



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 Ramsay 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 Ramsay 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 Ramsay. The results of this round of engagement are collected in this report-back.

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

Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee

The Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee (ARC) was comprised of residents and volunteers from the communities of Inglewood, Ramsay, Millican-Ogden and South Hill/Riverbend who met to review and discuss the draft area redevelopment or station area plan in their community. This group was tasked with providing additional local context to the document and identifying areas of the document where they felt that additional focus was required. 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 Ramsay met four times over the course of October & November of 2017.



Ramsay 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 Ramsay 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 Ramsay 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. Land Use Concept - Different Character to North & South TOD / Station Areas**

Interest in seeing a greater distinction between the Inglewood/Ramsay Station TOD character and the Crossroads Station TOD character, with development near Inglewood/Ramsay station emphasizing preservation of existing community character, and development near the Crossroads Station focusing on taking most of the increased density.
- 2. Land Use Concept - TOD Circles**

Suggestion that a TOD area that reflects destinations and travel paths may focus development more appropriately than the circular TOD areas used.
- 3. Land Use Concept - North 9th Street Zoning Change to Midrise**

Concern that the change in land use designation at the north end of 9th street would have a negative impact on adjacent properties, as well as for the current owners of those parcels. Likewise, concern that there was not adequate consultation done with impacted residents before making those changes, and that the diagonal border of that designation will lead to this area slowly growing in size.
- 4. Land Use Concept - Building Heights, Setbacks & Stepping**

Concern that there is not adequate 'stepping-back' between the higher heights of new developments and the lower heights of the existing structures.
- 5. Land Use Concept - 20m heights @ 19th Ave & 9th**

Concern that this small parcel of 20m height will overshadow adjacent properties.
- 6. Land Use Concept - Active Frontage**

Concern about design elements of active frontage, as well as an opportunity to be less restrictive about large-scale retail in that zone.
- 7. Land Use Concept - Affordable Housing**

Opportunity to encourage affordable housing while ensuring sustainable operation of these sites.
- 8. Land Use Concept - Laneway Houses**

Opportunity to emphasized laneway housing as a way to sensitively increase density in the community.
- 9. Land Use Concept - Allow Rowhouses Where Appropriate**

Interest in allowing sensitive integration of rowhousing in the community.
- 10. Land Use Concept - Secondary Suites**

Opportunity to encourage secondary suites
- 11. Stampede - Nuisance Factors**

Interest in seeing more mitigation of Nosis and sound from Stampede operations.



12. Stampede - Future Vision for Stampede Back of House

Concern with what is described for this area, as well as a feeling that it is inappropriate to provide too many details in this section, prior to a future study being completed.

13. Stampede – Other

Interest in seeing historical relationship to Stampede grounds integrated into document.

14. Heritage - Skepticism Around Effectiveness of Density Transfer

Concern that the listed described heritage density transfer process will not adequately preserve existing heritage buildings in the community or existing heritage character.

15. Heritage - Other Heritage Preservation Models

Interest in alternative strategies for heritage preservation.

16. Heritage - Undesignated Historical Resources

Concern that protection of heritage homes will prove too difficult to be effective.

17. Heritage - Other

Interest in seeing greater detail around heritage resources on maps.

18. Community Character - Human Scale, Sensitive Density & Quality Building Design

Desire for guidelines or incentives that outline or encourage high-quality quality, human-scale development that fits community character.

19. Community Character - Housing Mix

Interest in preserving a wide variety of housing choices in the community.

20. Community Character - Gas Stations

Debate over whether a gas or service station should be restricted within the community.

21. Community Character - Encourage Entrepreneurship

Interest in seeing encouragement of small-business, entrepreneurship, and start-ups.

Open Space Feedback

22. Open Space - Challenges / Desire for more public open space

Interest in strategy or plan to increase open space in the community.

23. Preserve & Enhance Street Trees & Shrubs (Historic Character & Biodiversity)

Interest in seeing increased focus on preserving and enhancing street trees & shrubs.

24. Private Open Space listed as public

Concerns around how Enmax Park is considered and described within the Open Space section.

25. Park Safety / Homelessness

Interest in maintenance of open space to ensure safety.



26. Protection of Natural Heritage

Interest in strategies around preservation of natural heritage and biodiversity.

Mobility Feedback

27. Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility - Infrastructure & Routes

Desire for increased walkability and pedestrian safety through active transportation routes and corresponding infrastructure.

28. 11th Street - Parking/Cycling/Traffic Flow Tension

Debate over parking, cycling, traffic-flow precedence on 11th street.

29. Parking – Transit

Concern over parking impacts near stations.

30. Traffic Calming

Interest in seeing some active traffic calming in the community.

31. Traffic Connections

Interest in seeing strategies for greater vehicle connectivity described in more details in the document.

32. Concern about at-grade crossing on 11th

Concern that level-crossing on 11th street will limit potential for this area to flourish as a mainstreet.

33. Supporting Transit Network

Other transit network concerns.

34. Cycling Infrastructure (Bike Lines & Paths)

Interest in cycling infrastructure, but concern over how they are integrated into the community.

35. Transit Plaza – Elements

Suggestions for elements in the Green Line station plazas.

36. Transit Plaza - What plan does this belong to?

Concern over whether the ARP is the right document to contain information about the transit plazas.

37. Transit Plaza - Interface & Integration Ideas

Suggestions to improve integration of station areas with surrounding community.

Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

38. Flood Mitigation

Suggestion that flood mitigation does not require an entire section of the ARP.



39. District Energy

General interest in district energy.

40. Remediation & Environmental Impacts

Interest in seeing policy directing environmental remediation, or proactively limiting potential for environmental impact.

41. Water Quality & Utility Lifecycle

Interest in greater discussion of infrastructure and strategy to mitigate storm water pollution.

Other Feedback

42. Benefits to Community

Interest in seeing greater discussion of how plan implementation may include investment or benefits for the community.

43. Errors, Additions, Clarity - Simple Additions

Suggestions for simple changes or additions to make.

44. Errors, Additions, Clarity – Typos

Typos pointed out.

45. Errors, Additions, Clarity – Definitions

Requests for additional definitions of terms.

46. Errors, Additions, Clarity – Clarity

Requests for clarification of specific sections or ideas.

47. Other Information - Could be referenced within Plan

Suggestions for other plans or documents that could be referenced with the Plan.

48. Maps - Lot Lines

Interest in seeing lot-lines on ARP maps.

49. Maps - TOD Circles

Interest in seeing TOD circles from adjacent communities on maps.

50. Maps - Suggested Maps

Suggestions for additional maps.

51. Maps - Errors or Changes to Maps

Maps that show errors or require changes.



