the road is closed will there still be pedestrian/cyclist access, etc. Who is pushing for the permanent closure? Is it the City or local residents living along Lynnview Ridge?
		Section on extending Millican Road needs to either be removed or made more specific. Such broad statements in plans have troubling tendency of becoming reality with consultation. There are obvious concerns from Ogden residents about short cutting if this is built as stated in the ARP.
46		P. 46 Lynnview Rd SE should remain closed to vehicles but could be re-purposed. Would make sense as a wide pathway for pedestrians and cyclists. It has a more gradual slope than Millican Road so it could be a good alternate route for cyclists coming up the hill.

17. Park and Ride

- Relationship between location of Park and Ride and impacts to open space and Ogden Road SE traffic flow and parking.

Page #	Section #	Comment



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

bulldoze a park for park and ride? why not put the parking lot on or beside the Shepard dump site?

If you must build a train station at 72 Ave include a minimum of 150 parking spaces so people can use it. Ensure that nothing you do will cause Ogden road traffic to flow any slower or impede people from parking on street and entering into business parking lots.

18. Community Parking

- Underground parking suggested to maximize space, along with concerns it is too expensive and that on-street parking should be expected. Concern about the impact of parking removal on local businesses.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Parking should be under ground to maximize space.
	3.4.1	3.4.1 -c Below grade parking is very expensive and parking to the rear is non-existent or very limited. Neither is economically feasible. To encourage any kind of development requiring parking, street parking should be expected.
		A station without parking is restrictive for resident's needs. Removing parking from infant of businesses will force businesses like mine to close it doors. A little independent like myself cannot survive with traffic impairment to the great flow of traffic on Ogden Road.

19. Connectivity

- Access and connections to Pop Davies Park and the LRT Stations is currently seen as an issue that is not well addressed in the ARP. Concern for overall pathway and bikeway connection in the area and gaps in ARP related to Regional Pathway.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		How residents are to access Pop Davies Park from the south end of Ogden needs to be addressed. Interface between Pop Davies Park, LRT, and Ogden Road (south of Millican Road) needs to be addressed. Will there be crossing, pathways etc. At present there is no sidewalk/path between Millican Road and 69 Avenue. How will this be incorporated with the changes to Pop Davies and the LRT. At present the park and parking is an eyesore and an embarrassment to the community.
		Section on Transit Network is too generic and lacking. LRT stations are only briefly identified and there is no discussion on how each station will be accessed (vehicle, foot, bicycle, transit). No discussion on stations/transit stops and how they interface with community (see section 5.4.2 in Ramsay ARP).
		On several maps (map 6) there is a ped/cyclist connection shown from 78 Avenue to WID path but no mention in the path. This is another example of the ad hoc process shown in this ARP, designs and policies on the fly.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Right now, the lands around the Pop Davies park provide barriers to access to the planned new LRT station. Providing better walkways, bike lanes and well planned transit routes, along with a small kiss and ride area here, will be instrumental in making sure this station doesn't turn into a "ghost" station, with little use to justify the expense.

Similarly, in the rest of the community, better walkways, bike lanes and transit routes into the residential and intense employment areas of the CPR yards, and further east into Foothills Industrial area, are going to need to be intensely planned, to make sure they are utilized as much as possible.

41		P. 41 What about pathway connectivity to the west? Ogden is cut off by the Bow River, Deerfoot, and Blackfoot. Glenmore is not navigable by bicycle. Heritage is quite far south and the next route west is downtown, 11 km north. More detailed signage along the pathway is needed, including descriptions of neighbourhoods.
40	5.2.1	Not clear on how? What does this path entail? More details. Address safety. DUPLICATE COMMENT FROM PATHWAYS SECTION -- How residents are to access Pop Davies Park from the south end of Ogden needs to be addressed. Interface between Pop Davies Park, LRT, and Ogden Road (south of Millican Road) needs to be addressed. Will there be crossing, pathways etc. At present there is no sidewalk/path between Millican Road and 69 Avenue. How will this be incorporated with the changes to Pop Davies and the LRT. At present the park and parking is an eyesore and an embarrassment to the community. A Pedestrian and Cycling Network plan needs to be designed and included in the ARP (similar to the one in Ramsay ARP, map 7). Residents identified improving pedestrian and cycling connectivity in the community as important yet there is no plan in the ARP. Why? Also lacking is any mention on how pedestrians and cyclists will access transit plaza, etc. Ramsay ARP mention bike stations, will there be similar ones in Ogden? What about LRT stations. Wheelchair access from community site to seniors station should be considered.
	map 5	New regional pathway missing from N. Glenmore

