



# **Millican-Ogden Area Redevelopment Plan**

Draft ARP Review

What We Heard, What We Did

April 4, 2018

The City of Calgary



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## Contents

Project Overview .....	3
Engagement Overview .....	3
Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee.....	3
Online Public Survey .....	4
What We Asked .....	4
What We Heard, What We Did.....	5
Land Use Concept Feedback .....	6
Open Space Feedback.....	13
Mobility Feedback.....	17
Infrastructure and Environment Feedback .....	26
Other Feedback.....	29
Next steps.....	39



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 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 an 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 attempts to reflect community priorities, while also aligning with overarching policies in the Municipal Development Plan and the Calgary Transportation Plan.

## Engagement Overview

The City of Calgary conducted an additional round of public engagement in October and November of 2017 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 on-line, 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 and November of 2017.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 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.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## What We Heard, What We Did

All of the feedback collected from the Millican-Ogden Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee participants as well as all feedback collected through the online survey has been combined into a single feedback data set. Similar responses have been grouped together into themes and a summary statement describing the central idea or community concern have been drafted for each theme.

The City’s Technical Advisory Committee for the ARP – which includes representatives from Community Planning, Calgary Parks, and Transportation Planning – have reviewed all of the collected feedback, themes, and summary statements and have determined how the community feedback can best be addressed within the ARP.

The City’s responses to the community feedback generally falls into one of five categories below:

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.

---

- Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.

---

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.

---

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.

---

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.

The following pages outline The City’s responses to all of the suggested ideas or changes. For a complete list of all verbatim comments, please see the What He Heard report back, published earlier here:

[https://calgary.ca/engage/Documents/Green%20Line/ARP/Millican-Ogden\\_draft\\_Area\\_Redevelopment\\_Plan\\_-\\_What\\_we\\_heard\\_FINAL.pdf](https://calgary.ca/engage/Documents/Green%20Line/ARP/Millican-Ogden_draft_Area_Redevelopment_Plan_-_What_we_heard_FINAL.pdf)



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## Land Use Concept Feedback

### 1. Community Character & Historic Resources

#### What We Heard

- 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.

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- Policies on heritage resources are primarily located within the Developed Areas Guidebook.
- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- Community Planning can work with The City’s Heritage Planning group to elaborate on community history, heritage resources and policies that are specific to the area within the ARP. The request to include “Oggie Ogden” in the Plan Area came through the 2015 charrette process and subsequent public consultation in 2016. The City can investigate the current status of the monument.



## 2. Building Blocks & Building Heights

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- The vision, building types and location of density were developed in consultation with the community through the 2015 Charrette process and refined through further public consultation throughout 2016. Some of the primary objectives developed through the Charrette vision are to establish Ogden Road and Ogden LRT station as the heart of the community while facilitating redevelopment in strategic locations throughout the community, hence the concentration of density in Neighborhood A and at existing commercial nodes throughout the community. The Airport Vicinity Protection Area (AVPA) does not limit building heights in the Plan Area.
- Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.
- Through stakeholder feedback, the Green Line Local Area Plans will likely use the Community – Mid Rise Building Block rather than Neighborhood – Mid Rise. The City will continue to refine the land use concept based on public feedback while maintaining the intent of the vision and core ideas developed by the community through the 2015 Charrette process.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 3. Southeast Calgary Resource Centre

#### What We Heard

- 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.

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- The policies in the plan are meant to emphasize the importance of the Southeast Calgary Resource Centre, within the community and beyond. Relocation is not anticipated, but given that the population that the Resource Centre serves depends on public transit, it is important to state that should the Resource Centre be relocated, it should be in close proximity to public transit.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 4. Legion Site

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.
- The former Canadian Legion site is privately owned and future use as a community recreation facility is unlikely given the proximity of a future regional recreation facility at the southeast corner of Ogden Road and 78 Avenue SE. As with all privately and publicly owned sites within the Plan Area, the ARP sets out the land use allowable should the site redevelop. In this instance the draft ARP policies (page 21, section 3.2.11) indicate that any future redevelopment on the site should be generally consistent with the Community – Mid Rise Building Block. This site has not been identified as an Active Frontage.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 5. Seniors' & Affordable Housing

### What We Heard

- 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).