52. Nothing Noted

Next steps

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

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



Verbatim Comments

Land Use Concept Feedback

1. Land Use Concept - Different Character to North & South TOD / Station Areas

Interest in seeing a greater distinction between the Inglewood/Ramsay Station TOD character and the Crossroads Station TOD character, with development near Inglewood/Ramsay station emphasizing preservation of existing community character, and development near the Crossroads Station focusing on taking most of the increased density.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
25	3.2.2	Page 25, Section 3.2.2 & 3.3.2 - The community need large-scale retail establishments. The community ARP should not be making it difficult for larger scale establishments to be developed in these areas. Large-scale retail establishments can be designed in such a way where they can provide an animated pedestrian environment, and they will bring in the foot traffic required to support the smaller-scale retail businesses along the street.
		The land uses seem incompatible in most of the subject lands for a community so close to the Calgary core. It would seem better to encourage additional density to enhance walkability, support for community facilities, support for proposed transit uses, and commercial opportunities.
39	3.10.1	Page 39 3.10.1 was that intended to be the 26 Ave station or the closer one shared with Inglewood? It's not clear to me what this is and I'm not sure it will be clear for those interpreting the document later.
		Ramsay is a destination. People come here because of the heritage. Crossroads as DENSE residential.
18	map 3	Move density from the north, southward.
	3.8.1	3.8.1 and 3.8.2 are too vague. Our policy objective should be much more clear about shifting density away from heritage. Ramsay/Inglewood as a HERITAGE DESTINATION with Crossroads as a huge-dense residential.
		Modifying the overarching structure of the document. Emphasize differences between the two stations. Emphasize heritage throughout. Build a strong bonusing system to promote beautiful, unique, development.
		Consider treating 2 stations differently: Crossroads, high-density for residential. Inglewood, is more "cultural" heritage. Therefore consider stripping density from the north and moving to the south.
	3.8	Different rules for different stations. Shift density increases to Cross-roads.
		Maintaining the heritage aspects of the area is commendable, but overall FAR ratios are far too low, considering the location of these lands.
		Treat the station areas differently.
		Sensitive integration of density



Standard TOD rules should not apply to Ramsay / Inglewood station. Unique station should have unique rules to protect heritage.

2. Land Use Concept - TOD Circles

Suggestion that a TOD area that reflects destinations and travel paths may focus development more appropriately than the circular TOD areas used.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
39	3.10.1	Page 39, Section 3.10.1 - The Ramsay community association is located a very far distance from the 26th Ave station, and is in much closer proximity to the Inglewood/Ramsay station. This should include the TOD around both stations, or perhaps just the Inglewood/Ramsay station and not the 26th Ave Station.
	3	Circles for the TOD aren't actually reflective of the actual walking circles that people may take.
18	map 3	Why are we using circles, isn't this a bit chimpish/archaic? Why not a more fined-tuned network-based, destination oriented approach?

3. Land Use Concept - North 9th Street Zoning Change to Midrise

Concern that the change in land use designation at the north end of 9th street would have a negative impact on adjacent properties, as well as for the current owners of those parcels. Likewise, concern that there was not adequate consultation done with impacted residents before making those changes, and that the diagonal border of that designation will lead to this area slowly growing in size.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	Map 5	Map 5 - future target height. The target height of the Neighbourhood - Centre properties along 9th Street (abutting the LRT to the east). The 14 metres is not meaningful enough to do anything substantive along this corridor. These are the closes ranging residential properties to the LRT (possibly in the whole city) and prescribing a neighbourhood-centre zone to accommodate mid-rise buildings with retail, service, office and residential uses could not be accomplished very well with a 14 metre height maximum. Perhaps some consideration could be given to allow for 14 metres along the streetside to create a buffer between the low-res on the opposite site of the street, but jogging to 18 or 20 metres in the rear. Having a higher building will also help create a buffer between the traditional res and the LRT.
31	3.7.2	Page 31, Section 3.7.2(b) & 3.7.7 - Why are light industrial uses allowed in a Community - Urban or Neighbourhood - Centre development area? Industrial uses do not seem consistent with the type of environment that is meant to be achieved in these types of areas at all. I know that the existing zoning of the areas is perhaps industrial, but as the area is redeveloped the industrial uses should be restricted. Perhaps the ARP could allow light industrial uses in existing buildings only, or something to that effect.



50	5.5.2	Page 50, Section 5.5.2 - It is very concerning to the community that our ARP would indicated that these areas are subject to change without going through the regular amendment process. Any change that results in the loss of a street network connection to the community must require an amendment to the plan, and must be thoroughly reviewed with the community.
	Map 3	Upzoning in North area will result in dead-end and yet the homes there will have higher taxes.
	map 5	14m zone is too large, should not include R-2 home lots. There should be a shorter 12m buffer.
	map 5	North zone of 14m is too large. Should just be City owned land. 12m zone should buffer all grey zones.
	map 3	There is a difference between an empty lot and a lot with a heritage home. On 9th st SE, R-2 zoned properties are being upzoned to neighbourhood centre, which is a HUGE jump, especially for the neighbours who have 1 story homes or 11 Ave SE. Gradual transitions are important. We want lot lines!!! for clarity. We want to save heritage homes on 9th St. the Map rezones more than just the empty lots.
18	map 3	Community Centre at north 'tip' of the neighbourhood is planned strangely. Why is it not neighbourhood low rise? It has: Heritage houses, geologic history, no road access, so why mixed use? Weird? Great opportunity for a pathway.
	map 3	Community midrise on N 9th street. This is not community driven. Combined with the 300m meter rule and the fact that the 9th street is largely rentals, a 9th street landowner will be stuck on a dead end with unsellable zoning & high taxes.
	map 3	10st & 11ave - Midrise zoning encroaches (diagonal line) on residential historical block. This is zoning creep.

4. Land Use Concept - Building Heights, Setbacks & Stepping

Concern that there is not adequate 'stepping-back' between the higher heights of new developments and the lower heights of the existing structures.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		I would like to see more of a slow build up between the really tall condo zones and the single family homes, especially at the northern tip. Neighbourhood ltd. should have neighbourhood low-rise between them and neighbourhood centre.
27	3.4.1	Page 27, Section 3.4.1 (f) - Why is the ARP allowing building in this area to not meet contextual height regulations. This is not an area where residents want a building that is way higher than everything around it. Our ARP should not be exempting buildings from not meeting contextual height regulations in this zoning.
36	Map 5	Page 36, Map 5 - This Map is very concerning as it would appear to be indicating that a large amount of increased height would be allowed directly adjacent to low-height residences. The community has issue with there being no sort of transition zone where there would be a scaling down of building height, form and massing between existing smaller scale buildings, and new increased density and larger scale developments.

27 3.4.1 Page 27 3.4.1 f Buildings are not required to meet contextual height regulations signs away all rights of existing property owners to development that respects as built conditions. Is this already in the land use? Was this negotiated by developers posing as community volunteers in the consultation process?

18 There should be 4 storey max. (Neighbourhood Low-rise) development between RC-2 and 6 storey proposed rezoning (Neighbourhood centre) at the North end of Ramsay. At the very least there should be limits on building form, which require step backs to the 6 storey max. (Pg. 18 Map)

map 5 Concerned about lack of language here around setbacks and transitions for heights

3.1.8 Development should be respectful of neighbours, stepping back where possible, minimally shadowing neighbours, unique detailing added

Hard to accept future target heights w/o conversation about form.