20. Bike Lanes

- Concern about the inclusion and amount of bike lanes that are suggested in ARP.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Ogden road should be 2 lanes. No need for bike lanes, [offensive term removed] no more dam bike lanes. You royally botched Glenmore because of it. 2 east bound lanes over the irrigation canal? Seriously? The planner should be fired. Glenmore should be 3 lanes. period. In the future you'll spend millions to fix your mistake.
	5.3.1	New bike lanes going to station. Bike lanes on 72, 74, 76 seems excessive. Do we really need 3 going to the same place? Do we consider adding "or" to the list?
	5.3.1	Consider saying two east/west, two north/south, pathways/bikeways.



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

Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

21. CP Plume Area

- Concern that development will not be realized in the CP Plume Area. Clarification about who would be responsible for remedy, etc. is needed.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		An unknown factor in all of the plans for Neighbourhood A is the cost for clean-up of contamination in the plume area extending from the CPR's Ogden Shops.
51	6.1.1	Page 51, Section 6.1.1 – Lands impacted by the CP ground water contamination plume: For the City of Calgary to work with possible developers and their lenders to ease the process for development to proceed.
	6.1.1	6.1.1 What will this cost and who will pay for it? No incentive for development unless the City underwrites these costs!
		CP Plume - Need assurance that City will work w/ developers to help encourage development in this area. Make the process easier and not scare them off?
		CP Plume - Not limited to ground water contamination. Also soil contamination.
		Who cares what the cost is, if you contaminate, you clean it up.
		CPR needs to pay for clean up
		Before promoting development, make sure that Ogden has been fully remediated. We don't want another Imperial Oil fiasco.
		There has not been a comprehensive study done on the CPR plume area that speaks to the contamination, that is a public document.
		Attributes: If mentioning Lynnview Ridge, should mention CP plum in the attributes. Not really an attribute.
		ARP needs a plan to encourage development and make land developable. Remediation plan for contaminated areas.

22. Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area

- Concern that the term 'contamination' should not be used in document because remediation has taken place and the term 'reclamation' should be used to focus on more positive current and future state rather than negative past tense.

Page #	Section #	Comment
50		P. 50 Is the fenced off area north of Millican Rd at Ogden Rd included in the Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area? Seems as though this would make a good parking area for the future LRT station.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

Important not to use the term 'contamination' as when the ARP is published, it will be remediated.

Important for accuracy in reporting the Lynnview Ridge contamination by changing term to reflect current reality: Lynnview Ridge remediation. Upset by comment made by City Planner at the last mtg as he saw need to emphasize the contamination. Our reality - why emphasize what has been remediated - which community in the City of Calgary would accept the focus on the past in their ARP when it is known that remediation took place. Why would the City want to reflect the negativity when 100s of millions of dollars have been spent on the remediation process.

Important to state the history of the clean-up process which occurred to lead to the reclamation of the lands – collaboration between Imperial Oil, City of Calgary and Alberta Environment. The ARP should focus on the reclamation of the lands and not on the contamination – lets keeps the document positive and reflective of the present day status as oppose to focusing on the pre-remediation stage.

50 6.1 Page 50, Section 6.1 – Environmental Constraints. Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area: Ensure no dog park is considered for this area – need to be mindful that residential homes face the study area. The area also has to be well lit to discourage questionable behaviour.

