



HISTORIC EAST CALGARY

Area Redevelopment Plan Recommendations Report

November 27, 2019


Prepared for

THE CITY OF CALGARY

Prepared by

B&A PLANNING GROUP

b&a



Acknowledgments

Prepared by

B&A PLANNING GROUP

Geoff Dyer

gdyer@bapg.ca | 403.692.4528

Prepared for

THE CITY OF CALGARY

Breanne Harder

Breanne.Harder@calgary.ca | 403.268.5729

November 27, 2019

Contents

1 Background & Introduction	01	G. Main Street: 9 Ave S.E. Inglewood	20
Introduction	03	H. Ramsay Main Street & Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)	23
B&A Planning Group Engagement Approach	03	I. Inglewood/Ramsay Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)	24
Engagement Timeline	04	J. Bus Rapid Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) - Blackfoot Truck Stop	25
2 Recommendations	06	K. Central-West Ramsay	26
Overview	08	L. Public Improvements	27
A. General to All	09	M. Other Recommendations	28
B. Heritage, Character, and Vision	10	Appendix	31
C. Heritage Preservation	12	A. The Process	32
D. Height, Density, Intensity	14	B. What We Heard	39w
E. Land Use and Built Form	16	C. Consolidated Feedback on First Report	
F. Comprehensive Sites Generally	18		

Reading This Document

The Recommendations in the Report are presented through the following sections:

Discussion: Provides an explanation on the issue, context on the stakeholder engagement sessions, and the rationale for the resulting recommendations;

Key Recommendations: Provide recommendations that are specific to the 2018 draft of The Historic East Calgary Area Redevelopment Plan and on the major topic areas that are common to local area planning in general.





SECTION 1

Background & Introduction



Background

Introduction

In 2018, The City of Calgary (hereinafter referred to as “The City”) combined the 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay Area Redevelopment Plans (ARPs) into The Historic East Calgary Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) draft document. The goal for The Historic East Calgary ARP is to allow the two communities to share a similar approach to growth while recognizing the differences between the two communities.

Despite extensive public engagement on the two 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs, the character and intensity of future redevelopment in these communities remains unclear. This prompted The City to seek an independent third party to work through, in consultation with stakeholders, the remaining issues in order to move forward with the ARP.

The City contracted B&A Planning Group (hereinafter referred to as “B&A”) to guide a public engagement process aimed at collecting feedback from all stakeholders. The purpose of this new phase of engagement is to balance stakeholder desires, provide guidance and create recommendations for revisions and refinements to the 2018 draft of The Historic East Calgary ARP (hereinafter referred to as “2018 Draft ARP”). The recommendations that surface from this process will inform The City in the development of the ARP. Not all recommendations will be accepted as City policy, standards and/or technical reasons may prevent certain recommendations from being incorporated into the ARP.


B&A Planning Group Engagement Approach

With support from The City’s Administration, B&A coordinated stakeholder meetings, public outreach, and information sessions on the 2018 Draft ARP. The process was vetted by stakeholders – both The City’s Administration and the Inglewood and Ramsay Community Associations – to arrive at a process that targets numerous issues within a limited timeline and budget. Understanding that the area redevelopment plan process for the Inglewood and Ramsay communities has been underway for a number of years, feedback documented from previous engagement was used to focus themes and topic areas for the engagement process.

The pressure for growth, change, and redevelopment is significant and given the diversity of opinions, detailed history, and the complexity of the issues, the goal for engagement is not consensus. Rather, B&A is committed to a transparent and professional process that will inform our recommendations. Our goal is to demonstrate clear rationale for our recommendations based on a balance of all stakeholder opinions, City policy and sound planning practice.




Engagement Timeline





Engagement Process







SECTION 2

Recommendations


Overview

Our Commitment: Balancing Stakeholder Desires

The recommendations proposed in this Report respond both generally to the 2018 Draft ARP approach as it relates to the June 2019 Draft Guidebook for Great Communities (hereinafter referred to as “June 2019 Draft Guidebook”) and specifically to the 2018 Draft ARP. The recommendations represent the findings of B&A in response to the following considerations:

1. A reasonable balance of the expressed desires of local stakeholders that have been involved through numerous past City-led engagement processes, as well as the targeted engagement sessions and meetings conducted by B&A as part of this process. Stakeholders included the members of the Inglewood and Ramsay Community Associations, Development Industry, residents and business owners, and general public;
2. The interests of The City, including City-wide policy such as the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and the June 2019 Draft Guidebook; and
3. B&A’s professional planning, urban design, and public engagement expertise.

Figure A-1: Building Scale Recommendations Map



An impression of the recommended building scale map. Note the fine detail in Figure A-1 is difficult to read at this scale and the inset dashed box representing the area in Figure A-2 illustrating a detailed representation.

A. General to All

Toward a More Concise, Usable ARP

Discussion

A more concise, plain-language ARP has been a long-running goal of The City's Administration. The City's development of an Implementation Guidebook for the developed communities (currently named and hereinafter referred to as the "Guidebook for Great Communities") renews the plain-language issue as ARPs are structured within the MDP as local area plans and are intended to be used in conjunction with the Guidebook for Great Communities. The 2018 Draft ARP demonstrates a hybrid of this approach for the Inglewood and Ramsay communities. Unfortunately, the 2018 Draft ARP created confusion through the lack of detail compared to previous draft versions of the Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs, the absence of content from the June 2019 Draft Guidebook, and the persistence of redundant policy.