Shadowing

5. Land Use Concept - 20m heights @ 19th Ave & 9th

Concern that this small parcel of 20m height will overshadow adjacent properties.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------

map 5		Why the 20m chunk in the middle of the community?
-------	--	---

map 5		Centre of the community should not be allowed to be 20m tall (19 ave SE) next to residential homes.
-------	--	---

map 5		20 meter height at 19th ave and 9th street is unacceptable.
-------	--	---

6. Land Use Concept - Active Frontage

Concern about design elements of active frontage, as well as an opportunity to be less restrictive about large-scale retail in that zone.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------

32	3.7.6	Page 32, Section 3.7.6 (c) - This is restricting the opportunity for larger-scale retail establishments to be developed in the area. This area seems to be a prime location for a larger-scale retail development, and the community is in desperate need of larger-scale retailers in close proximity. Large-scale retail developments can be designed in such a way to meet the pedestrian objectives of the zones, and they will bring in the foot traffic required to support the smaller-scale retail units in the area.
----	-------	---

	3.1.5	Not just blank walls are a problem, but closed off doors and windows too. No tinted windows, doors every 'blank' feet required (not allowed to be closed off once a tenant comes in). Worried about street safety of large building frontages.
--	-------	--

Include language around built form elements in active frontage

7. Land Use Concept - Affordable Housing

Opportunity to encourage affordable housing while ensuring sustainable operation of these sites.



Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.10.4	Public housing is not being kept up and we don't want to lose it.
		Inglewood ARP, 2.1.5 (p. 16) We would want this point too, and I would add that maintaining affordable housing stock and diversity of incomes in residents is important too.
		How might we promote private investment in affordable housing? Bonusing? Mix market & non-market?
		8th & Macdonald - Current low-income not being maintained. Needs to be re-developed. Can we increase this to low-income higher density?
		Affordable housing and age-in-place seniors housing as an aspiration for community demographics

8. Land Use Concept - Laneway Houses

Opportunity to emphasized laneway housing as a way to sensitively increase density in the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.4	3.4 Development within Ramsay should include provisions allowing and encouraging the use of laneway homes whenever possible.
		Why do we assume density always means upzoning? Why not blanket secondary suite/laneway house approvals instead?
		According to targets, Mills Estate is targeted to double density (36 ppl/hectare -> 80 ppl/hectare). This would be a perfect opportunity for laneway houses on these lots (x2 density). Makes an opportunity for a super-unique area.
	3.5.1	Consider expanding to include laneway housing as this is a creative way to increase density (sensitively) where heritage can be preserved.
	3.5	Laneway houses for small size lots to increase density w/o mid-rise
		Where are laneway houses as a form of density? These create density.
		laneway as a mechanism to increase density
		We have narrow laneways, makes it difficult for more intense access

9. Land Use Concept - Allow Rowhouses Where Appropriate

Interest in allowing sensitive integration of rowhousing in the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.5.2	3.5..2 - it notes Rowhouses should not be approved within the neighbourhood-limited areas. However, there is one section, west of the Ramsay school along Alexander Street that currently has 3 homes on it and it is sorely under-utilized in its current zoning. They are awkward lots that look "lost" adjacent to the school. Perhaps an opportunity to review this section in more detail.



27 3.5.2 Page 27, Section 3.5.2 - Why is the ARP restricting rowhouse development in this zoning? Rowhouses can be designed in such a way that they are a benefit to the community, and are really not much different from duplex developments. The community does not see why rowhouses should be signaled out in the ARP and not allowed to be proposed in these areas.

Townhouse conversations

10. Land Use Concept - Secondary Suites

Opportunity to encourage secondary suites

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
20	3.5.3	encourage' secondary suite development (and not just enable). This will give us more density and hopefully help keep more heritage homes.

11. Stampede - Nuisance Factors

Interest in seeing more mitigation of Noise and sound from Stampede operations.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.6.4	3.6.4 Nuisance mitigation Stampede operations in general need nuisance mitigation. For example monster truck shows create noise and exhaust fumes, existing noise violation tickets of \$250 as current bylaws are ineffective against an organization of this size and do nothing to protect the peaceful enjoyment of property. This section should be for Stampede Operations and contain some actual teeth to ensure respect for residential neighbours. refer to section 3.4.1 b.
	3.7.4	Noise impacts minimized and screened.
	3.6.4	Stampede Back of House - Nuisance mitigation design. Add Brown & Associates, April 2010 Development Impact Study (re: residential/commercial interface with agricultural uses. A difficult transition area because of sterilization setbacks from agriculture.

12. Stampede - Future Vision for Stampede Back of House

Concern with what is described for this area, as well as a feeling that it is inappropriate to provide too many details in this section, prior to a future study being completed.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------



31 3.7.2 Page 31, Section 3.7.2 - This section of the ARP does not align with the community context, vision or needs whatsoever. This area has been identified as a prime location for increased density and mixed-use development in the community for many years, and the community is not in support of what is written in the ARP for this site at all. The ARP indicates that 4 hectares of the land can be incorporated into the existing Stampede Back of House Area. 4 hectares is a very large majority of the land, and the community will not support the ARP allowing that much of the area to become locked-off, unkempt, low density and ugly land which is what the existing Stampede Back of House Area is. Also, the ARP indicates that "the remaining area to the east" will allow for Community - Urban development. This makes no sense, as it is the land along the west and south portion of the site that is adjacent to the community (Spiller Road & 24th Ave) and it should be that portion of the site which is developed as Community - Urban. The ARP is indicating that the area of land that has the most opportunity to become a vibrant part of the community is allowed to be used for Stampede Back of House. The ARP should indicate that only the South East portion of the site can be developed as Stampede Back of House area (if anything), and a much smaller area than 4 hectares of the site should be allowed to be developed as Stampede Back of House.

29 3.6.3 Page 29 3.6.3 I don't understand the rationale behind putting intensive office uses by open space amenities? Does this require open space amenities to be part of such development unless they are beside a station? I suggest that it could be ambiguous in practice as well.

map 4 Stampede should not show 3 FAR yet.

3.7 Community engagement required for the stampede back of house and dominion bridge comprehensive plan areas.

3.6 Could use a more collaborative approach (stampede & community) to this entire section.

3.7 In an ARP we should envision what we want in that area.

Stampede lands need to be revisited as a future comprehensive study.

13. Stampede – Other

Interest in seeing historical relationship to Stampede grounds integrated into document.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
15		Prior to page 15 the history fails to mention the Calgary Stampede which sits within our boundaries and is a huge impact on the community. We are the only community adjacent to an exhibition ground in North America. All others are separated by major roadways. By ignoring this you are ignoring a more vital and long term issue than baseball teams and the Water Centre.