54 7.1 Page 54 – Section 7.1. In the statement: “Lynnview Ridge and Former Imperial Oil Land Past oil refining activities in the area resulted in contamination of Lynnview Ridge in the northwest portion of the Plan Area” it should be noted the areas that have been completely remediated.

Residual contamination from the refinery has been remediated.

54 Lynnview Ridge Paragraph: Assumption whole area has been contaminated, but some has been remediated.

23. District and Alternative Energy

- Positive comments related to the use of district energy system overall and related to specific area.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		A district heating system for the north node and the "Pop Davies" LRT station would make good sense here, at first glance.
		A district energy system for the south end of the subject lands, and for any future development considered for the CPR lands would also be good use. Making Ogden Millican the "alternative energy" centre of the city, would also go a long way to dispelling some of the existing stigma around legacy industrial sites.
		Utilizing the former refinery lands for a solar "farm", or even a wind farm installation (if wind speeds were strong enough), or for a geothermal energy usage would be a great use of these contaminated lands.
		Reference to solar needs to be kept down the hill along Ogden road and not up on Lynnview Ridge lands.
		Agreed, this would be the best way to get full sun. The lands may not be usable for any other purposes. Would not work down the hill.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

6.1 Last paragraph - very vague. Is this solar lights or solar panels? Need more clarity on "solar energy instillation"

Other Feedback

24. Maps

- Please see specific details below.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		All maps in the Ogden ARP needs to show distances from LRT Stations (see map 3 in Ramsay ARP for an example).
13	map 3	Page 13 – Map 3 – bottom leg of Lynnview Rd should not be indicated on the map as this part of the road is now closed off.
13		Add 2 labels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Millican Road SE - Lynnview Ridge (as people confuse Lynnwood with Lynnview Ridge) <p>Create a Legend for A-E (Ogden, Lynnwood, Millican Estates, South Hill)</p> <p>Add Neighborhood Boundary for South Hill (E.) (note: all station platforms use one of these neighborhood names)</p>
	map 5	Map 5 is confusing with its mix of present and future amenities. For example there is no regional pathway along Ogden Road south of Millican Road. Is this too be added in the future? Is it planned? Map is unclear and very poorly designed.
34	map 5	Page 34, Map 5 – Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area – bottom leg of Lynnview Rd should not be indicated on the map as this part of the road is now closed off.
36	map 6	Page 39, Map 6 – bottom leg of Lynnview Rd should not be indicated on the map as this part of the road is now closed off.
43	map 7	Page 43, Map 7 – bottom leg of Lynnview Rd should not be indicated on the map as this part of the road is now closed off.
46	map 8	Page 46, Map 8 – Potential Future Road Closure – to note this part of the road is presently closed off.
47	map 9	Page 47, Map 9 - bottom leg of Lynnview Rd should not be indicated on the map as this part of the road is now closed off.
55	map 10	Page 55, Map 10 - bottom leg of Lynnview Rd should not be indicated on the map as this part of the road is now closed off.
59	8.2.4	Page 59, Section 8.2.4 – Important to correct all maps based as the wording in this section states the present reality. At no time has “Lynnwood Park” existed.
		On all maps, lower leg of Lynnview Rd is closed so all maps should indicate this.
40	5.2.3	[Path] Not reflected on the map.
	8.2.4	re: map 3. This document needs to be absolutely correct.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

25. Suggested Changes

- Specific feedback on updates or changes to wording in the document.