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- Affordable housing is addressed in the Volume 1 of the Municipal Development Plan (section 2.3.1) rather than in the Developed Areas Guidebook as affordable housing policies apply city-wide. Under existing Provincial legislation, The City cannot require affordable housing in most instances, but rather encourage the provision of affordable housing through policy. The ARP strongly encourages the provision of affordable housing. Changes to Provincial legislation that are anticipated to come into force in April 2018 will allow municipalities to include “inclusionary housing” as an option within municipal land use bylaws. “Inclusionary housing” would require affordable housing to be built in new development projects at the development permit stage with required compensation to be offered to developers to help reduce the financial burden passed on to homebuyers. The Calgary City Charter which is anticipated to come into effect in 2018 will also enable the provision of affordable housing. The requirement that seniors housing be located within 200 metres of transit is a city-wide standard and ensures access to transit in a demographic where mobility is often a concern.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 6. Active Frontage

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.
- The City is investigating the inclusion of two Active Frontage categories in the ARP – “required” for the portion of Ogden Road between 69 and 72 Avenue SW and “encouraged” for portions of Ogden Road to the north of 69 Avenue SE and south of 72 Avenue SE.
- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- Transportation modeling has been completed as part of this ARP and the Green Line project. Both current and future traffic volumes have been considered and mobility improvements have been identified in section 5 of the ARP.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 7. Safety

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- As an ARP can only regulate land use and development matters, policies on police presence are outside of the scope of influence of an ARP. Policies regarding Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design are included in the Developed Areas Guidebook and ARP and will be considered in future land use and development permit processes.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## Open Space Feedback

### 8. Park/Playfield Redevelopment, Open Space and Parks

#### What We Heard

- 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.

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- The City is looking into changes to open space maps to more accurately reflect the building footprints and use of parks and open space sites.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 9. George Moss Park

#### What We Heard

- 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.

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.
- As indicated in the ARP, further consultation would be required prior to incorporating seniors housing in George Moss Park. The City is investigating removing this policy in favour of a more general policy encouraging seniors housing within 200 metres of the LRT stations.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 10. Recreation Facilities

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- Currently Calgary Recreation is working with a prospective partner, Calgary Winter Lacrosse Association, for future development of an indoor and outdoor lacrosse center. The Calgary Winter Lacrosse Association is working on completing their project design and fundraising efforts in 2018.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 11. Beaver Dam Flats

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- The City can look into including Beaver Dam Flats and Old Refinery Park within the boundaries of the ARP. Contamination related to the former refinery site remains in place in Old Refinery Park and Beaver Dam Flats Park, thus any redevelopment on these areas would need to follow the 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan and 2007 Risk Management Agreement and uses would be restricted to urban transportation, urban park, research or recreational uses.
- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- Beaver Dam Flats Park and Old Refinery Park are currently closed for restoration work and reopening on October 1, 2018. For more information visit the [Beaver Dam Flats website](#) and [Old Refinery Park website](#).



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## Mobility Feedback

### 12. Ogden Road SE

#### What We Heard

- Clarification needed around the intended type of roadway planned for Ogden Road SE (e.g. number of lanes, intent to include 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.

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- Ogden Road SE, between Millican Road SE and 78 Avenue SE, is intended to be the high street of the Plan Area and will be constructed to a [Complete Street](#) standard. Although a specific Complete Street classification is yet to be determined through future study, the ARP specifies that Ogden Road SE should be redesigned to accommodate one permanent lane of travel in each direction, on-street parking during off-peak hours and bicycle lanes in each direction or a multi-use pathway. Section 5.2.4 on page 40 of the ARP also specifies design elements that should be considered to improve the pedestrian environment on Ogden Road SE. The LRT will cross under Ogden Road SE in a tunnel between the Lynnwood/Millican and Ogden LRT stations and will not cross at grade.
- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- The City will correct any discrepancies between the text and maps with respect to Complete Streets.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

13. 18 / 18A Street SE

### What We Heard

- 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 as an issue by the community and not addressed. Community is concerned with safety presently and is worried problem will get worse with inclusion of LRT station.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- The ARP recognises that 18 Street SE is a major gateway into the Plan Area from the south and should be redesigned to a Complete Street standard to facilitate pedestrian and cyclist circulation and discourage short-cutting, particularly at the intersection of 18 Avenue SE with 76 Avenue SE and Glenmore Trail SE.
- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- Any current concerns related to speeding or intersection safety can also be addressed via a [Traffic Service Request](#).