14. Heritage - Skepticism Around Effectiveness of Density Transfer

Concern that the listed described heritage density transfer process will not adequately preserve existing heritage buildings in the community or existing heritage character.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------

33	3.8.3	Page 33, Section 3.8.3 - How is exempting properties from having to follow heritage conservation approaches to get increased density helping to conserve heritage? Ramsay will not support this being written into the heritage conservation section of the ARP.
34	3.8.5	Page 34, Section 3.8.5, 3.8.6 & 3.8.7 - The heritage conservation approaches outlined in the ARP indicates that only buildings that are designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource would be eligible to benefit from the conservation approaches outlined in the ARP. The pervious section indicates that the majority of historic resources in the community are not protected. Based on research of buildings that are designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource, it appears that there are in fact no buildings in the entire plan area that are currently designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource, and it is actually very unlikely that any buildings within the plan area would meet the criteria or ever be designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource. In particular, any of the historic residences throughout the community would almost surely never be designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource. Page 33 of the ARP does a good job of talking about how important the historic character of the community is to residents, and what contributes to this cohesive heritage character (i.e. the large number of historic residences throughout the community, the majority of which are modest in scale, being vernacular or pattern book examples), however the heritage conservation approaches outlined in the ARP do nothing to help to conserve any of the important heritage fabric of the community. The community will not support an ARP that does nothing to help preserve the heritage character of the community. As previously mentioned it is very unlikely that any building in the Ramsay ARP area will ever be designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource, therefore this ARP is doing nothing to provide incentive to retain heritage.
34	fig. 13	Page 34, figure 13 - This illustration makes it look like someone could be transferring the density from above their single family house site to another site. This is misleading as it is extremely unlikely that any residence within Ramsay will ever be designated as a Municipal Historic Resource, and therefore would not be eligible for Heritage Density Transfer, based on what is proposed in the ARP.
	3.8.5	Section 38.5 I am concerned regarding Bonusing of developments through the transfer of unused Heritage Property density. There should be a maximum height permitted for each area so that bonusing does not create developments that are too high for the area.
	A.2	Appendix A.2 - It is confusing as to what the purpose of this appendix is? There does not appear to be any reference to a "Character Home" anywhere else in the ARP. Having your home identified as a "Character Home" according to this criteria would seemingly not get you anything in terms of any type of bonus or incentive for conserving heritage. The community does want there to be some type of incentive written into the ARP that would help to preserve more of the character homes in the community, but the way it is currently written there would be no way that any of the character home in Ramsay would be able to benefit from any of the Heritage Conservation Approaches outlined in section 3.8.
	3.8.6	Has this model been used already in the city? Where and what were the outcomes?
	3.8.5	Heritage density transfers would not likely be cost effective for homeowners.
	3.8.3	3.8.3 & 3.8.4 seem to run completely contradictory to each other.



3.8.5	I don't think this will work to save any homes. Few will designate and there isn't a good enough reward. One time money, and not much.
3.8.6	This fund won't necessarily have enough income to help anyone who want to preserve their home. There are no guidelines/rules about how this fund is run - equal access to funds? Who qualifies - is it too limited?
3.8.5	We already are re-zoning there is nothing left to transfer/need for transfer.
3.8	I don't think the heritage conservation approach discussed will actually help us save heritage buildings. If a heritage building will be torn down is there a way to save part for neighbours?
3.8.5	Heritage Density Transfers will not preserve one heritage house in Ramsay. Needs to be re-written.

15. Heritage - Other Heritage Preservation Models

Interest in alternative strategies for heritage preservation.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.8.5	Density transfer. This is a bonusing system. Can we implement a bonusing strategy that provides for laneway houses? Eg: keep old house, adds laneway house for free/unrestricted.
		Can the community investment fund be used to help more properties be designated?
		Heritage policy with laneway homes?
		Are there other ways to conserve heritage that is not bonusing?
		Bridgeland Mainstreets has a maintaining character strategy, we would like that too
		Character home preservation (from Bridgeland)

16. Heritage - Undesignated Historical Resources

Concern that protection of heritage homes will prove too difficult to be effective.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.8.3	I have a big problem with clause 3.8.3. Does this mean my entire street could re-designate itself to higher-density residential if desired? What's stopping developers from purchasing homes within the 300 m radius and applying to re-designate them? Also, this clause is referring to the wrong map. It should refer to Map 4.
24	3.1.2	Page 24, Section 3.1.2 - The historic character of Ramsay is important to the residents of Ramsay, and new development should be encouraged to protect it within the entire plan area, not just on 11th Street SE.
52	5.6	Page 52, Section 5.6 (c) - What does "officially being protected" mean. As was indicated earlier in the ARP, very few building in the plan area are protected, and in fact it is very unlikely that any buildings in the entire plan area will ever be designated as a Municipal Heritage Resource by the province.
	3.8.3	[300m redesignation rule] Should be removed from the ARP



3.8.3	[300m redesignation rule] is Ironic. How is mass upzoning a "heritage conservation policy"
3.8.3	Neglects to address heritage resources on 10st/9st/17 Ave
map 4	Zoning FAR 2 within 300 meters of Ramsay station will destroy the historical aspect of 9th and 10th street. I don't think the ARP includes enough protection for character homes that aren't on the historic register.
map 5	Targets need to start quite low and then heights can come up with the bonusing scheme Will the City designate single family homes in a timely manner?

17. Heritage - Other

Interest in seeing greater detail around heritage resources on maps.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
60		P. 60 - provide description of Historical Resource. The H's appear on map (p. 61) , but should be described.
	3.9.8	Contradicts the zoning in the land use plan. [New development should be contextual w/ adj. heritage; scale, massing, street wall] Note historic streets (9th Street, Maggie, Bison Path)

18. Community Character - Human Scale, Sensitive Density & Quality Building Design

Desire for guidelines or incentives that outline or encourage high-quality quality, human-scale development that fits community character.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		I'm very concerned about the scale of the development on 11 Street SE. The plan shows large buildings immediately adjacent to existing single-family homes in Ramsay. I'm worried this will significantly affect views, privacy, sunlight, and property values of my home (on 10 Street SE). On page 36, the map shows a target height of 20 m immediately adjacent to the backyards of single-family homes on 10 Street SE. These 20 m high buildings are going to tower over our backyards!
		I'm excited for the redevelopment of the Dominion Bridge site. It's been an eyesore for too long. I'm also looking forward to the creation of 11 Street SE as a main street. I'm just concerned about building height and neighbouring redevelopment as a result of the main street creation.
24	3.1.5	Page 24 3.1.5 Blank walls and monolithic blocks at ground level...
24		Pg. 24 There should be no tinted windows on the ground floor, and a maximum allowable area advertisements and signs can fill of the total window area.
	3.8.2	Development in empty lots and secondary suits, limit redevelopment of lots with single family homes.
	3.1.8	Setback for front gardens and trees are important to maintain character of community.



How might we attract quality design? (Character, form)

Let's break some boundaries (on planning)

Can planners offer up some creative density ideas that are not towers?

Form-based zoning codes. Design guidelines. Rigorous design review. Focus on 'character' of new development. More stringent landscape requirements, room for 5m wide trees not just columnar, which provide no shade or habitat.

Character lighting along 11th and Spiller maybe with historic elements similar in reference to the lighting on Elbow Drive or 9th ave between 14th and 11th.