The ongoing challenges of this effort are: 1) a more concise ARP that links to the Guidebook for Great Communities will appear to have less of the elements that are valued by a community (such as historical preservation, walkability, vibrant streets, etc.); and 2) that there will be a need for users to cross reference several policy documents in order to understand all policies applicable to the ARP.

Key Recommendations


A.1: The ARP should adhere to the Guidebook for Great Communities.

A.2: Expanded ARP areas and increased detail make maps difficult to read. The ARP should include detailed maps on focus areas such as the one shown in Figure A-2.

A.3: More effort should be placed on explaining how and why the urban form classifications (the system utilized by the June 2019 Draft Guidebook) are applied in the communities, rather than what they are and how they work which can be referenced to the Guidebook for Great Communities and summarized in the ARP.

A.4: While ARPs are moving toward more concise documents that do not repeat policy, there is a need to avoid users from needing to access several documents just to understand basic policies. The ARP should reference, and possibly summarize key policy elements of other supporting policy such as the Guidebook for Great Communities, Transit-oriented Development (TOD) policies, Main Street plans, and the MDP. In particular, the urban form classification summaries could be provided for ease of use. References and summaries should include the date of the referenced document and a caveat that amendments to referenced documents shall supercede any summary information provided in the ARP.

Figure A-2: Plan Detail



Expanded ARP areas and increased detail make maps difficult to read. The ARP should include detailed maps on focus areas such as this one.

B. Heritage, Character, and Vision

Linking Past and Future Character

Discussion

A common thread that has run through the ARP process is the intertwined concern for preserving and celebrating heritage, while defining and protecting character. This has drawn the following observations and conclusions:

1. Limitations of the ARP: It is frequently implied that the ARP is the primary mechanism to achieve preservation and to define the character of a neighbourhood, when in fact it is actually just one tool to support this multi-faceted goal, limited by what an ARP can actually enforce. A community is what it is: the people and landscape of the present built on countless narratives that describe where it came from. The ARP cannot embody and fully represent this. It should instead seek common themes that define its essential character in order to build a clear vision for redevelopment with appropriate ARP policies that can actually enact that vision.

2. Preserving the Past while Embracing the Future: One of the most challenging elements of character and heritage is the struggle to preserve the past while allowing inevitable change and evolution.

3. Eclecticism: One notable theme that continues to surface from past engagement sessions is that the two communities' character has been described as "eclectic". This comes from the diversity of people: income, age, cultural background, etc; but also in its built form: old and new, large and small, local and regional, and a diversity in style. The idea of eclecticism means that there should be room for new things and the opportunity for change. The challenge for eclecticism is embracing change while preserving the essential qualities of the communities' character.

4. The Character of New Neighbours and New Transportation:

Born out of the railways, shaped by rivers and streetcars, and driven by its industrial captains and blue-collar workforce, the two communities of today are much different than their humble beginnings. The automobile-oriented planning of the 1960s, followed by the recent rapid gentrification of these two communities and Calgary's inner city as a whole, challenges their essential character. The increasing need for affordable housing and the renewed promise of rapid transit provide the opportunity to retain elements of that essential character.

Key Recommendations

B.1: Linking heritage to vision and character, a set of essential elements that define the two communities' character should be established, and serve as key indicators and criteria to help guide policy. These essential community character elements can serve to communicate key elements of the two communities' vision as part of the design process for new developments.

B.2: Through the historical narrative and in-depth public engagement, several themes have emerged that can be used to define the essential community character elements for Inglewood and Ramsay:

- 1. History and Historical Assets:** Inglewood and Ramsay are built on an historic foundation. The history exhibited in their built form and historic assets should be preserved and integrated into future development.
- 2. Cottage Streetscape:** The intimate porch-fronted, tree-lined, single-family streets create an identifiable and unique quality to the communities' lower density residential areas. As low density housing stock is improved, replaced, and intensified, it should seek to maintain this collective streetscape character.
- 3. Mid-Rise Streetscape:** Unlike other inner city areas such as the Beltline and East Village that are defined by high-rise corridors, the commercial core for Inglewood

and Ramsay is born out of the Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise building scale of 6 stories or less) character. As intensification and redevelopment occurs in response to affordability and transit investment, this mid-rise character should be maintained along key corridors and as the primary character.

- 4. Social Spaces:** Starting from the front porches of the Cottage Streetscape, to the river edge and mid-rise main streets, to the many intimate neighbourhood green spaces; Inglewood and Ramsay foster sociability from a tight-knit network of public spaces interfacing with a fine-grained rhythm of shopfronts and porches. This network and the sociable character of building frontages should expand and replicate as new development and intensification occurs.
- 5. Quirky and Eclectic:** These are historic communities that have always responded to change: The old and new, the regional and local, the big industrial and quaint cottage, the traditional and the modern. Tied together by elements 1 to 4, this change can preserve and expand on the communities' eclectic character.

B.3 Many of these elements may not be able to translate into specific policy and/or land use district requirements, but should at least be communicated as part of the narrative for the communities' vision and aspirational elements as new development is considered.

Figure B-1: Heritage Streetscapes



An example of Ramsay's iconic "Cottage Streetscape".



An example of Inglewood's iconic "Mid-Rise Streetscape".