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 14. 78 Avenue SE

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
  - The City is doing several construction projects, called Enabling Works, to get ready for the Green Line LRT. One of these projects proposes closing the 69 Avenue SE crossing at the CP rail lines, widening 78 Avenue SE to three lanes (east of Ogden Road), and building an underpass to connect 78 Avenue SE under the CP rail lines and future Green Line LRT tracks to Ogden Dale Road SE.
  - The Green Line team is recommending that the truck route currently on 69 Avenue SE not be replaced after 69 Avenue SE is closed. This means that our recommendation is that 78 Avenue SE not become a truck route. The Green Line team will be reviewing this recommendation with the trucking community and moving it through the Council approval process, which could take several months. We will inform the community of the outcome of this discussion.
  - Other safety concerns have been addressed through public consultation including:
    - The park/playground space would be fenced along 78 Avenue SE and the playground would be improved, with new benches and a new look for the playground, including a community art project facilitated by the *This Is My Neighbourhood* project to beautify the fence. We will also improve the nearby basketball court with new hoops, new pavement and some new landscaping to enhance the play spaces on the north side of 78 Avenue SE.
    - Not replacing the 69 Avenue SE designated truck route would reduce the number of trucks passing through the area (i.e. no truck route on 78 Avenue SE).
    - The pedestrian crossing at 27 Street SE would initially be a marked crosswalk, as the projected traffic and pedestrian volumes at that site do not warrant greater traffic control devices. Once the road is operational, The City would monitor the intersection to determine whether additional traffic control devices are warranted. This is the standard practice for new pedestrian crossings for The City of Calgary.
    - Traffic modeling shows that, once the underpass is open, traffic volumes on 78 Avenue SE east of Ogden Road SE would be approximately half of the present day volumes on 76 Avenue SE between 18 Street SE and Ogden Road SE. It is estimated that by 2028, the traffic volumes on 78 Avenue SE will be the same as the present day traffic volumes on 76 Avenue SE. Both roads have similar speed and pedestrian crossing conditions.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

15. 74 Avenue & 72 Avenue SE

### What We Heard

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

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- 72 Avenue SE would be constructed to a [Complete Street](#) standard. Although a specific Complete Street classification is yet to be determined through future study, the ARP specifies that 72 Avenue SE should be redesigned to accommodate on-street parking and high-quality transit stops. The roadways and intersections will be reviewed as development in the plan area occurs.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 16. Lynnview Road SE and Millican Road SE

#### What We Heard

- 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.

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- In response to safety concerns, Lynnview Road SE is currently closed to vehicular traffic. The intended use of the site is a passive park or open space to be developed according to a park master plan and the 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan. Millican Road SE will be redesigned in 2018 and will no longer connect directly to Lynnview Road SE, however, The City can investigate the inclusion of pedestrian and/or cyclist circulation in the area.
- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- The City will clarify the text with respect to the Future Mobility Improvement identified at Millican Road and Ogden Road SE.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 17. Park and Ride

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- A 250 stall Park and Ride for the Lynnwood/Millican LRT station is planned on the site of the existing gravel parking lot at Pop Davies Park, with no net loss of green space.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 18. Community Parking

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- On-street parking will remain on Ogden Road SE during off-peak hours. Policy 3.2.4.e on page 20 of the ARP indicates that all on-site parking should be located underground, in structured parking or to the rear of a building.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 19. Connectivity

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.

A new multi-use pathway will be constructed along the length of Ogden Road SE, enabling access to Pop Davies Park and to the north. The City can clarify in the ARP how each station will be accessed, but the intent is to have access available for all modes. Section 5.2.2 on page 40 of the ARP addresses the pedestrian connections proposed at 78 Avenue SE to the W.I.D. pathway.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 20. Bike Lanes

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.
- The primary objective of Section 3.1 Transportation Choice of the [Calgary Transportation Plan](#) is to maintain automobile, commercial goods and emergency vehicle mobility in Calgary while placing increased emphasis on sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, cycling and transit. In order to provide for transportation choice and improved mobility options in the area, the addition of bike lanes is required. The City will continue to refine maps and policy with respect to cycling connections prior to finalization of the proposed ARP.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

### 21. CP Plume Area

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.
- The policy in Section 6.1 of the ARP related to the CP Plume Area was developed in consultation with the provincial government. The ARP indicates that the plume is being remediated and risk managed by CP through an Environmental Management Plan approved by the Government of Alberta and it is anticipated that ongoing monitoring and remedial activity will be required for the foreseeable future. As indicated by the policies in this section, The City will work with prospective applicants in the area, but The City is required to circulate environmental reports and plans to the satisfaction of the Government of Alberta prior to rendering a decision on any redevelopment application. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the site is suitable for redevelopment from an environmental perspective.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 22. Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.
- Text and maps within the ARP will be updated to accurately reflect the lands related to the former refinery site subject to the 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan and the remedial measures conducted to date. Though remediation/risk management measures are in place, contamination related to the former refinery site does remain in areas within the Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area and any redevelopment will need to follow the 2014 Environmental Risk Management Plan and 2007 Risk Management Agreement. Land uses would be restricted to urban transportation, urban park, research or recreational uses.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

### 23. District and Alternative Energy

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- Policy 6.2.1 on page 52 of the ARP does not preclude use of a district energy system in other parts of the community, but merely states that Neighborhood A may provide the best opportunity for implementation due to the density of future development and proximity to Employment areas. Solar energy installations within the Lynnview Ridge Special Study Area are already referenced in Section 6.1.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

Other Feedback

24. Maps

## What We Heard

- Specific feedback on updates or changes to maps.