19. Community Character - Housing Mix

Interest in preserving a wide variety of housing choices in the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Heamsted Hill should be accessible for area residents to use and should not become another exclusive hill for the rich only. This includes a variety of housing options for various income levels.
20	Page 20	Catalyst Redevelopment Area should include that the vibrancy of the community has always been the mix of high and low, big and small. Entry level opportunities should be part of any new development proposal to continue to encourage this diversity.
	3.5.1	3.5.1 Respect and reinforce ... structure and historic character. Common problems that new developments cause for existing dwellings are around drainage and shadowing. The planners have to take these concerns seriously if there is any intention of retaining heritage homes in Ramsay. Also city inspectors are creating neighbourhood friction by not holding developers accountable to standards and forcing a civil matter between people who may be living next door. This also puts older people and others on fixed incomes at a disadvantage. This fails to maintain the integrity of the community. This section needs to be stronger.
		Heamsted Hill should be accessible for area residents to use and should not become another exclusive hill for the rich only. This includes a variety of housing options for various income levels.
	3.4.1	3.4.1 Development of Maggie Street Area: Yes this development is long past overdue. Development needs to include an "Attainable Homes" and/or "Calgary Housing Partnership" to provide a mix of income level resident to the area.
		Language around respectful redevelopment (you have existing neighbours)

20. Community Character - Gas Stations

Debate over whether a gas or service station should be restricted within the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment



24 3.1.3 Page 24, section 3.1.3 - Many people in the community would like a gas station in closer proximity to us, and there is a need for these types of businesses within the community. Historically there was a gas station on spiller road. The community ARP should not be restricting all of these uses within the entire plan area. Maybe the ARP could be discouraging these types of in some specific locations of the plan area (i.e. fronting hurst road, 11th ave, and 26th ave), but not allowing these uses within the entire plan area is not what the community wants, and is restricting uses that the community needs.

Do not want gas station

We have 2 gas stations in Inglewood and a number more in the Beltline and McLeod Trail areas. No need for gas station in a small area where there are 6+ stations within 3km

21. Community Character - Encourage Entrepreneurship

Interest in seeing encouragement of small-business, entrepreneurship, and start-ups.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
26	3.3.4	Page 26 3.3.4 Incubator sites are encouraged to continue the long history of small business start up in Ramsay.
		Frontier community

Open Space Feedback

22. Open Space - Challenges / Desire for more public open space

Interest in strategy or plan to increase open space in the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	2.1.7	Section 2.1.7 does not go far enough. Ramsay is under 10% park space, which is the minimum the City expects from developers when they create new areas. In essence, this ARP process re-creates the community expanding capacity equivalent to a new community so the City should not expect less of their planners than they do of developers. Ramsay deserves equal investment as we expand the capacity and essentially create an already serviced community for the City of Calgary.
25	3.2.1	Page 25 3.2.1 This should be the opportunity to create parks and parklets as part of development. Maintain passive and active public space, community garden, food forest, plaza, etc. as part of Parks Inventory for the citizens of the area and not under 3rd Party control used for a commercial event facility.
31		Page 31 and 32 need to contain instructions to set aside parcels for Parks inventory in order to achieve 10% park standards at a minimum.



The area in and around (west of) the Lillydale Chicken processing facility needs to be developed as natural and cultural area. It would be an ideal location for an Arts Centre similar to North Mount Pleasant or Wildflower arts centre. The open playground area west of the Lillydale plant could be developed into a more natural urban park environment and be integrated with the arts centre design.

Most of the ARP park area is either the escarpment. There are only three additional other parks, two of which are completely underutilized at this point (by Lillydale and the train play-park along 10th). Is there any way to incorporate more greenspace? What can we do to improve the spaces we do have?

43	map 6	Page 43, Map 6 - This Map appears to be showing that Ramsay has much more Park and Open space that actually exists. The parcel of land to the south of the Catholic school site I believe is actually owned by the school and is used as their school yard area, so it should be coloured as blue school space not green park space. Also much of the land area along the western edge of Ramsay is a very steep escarpment area down to the Bow River, so it can hardly be considered as accessible or usable park area.
40	4.1	Page 40 4.1 Objectives should contain the objective to create more park space as development progresses. It only talks of maintaining, not expanding. Very disappointing, especially the use of private event lands as parks to make the green space appear larger on the map. The area south of the 26 Ave station is currently an abandoned wild area that could be developed into a natural features park and or a dog /walking area.
	4.1	Should list an aspirational goal of 10% open-space
	4.1	Southern portion of the community will need more open space, especially as density increases in that area. Enmax Park isn't/won't cut it.
	3.9.6	Better description of the opportunity around open-space in this point.
	2.1.7	Should shift from simply protection and enhancement to having a goal of increasing the amount of open space.
		City-Shaping: RE: open spaces and all of the land that the city purchased for the Green Line.
		Need dedicated parks space within 200m of Crossroads LRT station
	4.2	Also, where is the future park space (east & south of LRT)? We are at less than 10% open space. TO have a complete community we need community facilities. Plan does not include adequate green space for density increases Open Space "belongs" to the school board If we redevelop the Community Hall we lose this as "open space"

23. Preserve & Enhance Street Trees & Shrubs (Historic Character & Biodiversity)

Interest in seeing increased focus on preserving and enhancing street trees & shrubs.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------



41	p.41 Maintain and improve / expand the significant historic tree and shrub plantings in the boulevards (originally part of the City Beautiful movement).
2.1.7	Would like to see the inclusion of street trees and shrubs in the same language in this policy.
3.8.5	Heritage tree and shrub plantings should be protected and expanded.
2.1.7	Street Trees/Shrubs should be protected and enhanced as well. (historically and culturally significant - City Beautiful movement).
2.1.7	Preservation & showcasing of communities biodiversity. Protection of boulevard plants & established private trees. Is there a 'bonusing' system that gives these assets market-value in context of redevelopment?
	New development should seek to expand the existing tree and shrub planning scheme of the community.

24. Private Open Space listed as public

Concerns around how Enmax Park is considered and described within the Open Space section.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
42	4.2.1	Page 42 4.2.1 Third sentence would be more accurate as Enmax Park is intended for public use...subject to restrictions created due to...Calgary Exhibition and Stampede functions. Furthermore, many of the assurances provided to the community during the development permit stage of the area have been left behind and are not adhered to including the use of MacDonald Avenue as a vehicular entrance and the safety requirements for the bypass pathway. These assurances need to be enshrined in a living document such as this.
	map 6	Open space map still isn't reflective of the actual open space in the community. Is Enmax Park weighted with the same value per acre as other parks when calculating total park space? Does Enmax Park bias our perspective on open spaces - it is inaccessible.
	4.2	Enmax is private and could change and is over the cliff. Should not be emphasized as much. Need to be extra green space. Enmax park is leased, not public.