C. Heritage Preservation

Preservation at the Scale of an ARP

Discussion

1. The Challenge with Tying Together Preservation and

Development Bonusing: The 2018 Draft ARP linked the seemingly opposite aims of increasing development intensities beyond historic limits and preserving and rehabilitating heritage assets, where one would support the other through a bonusing system.

Where this system has proven workable through a few planning applications for smaller geographical locations, it was deployed throughout the Plan Area in the 2018 Draft ARP with uncertain results. To make this system work, building mass and height intensities were increased in many parts of the Plan Area with the intention of allowing these areas to trade unused density for preservation of historic buildings.

This results in potentially unrealistic preservation expectations beyond the scope of the ARP, and uncertainty of the redevelopment potential and character of many areas of these communities that should otherwise preserve appropriate building scale. The Report's recommended mapping of building scale seeks to correct this.

2. The Challenge with Bonusing Target Densities: In the context of an evolving Guidebook for Great Communities, the evolution of the 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs to the 2018 Draft ARP demonstrated an unresolved approach to bonusing and target intensity/height. A target by definition is a desirable threshold to attain, in this case adequate redevelopment intensity to match incoming public investment. The heritage bonusing system, however, suggests that attaining this desirable target would require additional investment from the developer in the form of heritage preservation.

Two maps will be required for a bonusing system to meet two objectives. Firstly, the need to establish a minimum acceptable intensity (height and density) threshold to ensure adequate investment and population support for future transit. Secondly, a maximum intensity threshold to protect the desired communities' character. While draft versions of these maps have been contemplated, the system has not been fully deployed and tested. The 2018 Draft ARP was unclear on the viability of bonusing density, the base from which to bonus, and the impact of targets being exceeded by bonusing. Further, the target maps were misleading in their ability to be increased in height and intensity.

3. The Challenge with Bonusing: Heritage preservation is just one of several potential bonusing scenarios contemplated in the 2018 Draft ARP and the June 2019 Draft Guidebook. Other possibilities include payment into a heritage conservation investment fund and the requirement for developments to provide publicly accessible outdoor amenity space. In all cases, it will be critical that these systems ensure the viability of system administration, developer cost-benefit, and the overall affect of increased intensities in a plan area.

Key Recommendations

C.1: Heritage preservation should be uncoupled from density.

C.2: The ARP should link to a City-wide solution to heritage preservation.

C.3: Where a bonusing system is proposed, it should align with a City-wide solution and policy. Bonusing should be tested for viability of system administration, developer cost-benefit of the bonusing approach, and the overall affect of increased intensities in a plan area.

C.4: Should a bonusing system be adopted, mapping and policy should be clear on base intensities and maximum allowable intensities.

C.5: Heritage preservation bonusing should be localized to directly link the benefiting site to the contributing asset. The 9 Avenue S.E. main street is ideal for this approach.

C.6: Bonusing for inclusion of publicly accessible outdoor amenity space should be localized to larger redevelopment sites, especially where municipal reserves are not required. If this is not achievable, then the communities should have a priority list for public amenities. The establishment of a community enhancement fund should be explored to fund local initiatives.

C.7: The preservation of Character Homes should not be part of a bonusing system, particularly when they are disconnected from the benefiting site. Other programs should be explored to address Character Homes as part of a City-wide approach.


C.8: Preservation policies should be measured against the essential community character elements discussed in the previous section.

C.9: Policies should be developed to preserve the character of the Mid-Rise (Low-Rise building scale of 6 storeys or less) and Cottage Streetscapes, providing a better chance for the preservation and renovation of Character Homes that are otherwise out of date and encouraging appropriate infilling.

C.10: The preservation of historically significant Character Homes listed on The City's Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources should be identified as a separate, more urgent pursuit than the general stock of character homes. The City's heritage program should explore additional mechanisms to preserve these Character Homes.

C.11: Registered Historic Assets and other significant potential heritage resources such as buildings and landscapes that are important to the Inglewood and Ramsay communities should be identified on a map in the ARP, noting the official Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources shall prevail.

Figure C-1: 2018 Target Intensity Map Tied to Heritage Bonusing



In the 2018 Draft ARP, heritage preservation was tied to height and intensity bonusing. The target future height and intensity (floor area ratio) maps allowed for an additional 1 FAR or 6.0m above the target through heritage bonusing. This 2018 Draft ARP Future Target Floor Area Ratio map is not explicit in the ability to bonus 1 FAR over the target sparking uncertainty and confusion.

D. Height, Density, Intensity

A Vision for New Development in Character

Discussion

Along with heritage and character, height has emerged as a key issue with the 2018 Draft ARP. Recent approvals and ongoing proposals have sparked uncertainty and controversy.

Through extensive stakeholder engagement, it has become evident that both the communities at large and the development industry are in agreement that the Inglewood and Ramsay communities should be largely mid-rise communities at their most intense. Where there is disagreement is the definition of “mid-rise” and where the “mid-rise” threshold can be exceeded without impacting the neighbourhood character.

Typically, the “mid-rise” form has been defined as a range of 3-6 storey street walls (sometimes up to 9 in recessed upper storeys), ensuring that sunlight can reach the sidewalk at some point in the day. Over time, as reflected by the June 2019 Draft Guidebook’s building scale categories, the industry has come to identify “mid-rise” as 6-12 storeys. Recent development proposals and approvals have further pushed the “mid-rise” threshold to 16 storeys, and even higher in the 2018 Draft ARP.