## City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- The City will look into including neighborhood names instead of letters, walk sheds on maps, a more accurate depiction of the status of Lynnview Road SE, updated pathways map and removal of references to Lynnwood Park.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

## 25. Suggested Changes

### What We Heard

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

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- The City will include additional information regarding the history of Lynnwood, community amenities and facilities.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 26. Process

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- The vision for the ARP was developed in consultation with the community through the 2015 Charrette and refined through further public consultation throughout 2016. The City will continue to refine the ARP based on feedback received through the current consultation process and upcoming public consultation in 2018.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 27. Names (Neighbourhoods, Parks, etc.)

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.
- The ARP is organized around neighborhoods loosely based upon the original phases of development. The City used names such as “Neighborhood A” as the boundaries do not precisely match the original historic neighborhoods that comprise the current community of Millican-Ogden. The City sought public input on neighborhood names through previous public consultation in 2016, but received none. The feedback received through the current consultation process indicates support for utilising historic neighborhood names. This idea can be further explored through upcoming public consultation in 2018 and incorporated into the ARP.
- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- The name Lynnwood Park appears on City mapping databases and on publicly available maps (e.g. Google Maps). It can certainly be changed on the maps if it is not a name used by the community.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

## 28. Definitions

### What We Heard

- 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).

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- The ARP is meant to be read and used alongside other City documents, particularly the Municipal Development Plan. Some definitions have not been included in the ARP as they are already contained in the Municipal Development Plan or Calgary Transportation Plan.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## 29. Plan Boundaries

### What We Heard

- 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.

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.
- In 2015, a decision was made to have separate charrettes for Ogden and South Hill by the Green Line Transportation Infrastructure team and the recommendation moving forward was to develop a Station Area Plan for South Hill. The rationale for the decision to keep the Glenmore Inn area in the South Hill Station Area Plan is as follows:
  - The Station Area Plan is focused around the South Hill LRT station and the proximity of the Glenmore Inn area to the South Hill station (especially on foot and by bike) makes it more suitable to be in the South Hill Plan. Future residents would be more likely to walk to the South Hill LRT station than to the Ogden LRT station. The slope from Glenmore Inn down to Ogden also separates it from the rest of Ogden to an extent.
  - The redevelopment (heights, form of development) on the Glenmore Inn site aligns more closely with what will be seen in South Hill Village than with what is in the Millican-Ogden ARP, so having that area in one document would avoid policy duplication.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

## 30. Implementation

### What We Heard

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

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.
- The primary means of implementation of the ARP will occur through the land use, subdivision and development permit processes. This statement can be added to Section 8.3 to clarify what is meant by implementation.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

## 31. Population Projections

### What We Heard

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

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.
- Population projections for the Plan Area are included on page 12 of the ARP in Section 2.2 Land Use Concept. Current population and a breakdown for each neighborhood can be added to the ARP.



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

## 32. Example Photos

### What We Heard

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

### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- Photo examples of the various Building Blocks are located within the Developed Areas Guidebook, but could be included in the ARP as space permits.



## Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did  
March 29, 2018

### 33. Station Location and Design

#### What We Heard

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

#### City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.
- The station locations were finalised by City Council in 2017. Station design work is currently underway, for more information visit [Green Line in My Community](#).



# Millican-Ogden ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 29, 2018

## Next steps

- Administration will incorporate suggested ideas and changes, where possible into the draft Millican-Ogden ARP.
- In the spring of 2018, The City will host a public information session for Millican-Ogden to provide the public with an opportunity to view the final draft of the ARP, noting where stakeholder suggestions have been incorporated. At that information session, specific feedback will be sought on the topics identified above as:
  - Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.
- A proposed version of the ARP that incorporates stakeholder suggestions from the spring 2018 information session where feasible, along with a What We Heard and What We Did report, will be made publicly available in early fall of 2018.
- The proposed ARP will be presented at Calgary Planning Commission and Public Hearing of City Council by the end of 2018.