25. Park Safety / Homelessness

Interest in maintenance of open space to ensure safety.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
41	4.1.4	Page 41, Section 4.1.4 - This should not be limited to the City-owned sites along the northeast edge of Ramsay. All City owned land should be maintained as a safe and attractive buffer. For example, much of the western boundary of Ramsay along the Elbow River, is City owned park space that has gone neglected by the City and has



become a haven for homeless camps, and has brought lots of crime to the neighbourhood.

42	Page 42 could expand on the protection required for this fragile area. Better care needs to be taken to ensure that chain link fences do not continue to create a safe space for urban camping and unsafe activities.
----	---

26. Protection of Natural Heritage

Interest in strategies around preservation of natural heritage and biodiversity.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.9.6	Where is this specifically? Can we see it on one of the maps? Does 3.9.8 come into conflict with 3.9.6?
	3.9.6	Where is the Ramsay Escarpment? Vegetation should connect to other vegetated areas . They need open space within this 26-100m future target area.
	3.8.6	Natural heritage escarpment preservation required.
	2.1.7	Preservation & showcasing of geological history (embankments to N and Scotsman's Hill) - Remnants of previous glacial periods. (Right along Green Line ROW)
	3.8	This section is missing natural heritage conservation.

Mobility Feedback

27. Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility - Infrastructure & Routes

Desire for increased walkability and pedestrian safety through active transportation routes and corresponding infrastructure.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
42	4.2.1	Page 42, Section 4.2.1 - More should be written into the ARP to ensure a safe alternate route to downtown, and to and from the Stampede is maintained when Enmax park route is closed due to functions. A major pedestrian connection along the western boundary of Ramsay gets completely blocked off and forgotten about during stampede and when the Enmax park route is closed due to functions. A better plan needs to be thought out to provide access to this route from the Stampede grounds, and Ramsay residents need to be notified much better as to when the primary route will be blocked off, so other arrangements can be planned out for pedestrian travelers. Enhanced walkability and alternative transportation modes don't seem to be encouraged here to the extent necessary. This would include making use of green corridors for this as well.



45 4.2.5 Page 45 4.2.5 If it is not already written into city best practices this should include ramps at all corners and assists for visually impaired. Sidewalks in East Village had to be redone because they merged onto the street without any cues for the visually impaired.

5.2.6 5.2.6b. Should list an alternative to the 8th St. SE / CP rail closure is needed. Should also mention improving the pedestrian /cycle underpass here.

47 5.3.2 Page 47, Section 5.3.2 - The streets are already over cluttered with City signage. It is referred to as "street pollution". The community ARP should not be dictating that gratuitous signage be provided throughout Ramsay which is completely unnecessary.

Enhanced walkability and alternative transportation modes don't seem to be encouraged here to the extent necessary.

We need to include / consider the 7th street underpass

Strengthen active transportation policy

Thoughtful pedestrian realm is a must (Wide sidewalks, slow cars)

More seamless access into Inglewood

28. 11th Street - Parking/Cycling/Traffic Flow Tension

Debate over parking, cycling, traffic-flow precedence on 11th street.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------

	5.5.3	I disagree that where parking spaces and bike lanes conflict that the parking spaces take precedent. it takes away from the continuity of biking through the neighbourhood and should not be taken away from the vehicles. section 5.5.3.c.
--	-------	---

46		p 46-47. Priority on 11 Street SE for Parking lane, to support business development. If it comes down to a choice - one vehicle parking lane over cycle lane down 11 St SE. Move cycle track under the GreenLine elevated track instead.
----	--	--

What is happening on 11th? Parking? Bike Lanes? What fits?

29. Parking – Transit

Concern over parking impacts near stations.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------

52		Page 52 Parking. Stand alone parking structures? are they permitted in this plan? I would hope not. surface parking lots should be landscaped.
----	--	--

	5.6	Section 5.6 Please ensure that permit parking is in place for adjacent streets to the elevated C-Train platform.
--	-----	--

Alleyway for existing homes on 10th street SE next to the Ramsay/Inglewood station???
[Concern about parking in alleyway]

30. Traffic Calming

Interest in seeing some active traffic calming in the community.



Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	5.5.3	5.5.3 Development of 11th Street should not encourage vehicular traffic to cut through Ramsay via 21, 20 & 19 Ave. Appropriate Traffic studies and community engagement should occur to ensure this is not a byproduct of the plan.
		What ever can be done to minimize the cut-through traffic through the community of Ramsay should be actively pursued.

31. Traffic Connections

Interest in seeing strategies for greater vehicle connectivity described in more details in the document.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
45	4.2.5	Page 45 4.2.5 It's important to improve connections to the Water Centre, Inglewood, Alyth Bonnybrook. Pedestrian crosswalk should be opened on the east side of 11th at 26th and traffic should be able to flow straight onto the site instead of putting pedestrians in harms way on the way to the market.
50		p. 50 Improve connectivity (more connections!) of street network by increasing alternate route options where possible, and limiting the use of one way streets and dead ends.
	5	Desire to see a more comprehensive transportation plan described in this section.
	2.1.8	Maintain or improve road and pathway connectivity.
	2.2	11th St. crosses a rail ROW. How does this impact the ideas of a mainstreet? This is likely future commuter rail and needs to redirect road. Extend mainstreet to flow in front of old lillydale site.
50		Page 50 - This section should indicate that no existing streets or connections into or out of the community will be closed off or taken away without extensive consultation with the community. All of the access points into the community are very important to the residents, and any proposed change that would close off a street network connection needs to be thoroughly reviewed with the community.
20		Mobility. Understand that while private vehicles will be less necessary we still need to get out. Need to understand the impact of 8th street closure on traffic before committing to load population. What will closing 8th look like? Opportunities to connect to Inglewood? Emergency Access Stampede Traffic How does 9th Ave relate to 11th street, they should be connected.

32. Concern about at-grade crossing on 11th

Concern that level-crossing on 11th street will limit potential for this area to flourish as a mainstreet.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
-----------	--------------	---------



5.5	Issues around the current at-grade rail crossing on 11th. This isn't explicitly addressed in the plan and will likely impact the ability for this to become a real mainstreet/highstreet.
5.5.3	11th Street is interrupted by an at-grade railway crossing. An alternative is to connect 11th street up to spiller road SE. This would solve so many traffic jams when a train comes through.
	11st. Rail crossing - Pedestrian/cycle interface solution
	11th street. Need to understand transportation/roads plans so we know how that impacts our ARP. What plan trumps what?
	What about at grade rail crossing on 11th? We can't ignore this.
	Hurst road as a high-street extension opportunity (avoid 11th crossing and add density here)

33. Supporting Transit Network

Other transit network concerns.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Mobility Systems it is important to note the Green Line connection to South Health Campus is vital to the well being of our population due to the dearth of inner city hospital facilities.
48		Page 48 as above objective to have connection via transit to hospital at South Campus.
49		Map on page 49 Doesn't make sense to add transit to the SNAFU that is the at grade traffic circle with a train shunting line running through it. As it stands, there are 5 opportunities for impact as traffic crosses within the circle. Page 50

34. Cycling Infrastructure (Bike Lines & Paths)

Interest in cycling infrastructure, but concern over how they are integrated into the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Bike lanes are needed along 8th St. SE.
46	map 7	Page 46, Map 7 - A major concern is that there appears to be a cycle route indicated along 23 Ave SE. This is a single family residential street, just like all the other avenues to the north, and it would not be able to support a major cycling route along it. A bus route does run along this avenue which is perhaps why it has been identified as a major pedestrian route and to have a cycle route, but this bus route was already meant to be changing to go along 24 Ave SE, and it is already planned to have been moved off of 23 Ave SE. 24 Ave SE would be a much better road to propose as a cycle route as the Dominion Bridge site runs along the bulk of the street and it is already slated for redevelopment, and the north side of the street does not have a demand for on-street parking whereas 23 Ave is lined with houses that rely upon on-street parking.