The recommendations in this Report step away from the implied precision of the Target Height maps and the Floor Area Ratio Intensity maps to align instead with the June 2019 Draft Guidebook policies that focus on quality of life and user experience. This is not to say that heights should not be established, but rather a simpler solution can be found by utilizing the June 2019 Draft Guidebook’s building scale categories and modifying the ones that do not reflect the essential community character elements for Inglewood and Ramsay. The ARP should reflect the modified building scale categories through the ARP’s policy, allowing specific heights to be established through the Land Use districts in response to certain criteria.

This criteria can include alignment with the essential elements community character described in section B of this Report, and more specifically to achieving certain shadow outcomes, corridor character (such as the Cottage Streetscape and Mid-Rise Streetscape), and the proximity of certain sites to transit. The recommendations of this Report propose an approach to achieve this, representing a reasonable balancing of stakeholder desires.

Key Recommendations

D.1: The ARP should base height and intensity on the Guidebook for Great Communities urban form categories rather than specific building heights and floor area ratio (FAR).

D.2: The June 2019 Draft Guidebook allows for local area plans to modify and or qualify certain policies and elements in the June 2019 Draft Guidebook. In this way, specific outcomes recommended in this Report should be ensured through ARP policy as modifications to Guidebook for Great Communities policy.

D.3: Floor area ratio is a clumsy indicator of intensity and provides no qualitative measure. Lot coverage, building and storey height, and other form modifiers such as setbacks and stepbacks are more precise regulators of form which can be guided by the ARP and enforced by the Land Use Bylaw. Floor area ratio should not be included as part of the ARP.

D.4: Buildings should be able to gradually transition between building scale categories within a parcel achieving the desired outcome through a number of building modifiers such as an upper storey setback. The specific setback should respond to the desired outcome, such as shadowing and the need to maintain a certain scale of a street.


D.5: Building scale categories should transition sequentially to the next building scale category.

D.6: The historic heights along 9 Avenue S.E. ranging between 20.0m and 22.5m sets the threshold for “mid-rise” that can be used throughout the communities, establishing a corridor height for the Low Rise and Mid Rise building scale categories through either a stepback, or a full urban form transition as referenced in D.4 above.

D.7: The High-Rise building scale category is not specifically mapped as it needs to be strategically designed into specific sites to minimize visual and shadow impact. Recommended sites for consideration are noted in the detailed plan recommendations that follow.

D.8 Where permitted and mapped, the High-Rise urban form category should not exceed 16 storeys.

Figure D-1: Height Map Discrepancies and Issues



Target Height Map: 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs (Combined)

Target Height Map: 2018 Draft ARP

Differences between the 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs' Target Height maps and the 2018 Draft ARP map created confusion and controversy. Issues from the 2018 Draft ARP's Target Height map included the bonus of an additional 6.0m for heritage preservation that is not explicit on the map; additional heights for areas intended to be donor sites for preservation bonuses but out of character for the area; the implied precision through height is regulated through the Land Use Bylaw, blanketed heights on comprehensive sites that require further planning; and, spot height increases on specific sites.

E. Land Use and Built Form

The Lifestyle and Experience Based Guidebook

Discussion

The June 2019 Draft Guidebook presents an experiential based planning approach rather than the more static land use approach of the past. Through this, an urban form classification system has emerged, identifying 16 categories that are to be mapped for each parcel through the local area planning process.

The 2018 Draft ARP started with an earlier version of the Guidebook, the Developed Areas Guidebook. The Developed Areas Guidebook's approach utilized "Building Blocks." The approach taken in the June 2019 Draft Guidebook utilizes the "Building Scale" element of the new urban form classification system as shown in Figure E-1, and the Developed Areas Guidebook's approach of very specific building mass (through floor area ratio calculations) and building height numbers.

Key Recommendation

E.1: The ARP should base the land use and built form approach on the Guidebook for Great Communities.


The subsequent recommendations in this Report reflect this approach.

Figure E-1: June 2019 Draft Guidebook Building Scale



Referred to as Building Blocks in the 2018 Draft ARP, The June 2019 Draft Guidebook uses Building Scale to determine general building scale character. This system is adopted for this Recommendations Report.

Figure E-2: June 2019 Draft Guidebook Urban Form Classification System



Matched to the Building Scale, The June 2019 Draft Guidebook establishes an urban form classification system that can be mapped through the local area planning process, in this case, the ARP process. Refer to the June 2019 Draft Guidebook for full descriptions.

Recommended Building Scale for Inglewood and Ramsay

- Limited - Local:** Buildings of three (3) storeys or less, Neighbourhood Housing Local: the Cottage Streetscape historical character.
- Limited - Minor:** Buildings of three (3) storeys or less, mixed Neighbourhood Commercial/Housing Minor focus, low-mid density ground oriented buildings.
- Low-Rise:** Buildings of six (6) storeys or less, the Mid-Rise Streetscape historical character. Mixed Neighbourhood Commercial/Residential, Major (Main Streets and TODs)/Minor (Corridor and Interior Streets).
- Mid-Rise:** Buildings of twelve (12) storeys or less, the new Mid-Rise Streetscape character to be located off major corridors and areas of low shadow impact for existing residences. Mixed Neighbourhood Commercial (Minor, Local)/Residential (Major, Minor)
- High-Rise:** Buildings up to 24 storeys are generally out of character for the community. This building scale is not mapped as it must be strategically designed into specific sites to minimize visual and shadow impact. It should be limited to no more than 16 storeys. Recommended sites are noted in Figures.
- Active Frontage:** Although other frontages are not mapped, the major main streets are recommended as "Active Frontages" also denoting a "Major" activity level.