Page #	Section #	Comment
6	1.1	add Millican Ogden title (after 2nd smaller paragraph)
7		remove last sentence re: contamination (as contamination is detailed within document - see 6.1 environmental constraints)
		add Lynnwood title & short write-up about Lynnwood as per below
		<p>“Lynnwood Established in 1956, Lynnwood was built as a new residential area on the hill above Ogden. Lynnwood boasted very close proximity to a public school, catholic school and church, community hall, swimming pool, green and open spaces, library bus, baseball diamonds, outdoor skating rink, small strip mall with medical offices and drugstore, seniors housing, and grocery store. The #24 bus ran on the ½ hour and would take you downtown in 25 minutes, as it does today. Lynnwood continues on as a beautiful, quiet and enjoyable area to live in.”</p>
16		replace “loosely” with “relatively”
24	3.4	3.4 Neighbourhood C, in the centre of the community [add] <u>within the Lynnwood area,</u> c. Lynnwood Park (see Section 4.2: Parks), which contains the Millican Ogden Community Hall [add] <u>site that includes</u> the community pool, the Jack Setters Arena, and Ogden House Senior Citizen Club (see Section 4.2: Parks); and d. various [add] <u>playfields and</u> open spaces [add] <u>attached to the community</u> and school sites (see Section 4.2: Parks).
29	3.7	3.7 Community Amenities and Facilities The Millican-Ogden community incorporates a larger than average number of residents in affordable housing: units, [add] <u>low density residential, multi-residential, townhomes, low income, and seniors.</u> seniors and low income residents. [add] <u>Amenities and facilities include a fire station, 4 schools, Millican Ogden Community Association site, Jack Setters arena, outdoor pool, Ogden House senior citizens club, places of worship, smaller shopping centres, medical offices, and a local Safeway grocery store.</u> <u>Vacant land in close proximity to Ogden Road provides noteworthy development opportunities.</u> The area is also one of Calgary’s original communities and contains a number of historic buildings and structures. These characteristics present some unique opportunities for the community when considering redevelopment. Map 4: Community Amenities and Facilities indicates other amenities located in the Plan Area.
50		Pages 50 & 51 - see revised 6.1 Environmental Constraints below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ [add] <u>Lynnview Ridge</u> ○ [add] <u>CP Ogden Shops</u> (rather than CP Plume Area) ○ remove 1960 refinery picture (we don’t need pictorial reminder of Imperial Oil’s contamination)



50 6.1 Delete the following paragraph - already included in section 5.6 Parking Framework on page 48

~~Providing well-designed, adequate parking for retail establishments and transit users is a key concern~~

Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area

Provide BACKGROUND paragraph so people understand the history and know what has been done so far to remediate the contamination:

[add]The Imperial Oil refinery site operated near Ogden Road and 50th Avenue S.E. until 1975, and was later developed into the Lynnview Ridge subdivision. The refinery site brought about soil contamination to Lynnview Ridge, discovered in 2001. Imperial Oil bought up 140 homes and several apartment blocks in the area; they were bulldozed and removed. The contaminated area has been and continues to be remediated.

Land comprising the former Imperial Oil refinery site will be restricted to urban transportation, urban park, research, or recreational uses ~~as per~~ **as per** according to a 2007 Risk Management Agreement and a 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan. A site reclamation program is presently being undertaken ~~as per the 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan which~~ **that** will make a large portion of the site available for the development of a park or open space.

No private residential or commercial development will be allowed on ~~these parcels~~ **the site**. The inclusion of any buildings on the former Imperial Oil refinery site would ~~also~~ be subject to further evaluation. ~~Additionally, a~~ **A**t the request of Alberta Health Services, no playgrounds or community gardens will be considered for the site without further evaluation.

Further investigation of solar energy **lighting and** development on portions of this site could provide opportunity for additional environmental and social benefit. ~~to be derived during the remediation of these lands. Figure 13 | Ref.~~ Solar energy installations are passive uses with very limited impacts on the land and adjacent uses.

The following restrictions are included above

~~Projects involving parks and open space in this area should be developed according to a park master plan and the 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan.~~

51 **(MAKE "OGDEN SHOPS" – the SOURCE of the contamination – stand out – rather than the Ogden contamination plume)**

CP [add] **Ogden Shops** Plume Area

The CP Ogden Shops area is the source of an off-site groundwater contamination plume which impacts a portion of the Ogden community. The contamination is being remediated and risk managed by CP through an Environmental Management Plan approved by the Government of Alberta (Alberta Environment and Parks Department). ~~It is anticipated that~~ **O**ngoing monitoring and remedial activity will be required for the foreseeable future.