47 Page 47 The cyclist infrastructure needs to minimize the potential for pedestrian/cyclist conflict by constructing separate areas for them to be .

Also driveways conflict with bike lanes. Not quite sure what we are promoting here...I feel that this is a more appropriate corridor for vehicles than through the neighbourhood.

Connection to existing regional pathways

35. Transit Plaza – Elements

Suggestions for elements in the Green Line station plazas.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
48	5.4.2	Page 48, Section 5.4.2 - Train stations and primary bus stops should be required to provide a heated area as part of the pedestrian waiting amenities.
		The new LRT station must include trees, it should be a point under Transit Plaza.
	3.9.5	Would like to see an increase in specificity around use of the space, i.e.: heated areas and bike facilities.
	3.9.5	Concern that the ideas that are listed here won't actually make it into the transit plaza as built (Sunalta as an example)
	3.9.5	Transit Plaza. Add security in general (cameras) and specific (bike cameras). Ramsay has a high theft rate and likely vandalism.
		Safety / security / activity centre interface to communities

36. Transit Plaza - What plan does this belong to?

Concern over whether the ARP is the right document to contain information about the transit plazas.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.9.5	Does this section even belong in this document? How does this align with the work that the Green Line will be doing?
	3.9.5	Need a station committee & public engagement. Multi-use space is important. Incorporate more uses: fountain, fire dept, stores, anything else you can add will give life to this space. So important! a. i. Heated space, ix. Covered bike facilities, x. trees, v. permanent vendors
	3.9.5	Transit plaza should be its own committee, not an ARP item.
		Transit Station planning as a separate function /activity with transportation specialists and design architects and landscape architects = successful spaces for people

37. Transit Plaza - Interface & Integration Ideas

Suggestions to improve integration of station areas with surrounding community.



Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.9.5	3.9.5 Plazas on both Inglewood and Ramsay sides of the station with good lighting, Transit security cameras and other features and areas to engage community use. I have concerns about the green line dividing the Inglewood and Ramsay communities creating mobility issues between the two interconnected communities.
	3.9.5	NEEDS to compliment the character. NEEDS to provide safe, clean, efficient.
18	3.9.5	Transit plaza. Can not be a moonscape. Need more specific language. Needs to be incorporated into the active frontage.
		Transit plaza interface
		Concern about noise around new bus routes / stops where currently there aren't any. 10st / 11 ave SE

Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

38. Flood Mitigation

Suggestion that flood mitigation does not require an entire section of the ARP.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
55	6.5	Page 55, Section 6.5 - As is indicated in the write-up of this section, "Only a small portion of Ramsay, mostly green space adjacent to the Elbow River, lies within the flood hazard area". Since this is the case, why is there a large number of sections included in the Ramsay ARP (page 58 & Appendix A.1) that have no relevance to the community whatsoever. This entire section seems to be copy/paste from the Inglewood ARP or another beltline community that has privately owned property within the flood plain. Since Enmax Park, and City owned lands are the only areas that are in the flood plain, there should be unique guidelines in the Ramsay ARP that address the specific type of park lands and natural areas that are affected by flooding, not just generic sections that are copied from other districts ARP's that have much different land zonings that are affected by the floodway.
	6.5	6.5 Floodway area should be described as the area in Enmax Park that was inundated in 2013.
		Not a copy/paste item. Should be community specific (we didn't flood).

39. District Energy / Solar

General interest in district energy.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		I think the idea of a DE system in Ramsay is pretty cool.
		A district energy system seems like a great idea - with the proviso that all new development be required to participate.



40. Remediation & Environmental Impacts

Interest in seeing policy directing environmental remediation, or proactively limiting potential for environmental impact.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	7.1	section 7.1 - where environmental impact assessments are necessary, a timeline should be placed on redevelopment/remediation so that the sites do not remain vacant. such items like managing sites through risk assessments should be considered to aid in development in a timely manner.
		i didn't see anything related to location of future gas stations or commercial/industrial properties that may be impactful to the environment, so restrictions should be put on where those are located. this looks great. thanks so much for all your hard work on this!

41. Water Quality & Utility Lifecycle

Interest in greater discussion of infrastructure and strategy to mitigate storm water pollution.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		The need to clean up the Elbow River should be included as a future goal. We should be able to wade / allow our dogs to enter without fear of what might be in the water (as the commonly posted signs in summer suggest). How will the new boat launch work if this persist?
		Regarding storm water management: I'd love to see some LID projects installed in Ramsay. I think they'd be very well received here, and there is a lot of space along the boulevards for this.
54	6.1.3	Page 54 6.1.3 should discuss use of solar for municipal and community structures. 6.2 Should acknowledge the existence of very old pipes and the additional pressure put on them by modern development. There should be an inventory of the pipe replacements so that the same streets are not torn up multiple times as the water pressure blows out more sections of rotten pipe. This would be more cost effective for the city and less disruptive to the community.
55		Page 55 See comments above regarding aging infrastructure and new infill development. Many of the existing alleys are still substandard in their ability to handle storm water management. Deficiencies must be recognized and addressed as part of the cost of inner city maintenance. I am currently in the midst of a 12 year struggle to deal with storm water management that the development department is refusing to accept responsibility for signing off on.
55	6.4	p. 55 6.4 Please note that storm water run-off into the Elbow River is having a negative effect on Elbow River water quality currently. We should include our hope for improvements.



Other Feedback

42. Benefits to Community

Interest in seeing greater discussion of how plan implementation may include investment or benefits for the community.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.10.1	community association building is underutilized, this is an opportunity for some other use. Civic partners would be great in city shaping. We would love more recreation facilities.
		What is the city investing in our community to improve it? (ie: green space & recreation)
		Community Hall site opportunities
		A small-medium sized recreation facility...ideas: City/Community partners, sponsors? Integration of an older-adult, child, and youth activity opportunities. Day care centre?