**The recommendations are based on the June 2019 Draft Guidebook.*

F. Comprehensive Sites Generally

Further Planning Required

Discussion

There are several sites that require detailed planning beyond the scope of an ARP. These sites generally represent larger multi-parcel redevelopment opportunities at the scale of the block, especially where new streets and public spaces will be required. While detailed planning is beyond the scope of an ARP, it is the function of an ARP to set expectations and policy to guide future planning of a site that is in line with community character.

The June 2019 Draft Guidebook suggests that an ARP achieve this in three ways: 1. Identify long-term “Future Planning Areas” that are intended to be planned in the future; 2. Identify “Comprehensive Large Sites” with near to mid-term redevelopment potential that will require further planning; and, 3. Establish urban form classifications generally where possible.

Key Recommendations

F.1: Master Plan: Through the Guidebook for Great Communities or another policy document, an option for a Master Plan process should be established for the June 2019 Draft Guidebook’s “Comprehensive Large Sites.” The Master Plan would describe a comprehensive redevelopment concept for the site in support of a Land Use Redesignation or Development Permit application. For certain larger, more complex sites, it could also allow for incremental redevelopment to proceed without the requirement for a more binding site-wide Outline Plan.

F.2: Planning Principles: Master Plans should establish clear planning principles for walkable urban places including small blocks, connected walkable streets, active street oriented frontages, a mix of uses, and the provision for public space and green space, especially on large projects where no municipal reserve is due.

F.3: The following sites should be identified in the ARP as “Comprehensive Large Sites” as defined by the June 2019 Draft Guidebook:

Site Descriptions

A. Crossroads Market: a “Comprehensive Large Site” - Immediate redevelopment opportunity as part of the Green Line and possible Master Plan as recommended in F.1.

B. Stampede Back Of House: a Future Planning Area - Long-term redevelopment.

C. Industrial Lands: a “Comprehensive Large Site” - Immediate to mid-term redevelopment opportunity as part of the Green Line.

D. Calgary Police Services: Unlikely redevelopment, consider matching it to appropriate urban form as it stands.

E. Stable Industrial: a “Comprehensive Large Site” - Viable, occupied industrial. Mid to long-term incremental redevelopment

F. Brewery Site: a “Comprehensive Large Site” - Immediate redevelopment opportunity subject to a possible Master Plan as recommended in F.1.

G.17a Street Infill: a “Comprehensive Large Site” - Short to mid-term opportunity.

H. “Truck Stop”: a “Comprehensive Large Site” subject to AVPA Regulation outcome - a potential Immediate redevelopment opportunity and possible Master Plan as recommended in F.1.

I. 16 Street SE: a “Comprehensive Large Site” - Immediate opportunity. City-owned parcels under consideration for redevelopment including potential park space and housing parcels.




Figure F-1 Comprehensive Sites Generally

- Limited - Local (3 storeys or less)
- Limited - Minor (3 storeys or less)
- Low-Rise (6 storeys or less)
- Mid-Rise (12 storeys or less)
- Industrial/Railway Use
- LRT/BRT Station
- Public Space
- Waterway
- Active Frontage/Major Activity
- Major Activity (All others Minor/Local)

G. Main Street: 9 Ave S.E. Inglewood

Iconic Mid-Rise Corridors

Discussion

9 Avenue S.E. is Inglewood's showcase mid-rise corridor, but its form is being pushed to the upper limits. The intersection of 9 Avenue and 12 Street S.E. is a community defining center, and a transition that will set the tone for Ramsay's new main street heading south. The introduction of the 2018 Draft ARP height and floor area ratio maps created confusion on the expectation for the scale of these corridors. Embedded in the 2018 Draft ARP is the beginning of an urban design solution by recognizing important gateways and centers along the corridor. The following proposes an urban design rationale to clarify and establish design direction for the corridor.

Key Recommendations

G.1: Generally, the scale of the 9 Avenue S.E. and 12 Street S.E. corridors should maintain a mid-rise character range between 20.0m and 22.5m in height with exceptions as noted below.

G.2: The location at the west edge of 9 Avenue S.E. is a highly visible and traveled gateway into the entire community. A taller element at this corner provides a vertical entry statement and a gateway compositional element. Limited width and varied heights will reduce shadow impacts.

G.3: The intersection of 9 Avenue and 12 Street S.E. allows for intensification and an iconic centering element - taller buildings marking the center of Inglewood's 9 Avenue S.E. and a place where Ramsay's new main street meets the 9 Avenue SE. corridor.

G.4: Extra height can be achieved on redevelopable sections of the south side of 9 Avenue S.E. through an urban form transition as referenced in D.4, but limited by shadow impact as illustrated in Figure G-2.

G.5: Height on the north side of the corridor should not increase shadowing to the north from a 20.0m height reference at back of lot, and should respect the mid-rise scale of 9 Avenue S.E. that ranges between 20.0m and 22.5m.

G.6: Although the upper storeys on new buildings should focus on residential uses, these corridors serve as the commercial heart of the community and should be identified as Neighbourhood Mixed-Use, Commercial Major with Active Frontages along the ground storey as defined by the Guidebook for Great Communities.