54 Page 54 - remove "Lynnwood Ridge... " paragraph – already detailed within 6.1 Environmental Constraints – pages 50 and 51)

56 Page 56 – remove "Contaminated Sites" (these are detailed within 6.1 Environmental Constraints – pages 50 and 51)



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

26. Process

- Clarification needed about the ARP process, the purpose of an ARP versus connected city-wide policies, who can provide input, how feedback is considered, etc.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Why when you provide feedback are you not asking where people live and work. If your responses come from outside of Ogden Millican then they should not hold the same weight at those of residents and employees go these communities. Are you going to take the time to get direct feedback from residents and businesses directly affected by these decisions? my name is [Personally identifying information removed]
		The ARP has to be reflective of the feedback obtained by the residents as an ARP should be reflective of the needs identified by the residents and not imposed from the outside. We recognize that Ogden might not be viewed as the most attractive community to move into but for Ogden residents, it is home and the Ogdenites are very proud of their community.
		I notice one person can also reply multiple times from anywhere in the city to this Survey so the results should be considered with deep reservation as to representing the views of people living and working in Ogden and surrounding communities
		It is very disappointing that the vision comes from somewhere else and not from the Community affected by it; a Top-Down approach. Nowhere in the Community History or (lacking) Introduction sections is there any evidence that the Community comes first and that its ideas & vision possibly need to be modified because we are part of a city that surrounds us on all sides.
	3.2.10	Not until 3.2.10 is there mention of extensive public engagement and the Community Association is mentioned as an after-thought. In real terms, how open is the City to comments/changes or is this process just window-dressing?

27. Names (Neighbourhoods, Parks, etc.)

- Concern that generic labels such as "Neighbourhood A" have been used rather than formal community names that already exist. Alternatively, there is concern that formal names such as 'Lynnwood Park' have been created within the document without consultation or explanation of origin.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Not even attempting to name the neighbourhoods (ie, Neighbourhood A) is an insult to the community and residents (see Map 3 for an example). Many of these neighbourhoods in Ogden have historic names. The draft Ramsay ARP has names for the neighbourhoods yet the Ogden ARP gets generic labels. This is a historic, established neighbourhood not some generic community that is just now being built. It shows how little the City has listened to residents and time it invested in this plan.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

17	3.1.1	Page 17, Section 3.1.1 directs us to Map 3 of Page 13. Two concerns over the map: o How did the name of Lynnwood Park come to be (community association and school sites) – Map 3 on Page 13. Until now, no such name existed for this area – how can the City simply decide to give this area a name?
25	3.4.5	Page 25, Section 3.4.5. To note, the fields are owned by CBE and once again, question how the name of “Lynnview Park” came to be.
	map 5	Map 5 Where did the name Lynnwood Park originate? Was the Community consulted to name it such?
13		Lynnwood Park. Who named this? It is not a Park. Schools and large open areas are CBE Property. Lynnwood Park - Why use this name? What other names are used?

28. Definitions

- Some terms used in the documents are not explained or defined and are therefore not understood (e.g. complete streets, transit mobility hub, live-work, formalized path).

Page #	Section #	Comment
47		P. 47 What is "Complete Streets"? It's mentioned several times in the draft ARP but never defined.
63	9.2	Page 63, Section 9.2 Live Work – “A land use where a business is operated from a dwelling unit by the resident of the dwelling unit” - Need clarification on what is meant by this term: hoping this is limited to a home based business. Also need to know what businesses are considered acceptable as need to avoid any negative impact on the community and neighbors, including reasonable parking and reasonable work hours. Define transit mobility hub. What is this?
40	5.2.2	What does 'formalized' mean? [Path]
63		Need better definition of live-work. Does not state in the ARP that it should be commercially zoned. Live-work definiton is not clear on pg. 63

29. Plan Boundaries

- Concern that historical aspects, such as South Hill being part of Ogden pre-Glenmore Trail, should be captured but are not. Concern that the Glenmore Inn lands should be part of the Millican-Ogden ARP versus South Hill.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The plan also ignores the history of South Hill, an important part of Ogden until Glenmore Trail cut through the community in the 1970s. Why are the 'Glenmore Inn lands' excluded from the Millican-Ogden ARP and moved to the South Hill SAP? This makes zero sense from a planning or community basis. Please consider restoring these portion of the community to the Millican-Ogden ARP.