43. Errors, Additions, Clarity - Simple Additions

Suggestions for simple changes or additions to make.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		The names of all parks in Ramsay should be named, not just Enmax park (which doesn't even feel public because it is rented out to Stampede and they post signs that reiterate that it is not public). Two dog parks, one on upper Scotsman's hill and the lower one by the McDonald Bridge. As well as the green spaces behind/beside both of the schools. And finally the 10th St SE park - whose playground could use an update. The unofficial green space at the end of Adelaide /9th St SE also deserves a mention.
	3.1	Section is missing the tennis courts, the historic covered rink structure, and the community gardens.
	3.10.	Missing the community garden.
	3.6.4	Add "odour control"
	3.6.4	Add odour control and add animal part control, because I have Lillydale and their random chicken parts around the community top of mind.
	3.10.	Add covered rink, tennis courts, community garden to this section.
	3.1	Community amenities & facilities - Add tennis courts, community garden, iconic covered rink.

44. Errors, Additions, Clarity – Typos

Typos pointed out.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
	3.8.4	Section 3.8.4 & 3.8.6 - There appears to be an editing error. There is no Map 6. Only a Map 4 & 5. It is unclear which map the section is supposed to refer to.



45	map 7	Page 45 - There appears to be an editing error, it indicates Map 9, whereas it should be Map 7.
54	6.2	P. 54 6.2 Water, delete first word (water).
38		26 Ave SE, 3.9.8 is used twice

45. Errors, Additions, Clarity – Definitions

Requests for additional definitions of terms.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
26	3.3.3	Page 26, Section 3.3.3 - It is unclear what the uses are that would be considered to "not generate significant pedestrian activity". The one example of a financial institution doesn't make it clear what other types of uses would be included, and it does not seem like a bank should be signaled out as to being a use that should be restricted to these extra maximum frontage rules by the community ARP. Residential lobbies can also be very nice spaces, and it is unclear why the Ramsay ARP should be placing restrictions on the street frontage.
38		Page 38 - What is the "Ramsay Escarpment" it is very confusing as to what area of land this is referring to?
	3.4.1	What is viable amenity space? Define.
	3.9.7	Define escarpment
		Definitions of types of open space

46. Errors, Additions, Clarity – Clarity

Requests for clarification of specific sections or ideas.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
26	3.3.3	Page 26, Section 3.3.3 - It is unclear what the uses are that would be considered to "not generate significant pedestrian activity". The one example of a financial institution doesn't make it clear what other types of uses would be included, and it does not seem like a bank should be signaled out as to being a use that should be restricted to these extra maximum frontage rules by the community ARP. Residential lobbies can also be very nice spaces, and it is unclear why the Ramsay ARP should be placing restrictions on the street frontage.
28	3.6.1	Page 28 3.6.1 b. Are these uses to be inside only? it doesn't specify. The ARP doesn't clearly state here if the park on 10 Street SE will be impacted by the new station. Could this be clarified?
	4.1.4	Is 4.1.4 meant to include C-train use as well as CP? Shouldn't it?
	map 3	review naming of the land-use building blocks
32		Stockyards look like old failed public housing blocks (I know it is just conceptual) but it looks awful. Community has not had input. Should not be in ARP. Looks like we approve as it is.



- Future target height meters = how many stories?
- Consistent terminology between DAG and ARP
- How is Open Space calculated?
- How do we get where we are going without knowing where we are? Density...
- What are the density targets?
- Tax implications, how does this impact property taxes?

47. Other Information - Could be referenced within Plan

Suggestions for other plans or documents that could be referenced with the Plan.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Ramsay is within 300m of a rail yard. Rail Policy is a big issue that needs to be in ARP, not flood planning (no flood plain in Ramsay)
		Ramsay Natural Steps - Document that should be shared
		Original Ramsay ARP
		Clint Roberts "windshield study"
		Community Needs and Preferences Study - Is there one?
		Community demographics from census info? (percentage of seniors, young families, single parents, renters vs. owners)
		Revisit the previously collected questions & answer them (the spreadsheet)
		More input from transportation & heritage
		Need to consider Inglewood ARP
		Merge Inglewood and Ramsay ARP

48. Maps - Lot Lines

Interest in seeing lot-lines on ARP maps.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Why do the other ARPs have lot lines? Ex: Bridgeland, I think? Our ARP is IMPRECISE
		Angles across lot lines are disingenuous.
18	map 3	Lot lines would be helpful because we need to understand specifics in order to provide decent input. Reads "sneaky" when zones are diagonal.
		We need lot lines please

49. Maps - TOD Circles

Interest in seeing TOD circles from adjacent communities on maps.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Can we also include the Erlton Station TOD circle on the maps?
	map 4	include Erlton station 300m zone



Why do the maps not include Erlton station radius and Vic Park station radius?

Put the erlton circles on as well

50. Maps - Suggested Maps

Suggestions for additional maps.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		Topographical map is missing from the document and contains valuable data.
		When we talk about amenities for the community we only show amenities within our borders, but there would be desire lines to things like the new Central Library, the Inglewood Pool, the Calgary Zoo, and the Repsol Centre, all just outside of our community.
		Placemaking maps. Where are these areas?
		Bigger Maps (Fill the page)

51. Maps - Errors or Changes to Maps

Maps that show errors or require changes.

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
18		Similarly, the map on page 18 misidentifies Stampede Grounds as Park Space.
43	map 6	Page 43 Map 6 should delineate escarpment area as this is passive green space.
46		The cycling map on page 46 shows the cycle connection reaching a dead-end at the north end of 8 Street. Is this supposed to connect to the regional pathway? Will the current (undersized) regional pathway at this connection be improved at all?
		All Maps - The traffic circle at the west end of 26 Ave SE is not shown on any of the maps. This is a large transportation feature and would make the plans much more accurate and readable if this large transportation element was shown.
	map 7	Map 7 - It is recognized that section 5.2.2 indicates that the regional pathways shown on the map do not delineate exact routes, however the new route shown connecting 26th Ave SE with the Elbow river is an extremely poor location, right along the Stampede Back of House area, which is a chain linked off, secure area that is not publically accessible. Although the map is not meant to indicate an exact route for a new regional pathway connection, it seems a little bit more consideration should be given to at least show a route that could somewhat make sense. It does not seem like the Stampede has any plans to dramatically redevelop their Back of House area at anytime in the near or long term future, so maybe showing a possible new route going down Dartmouth Rd, and then along the north side of 25th ave would be better than it running along the side of a chain link fence.
46		Page 46 map fails to indicate the pedestrian connection along Blackfoot Trail, north of Ogden Road. I regularly see pedestrians using the bridge over the train yards.



Ramsay ARP

Draft ARP Review - What we Heard

February 10, 2018

5.5.2	5.5.2 Typo -Map 9 appears to be the correct number of the Street Network map
figure 11	I've never seen this rendering before and it looks like a very large building across the street from small neighbourhood homes. Have these white boxes been approved? I don't know anything about the Stampede back of house and it feels like it's been snuck in.
	Open space map is still not right (Ramsay school site)
	Show setbacks for main line and rail yards in ARP
	Heritage inventory needs updated - new additions
18 map 3	Section of DC4Z2006(sites) containing Barn "G" and "Dirt Barn" is coloured as stampede back of house with is factually incorrect and inaccurate. Uses are slightly different. Livestock and kennels, no overnight camping, etc.

52. Nothing Noted

Page Ref.	Section Ref.	Comment
		no comments.
		no comments.