Figure G-1 Main Street Recommendations

- | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Limited - Local (3 storeys or less) | Low-Rise (6 storeys or less) | Industrial/Railway Use | Public Space | Active Frontage/Major Activity |
| Limited - Minor (3 storeys or less) | Mid-Rise (12 storeys or less) | LRT/BRT Station | Waterway | Major Activity (All others Minor/Local) |

9 Avenue S.E. Mid-Rise Corridor

As a transition to Mid-Rise building scale (up to 12 storeys) from Low-Rise building scale (up to 6 storeys) along portions of 9 Avenue S.E., a strategy is proposed to allow a transition within the site, subject to shadow impacts limitations. This is only possible on limited portions of 9 Avenue S.E. on the west between 9 Avenue and 11 Street S.E., and on the east adjacent to the Blackfoot Truck Stop site where parcels transition to the Mid-Rise building scale. As illustrated to the right, portions of the south side of 9 Avenue S.E. can increase by approximately 4 storeys where there is an appropriate setback from the street. Additional height on the north side of 9 Avenue S.E., where parcels back onto “Limited” low density areas cannot transition to “Mid-Rise” as it would have a negative shadow impact as shown. This strategy can be replicated on other corridors seeking to maintain the historical scale of Mid-Rise Streetscape (buildings of 6 storeys or less).




Figure G-2 Section - Shadow Study

Sample section allowing select parcels to transition to “Mid-Rise” building scale within the parcels through a building setback above the “Low Rise” building scale. This is only possible on parcels that have a “Mid-Rise” building scale to transition to on the rear of the parcel.

H. Ramsay Main Street & Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)

A New Main Street Anchored by Two TODs

Discussion

Linking Memorial Access/Zoo Bridge through the iconic crossroads of 9 Avenue and 12 Street S.E., and on to the future 26 Avenue S.E. Station at the Crossroads Market, 11 Street S.E., where Inglewood's 12 Street S.E. turns into Ramsay's 11 Street S.E., will transform over time to become Ramsay's main street. New development will seek to maintain the historical mid-rise scale of 9 Avenue S.E. and the community as a whole with taller buildings toward the interior streets.

A comprehensive TOD Master Plan (F.1) and ultimately an Outline Plan is recommended to establish new streets, public spaces, and a more fine-grained layout of the urban form classifications.

Key Recommendations

H.1: Maintain a Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise building scale of 6 storeys or less) and an Active Frontage for 11 Street S.E., Mid-Rise Streetscape (Buildings 6 storeys or less) scale can be established interior to the blocks and off major corridors.

H.2: High-Rise building scale can be explored within certain areas as shown on the maps as part of the Master Plan process. Land use should not exceed sixteen storeys.




Figure H-1 11 Street SE Ramsay



I. Inglewood/Ramsay Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)

At the Nexus of Two Neighbourhoods

Discussion

Situated at the nexus of Ramsay and Inglewood, this future Green Line station will anchor the start of a new main street for Ramsay, and an important 11/12 Street S.E. corridor through the communities terminating at the 26 Avenue S.E. Station. Several industrial sites provide redevelopment opportunities for a TOD.

Key Recommendations

I.1: The 11/12 Street S.E corridor should maintain the historical scale of the Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise building scale of up to 6 storeys), with taller buildings strategically located on interior sites.

I.2: The old Brewery site should be master planned, with careful placement of taller buildings to reduce shadow impact, safe and visible pedestrian connections to the future station, inclusion of urban public spaces and green space, and preservation of Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise building scale) character along existing corridors.




Figure I-1 Inglewood/Ramsay TOD

J. Bus Rapid Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) - Blackfoot Truck Stop

9 Avenue S.E. Anchor and TOD

Discussion

The site known as the “Blackfoot Truck Stop” includes several adjacent sites with immediate development interest. Serving as an important anchor to the 9 Avenue S.E. main street as a transit-oriented development site with bus rapid transit, and the need for careful integration with nearby low density areas (Cottage Streetscapes), a comprehensive Master Plan will be needed to link all the sites into a unified plan. A pending ruling on the Airport Vicinity Protection Area (AVPA) Regulation’s restrictions may limit development potential of the Blackfoot Truck Stop site.

Key Recommendations


J.1: The entire site should be designed cohesively under a Master Plan (F.1), including new streets, public spaces, and careful placement of taller buildings.

J.2: Master planning of the TOD should include both sides of 9 Avenue SE and 19 Street SE, and other areas as noted.

J.3: AVPA: Pending AVPA restrictions may limit development potential of the site and should be addressed in a Master Plan, including interim development options should the need arise.

J.4: Because of immediate development interest, this site should be included in the ARP as a “Comprehensive Large Site” as defined by the June 2019 Draft Guidebook.

J.5: Other recommendations as noted on the adjacent map to the right are recommended.



K. Central-West Ramsay

Eclectic Corridor through Cottage Streetscape

Discussion

The 8 Street S.E. corridor is an eclectic mixed-use street serving as a central spine to Ramsay. While the closing of 8 Street S.E. at 9 Avenue S.E. will have an impact on the street, it still serves as a back door to the Stampede grounds along MacDonald Ave. S.E. and will have good connectivity to the 11 Street S.E. main street and both Green Line stations.