Glenmore Inn is in Ogden so belongs in Ogden & not in South Hill. Explain the reasoning and one that is logical.

Why is Glenmore Inn excluded from this plan?

30. Implementation

- Concern that the title “Implementation Plan” is misrepresentative.

Page #	Section #	Comment
61	8.3	Page 61, Section 8.3 – The title states “Area Development Plan Implementation” but there is no implementation plan in the document. Based on this, what is the purpose of this document if no implementation plan is developed?
		An implementation plan is not required. MGA flowchart indicated guides on implementation.
	8.3	There is no implementation plan. Does not understand how this will be implemented and create incentive.

31. Population Projections

- Desire to include population projections and/or future density targets.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		What are the present and projected population numbers for Ogden and individual neighbourhoods. Needs to be included in the plan.
		The plan is lacking any charts/maps showing the predicted changes in population in Ogden over the next 25+ years. The ARP continually states the need to increase the density in Ogden but offers no projections or numbers. A monitoring plan also needs to be implemented to ensure numbers are within predicted ranges (see section 8.5 in the Ramsay ARP for an example of this).

32. Example Photos

- Desire to include imagery within Land Use Concept Elements section.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		Include example photos for Land Use Concept Elements section.

33. Station Location and Design

- Specific concerns about station location, station location consultation, and impacts to personal property.

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



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

I do not think the platform should be near any homes. I live right next to the train track, it's already too loud and a platform would bring more crime to the neighborhood.

Putting the Pop Davies LRT station at the top of Lynnwood Ridge (including park-n-ride) would serve the greatest number of users, also allowing for development of an urban park to revitalize the area.

Our house is on the east side of Ogden Road on the North side of 72 ave and I was wondering why I have not been contacted as looking at how the line runs part of the Ogden LRT platform is in my back yard

There is no real need for a station at 72 Ave with one at pop davies and one in South Hill.

Putting the Pop Davies LRT station at the top of Lynnwood Ridge (including park-n-ride) would serve the greatest number of users, also allowing for development of an urban park to revitalize the area.

Already gone through consultation process and approved by City Council so the station locations have been set. As one who attended all info and consultation sessions, I would not want for feedback indicating changes to the stations to be considered. The time has passed for this to occur. I would continue to suggest however that the Imperial Oli lands across from Pop Davies Park be made into concrete parking space with ample lighting and space for Food Trucks to serve ball diamond users on weekends.

Make each station platform vibrant, active, lit and safe.

Putting the Pop Davies LRT station at the top of Lynnwood Ridge (including park-n-ride) would serve the greatest number of users, also allowing for development of an urban park to revitalize the area.

bulldoze a park for park and ride? why not put the parking lot on or beside the Shepard dump site?

As I park my motor home in my back yard and with where you are showing the Ogden Platform I was wondering where I am going to park my RV. My address is [personally identifying information removed] which is on the east side of Ogden road not like Google shows in the middle of George Moss Park.

34. Nothing Noted

- See below

Page #	Section #	Comment
		No issues.
		DO WHAT YOU NEED TO DO, SO EXCITED TO HAVE THIS LRT IN THE SE COMMUNITIES
		No issues or changes needed.
		DO WHAT YOU NEED TO DO, SO EXCITED TO HAVE THIS LRT IN THE SE COMMUNITIES
		Looks good.



Millican-Ogden ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard
February 10, 2018

DO WHAT YOU NEED TO DO, SO EXCITED TO HAVE THIS LRT IN THE SE
COMMUNITIES

No changes needed.

DO WHAT YOU NEED TO DO, SO EXCITED TO HAVE THIS LRT IN THE SE
COMMUNITIES