Key Recommendations

K.1: The majority of the residential areas of Ramsay are maintained as the Limited-Local building scale, preserving a Cottage Streetscape (B2.2).

K.2: 8 Street S.E. is shown as Limited-Minor building scale but should be fine-tuned to a character that limits height to 3 storeys but allows for a mixed use street character including residential, ground oriented multi-family and row houses, commercial (retail, office, service) and institutional uses.



Figure K-1 Central-West Ramsay



L. Public Improvements

Targeting and Prioritizing Public Improvements

Discussion

An ARP establishes a vision for the future, and is the primary document responsible for assembling and prioritizing potential public improvements. This list can be updated on a regular basis, both adding/subtracting projects and rearranging as priorities and circumstances change. Projects - funded or unfunded - and at various levels of study and design can be more easily pursued when they are properly positioned within The City's policy hierarchy.

Key Recommendations

L.1: Identify an ARP section for which public improvement projects can be listed and referenced, and establish a process for which they can be updated over time.

L.2: Provide a clear reference to other policies/studies related to public improvement projects.

L.3: Once funded or partially funded, projects should be developed through a public design process.

Potential Public Improvements

1. Green Line: Provide a summary and reference for Green Line Station Plans and associated improvements.

2. Roundabout Improvements and Infill Site at 17A Street S.E.: Summarize and reference potential roundabout improvement plans for 17A Street at Blackfoot Trail and the associated infill redevelopment opportunity to the west.

3. 8 Street S.E. Interface: Remediation of the closing of 8 Street at 9 Avenue S.E.

4. Bike Routes and Bikeway: Provide a summary and reference for ongoing Bike Routes and bikeways.

5. Main Streets: Provide a summary and reference for ongoing Main Street studies and public improvements.

6. Inglewood/Ramsay TOD Pedestrian Connections: Develop a strategy for improving pedestrian connections to the Inglewood/Ramsay Green Line Station.

7. 9 Avenue/19 Street S.E.: Develop a streetscape design as part of the Blackfoot Truck Stop/BRT TOD redevelopment.

8. 16 Street S.E. Infill: Provide a summary and ongoing design process for the conversion of the City-owned 16 Street S.E. parcels to redevelopment sites and potential public green space.

9. Private Open Space: A number of redevelopment sites, particularly around TODs and designated "Comprehensive Large Sites" through June 2019 Draft Guidebook policy, will require publicly accessible, private open space as part of redevelopment efforts. This may include programmed and non-programmed green space, squares, plazas, and streets.

M. Other Recommendations

Discussion

The B&A engagement sessions were necessarily limited to solving fundamental issues surrounding height/intensity and heritage/character. During these sessions, and upon reviewing the extensive previous public engagement sessions, a number of other issues have been identified. Many of these have been re-iterated through ongoing discussion and correspondence. The following recommendations respond to a number of issues both generally, and specifically to the ARP. Some of these reiterate previous recommendations.

Recommendation:

M.1 Vision Section 2.0: The long one-line list of policies identifying vision and core ideas is confusing and repetitive with other policy. Summarize key Guidebook for Great Communities' elements (identifying them as key Guidebook for Great Communities' elements), and then concisely identify vision and core ideas that are unique to the Inglewood and Ramsay communities.

M.2 Separate Immediate Opportunities from Long-Term Opportunities: As shown in Section F, clearly identify redevelopment areas that are immediate to mid-term redevelopment opportunities as Comprehensive Sites and those that are long-term redevelopment opportunities, particular stable/well invested industrial areas.

M.3 Mapping Legibility: Provide clear mapping within the ARP, including lot lines and significant historic resources.

M.4 Plain, Consistent Language: The June 2019 Draft Guidebook is intended to use plain language, but is at the same time proposing a new planning approach and concepts. This will be a challenge in the near term, demanding the use of plain language consistently across documents, including the ARP.

M.5 Row Houses: Row Houses are a common challenge and opportunity throughout the inner city. They should be handled in a common way through city-wide policy. Inner-city neighbourhoods generally continue to gentrify, creating affordable housing limitations in low density neighbourhoods. Block-end row houses in particular utilize block-end on-street parking (up to 7 on-street parking spaces serving visitor parking for 4 units) and improve a streetscape that has traditionally been defined by side yards.

This "gentle density" is critical for these neighbourhoods to maintain a mixed, eclectic character and resilience through diversity.

The Inglewood and Ramsay communities are unique, but should be subject to a City-wide approach consistent with all city neighbourhoods. At the same time, Section B sets out essential community character elements that can be used to guide design in character with Inglewood and Ramsay, including sociable front yards (porches), maintaining the feel of the Cottage Streetscape, and preserving/integrating with historic assets.

M.6 Secondary Suites: Similar to the Row House issue described in recommendation M.5, “gentle density” should be widely implemented providing much needed affordable housing and appropriate density in the inner-city and near transit services.

M.7 AVPA: There are many factors that can limit the development potential for a site or neighbourhood. These factors can include the market demand, environmental remediation, and servicing availability/cost. The AVPA Regulation that limits development density in Inglewood is just one more limiting factor. And like other factors, circumstances can change quickly making redevelopment opportunities surface. It is the job of the ARP to ensure that when opportunities surface, new development occurs in line with the communities’ vision and policies.

The ARP should both include policy to continue challenging the AVPA Regulation’s restrictions in light of recent transit investments, and plan for the future regardless of the many potential factors that can limit the realization of that vision.

M.8 Use and Purpose of Projections: The 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs included development growth projections. The 2018 Draft ARP conspicuously omitted the projections raising questions on the nature of these figures. As discussed in M.7 there are many factors that can impact development potential, and predicting the private market is a challenge - especially looking out past 5 years. The projections were intended to provide a benchmark to measure the ARP’s policies in response to a possible development scenario - a way to test assumptions and explore viability in light of public investment.

The confusion arises from the implied precision of the predicted number, and failure to adequately describe how the information is to be used. It is recommended that this information can be useful - perhaps in an appendix- but should be tempered by rounding off predicted numbers and clearly positioning the projection data.


M.9 80/20: The 2018 Draft ARP policy calling for 20% of the Plan Area’s developable area to accommodate 80% of future growth should be carried into the new draft ARP, as it has been demonstrated as an acceptable policy and frame of reference for future growth.

M.10 ARP Name Change: The name “The Historic East Calgary ARP” proved to be generally unpopular throughout the engagement process. It is suggested here that it be named Central East Calgary ARP, but should be explored through engagement with stakeholders.

M.11 TOD Circles: The Walk Sheds of TODs can be confusing and should be clarified within the ARP. They simply provide a reference for general proximity to LRT stations, guiding how redevelopment opportunities might be matched to urban form intensity and density.

M.12 Auto Uses Prohibition: The Auto-Use prohibition was well received through engagement and should be carried through to the new ARP, noting that existing facilities can continue into the future.





HISTORIC EAST CALGARY AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

Appendix

Appendix A: The Process

The City of Calgary requested that B&A Planning Group (B&A) prepare an engagement program to facilitate discussions on the recently combined 2018 Draft ARP. Feedback gathered during engagement provided guidance for recommendations on revisions and refinements to the 2018 Draft ARP. Beyond a standard report-back, the information gathered has been synthesized to form actual recommendations in the preceding document.

An overview of the engagement program is summarized here. Rather than cover all topics within the ARP, the process targeted issues based on feedback received through previous City-led engagement. Understanding previous themes and reviewing engagement summaries helped focus the conversation early in the process.


Town Hall – January 23, 2019

The first engagement event, led by B&A on behalf of The City, kicked off a new round of public engagement on the recently merged 2018 Draft ARP. The goal of the first event was to clearly identify issues and confirm key ARP topic areas that require resolution.

Based on previous engagement, panelists representing different stakeholder groups presented thoughts on three key topics: height and intensity, heritage and character conservation and the overall trust in the ARP process. Attendees were also asked to reflect on other topics they would like to see addressed.

Over 150 people attended the event and 256 distinct comments were received through feedback forms, emails, and online surveys. Comments were grouped by subject to help identify trends.

The graphic chart shares how often stakeholders commented on a topic from the 2018 Draft ARP.



Workshop – March 13, 2019

Previous City-led engagement had identified height, density and intensity as the primary subject for comments provided by stakeholders. Feedback gathered at the January Town Hall confirmed that outside of trust and the ARP process generally, height and density (intensity) were the most commonly cited ARP topics. Based on this and changing City timelines for other policy areas, the second session focused on collecting feedback on height and intensity specifically.

A secondary focus for the session addressed concerns raised on trust and the ARP process. Many stakeholders feel that the engagement process has been frustrating. While there has been extensive engagement, they have yet to see a final ARP. Furthermore, height and density maps have been updated and changed, seemingly without consultation or transparency.

The workshop provided the opportunity for stakeholders to dive into the height and density maps. Two sessions were held to accommodate the interest demonstrated at the previous session. Of the 90 people registered for the event, over 70 people attended to provide their feedback and comments. Engagement stations were set up to focus on specific areas in the communities. Facilitators recorded comments directly on maps.

Height, Density & Intensity Feedback:

- Generally, stakeholders want to protect the residential heights in the single-family neighbourhoods. The protection of these areas is rooted in both heritage and character arguments. Many people identify the homes as historic both for the neighbourhood and all of Calgary. Coupled with this, the architecture of the homes – front porches, street set-backs, gardens – are wrapped up in the communities' identity.
- Many stakeholders understand and support density in corridors, adjacent to rail lines and in the future comprehensive areas like the Truck Stop, Brewery Site and Crossroads Market.
- Most often, stakeholders felt that a mid-rise height is the ideal maximum for their community. Many comments cited the Beltline and East Village intensity as incompatible with the character of Inglewood and Ramsay. As discussed in section D, the definition of mid-rise changes depending on your point of view. The Inglewood Community Association has consistently expressed their support for 6 storey heights as most suitable for their community.
- A common description of appropriate heights comes along with words like sunny, open, walkable, friendly, etc. These descriptions of appropriate height share insight into residents' feelings on their neighborhood character. Many attendees want to ensure this character is protected with sensible and gentle transitions to increased intensity.

Community Associations Meetings

Five meetings were held between December 2018 and October 2019 with representatives from Inglewood and Ramsay Community Associations. The working group vetted engagement events, provided insight into ARP topics, and generally helped guide the process.

During this time the Community Associations represented their communities as well as provided context and history to the discussions. This process has been ongoing, and the input from the Community Associations has provided valuable continuity. The Inglewood Community Association provided additional opportunities for community members to provide feedback through a community survey.

Changing City timelines for the Guidebook for Great Communities and Heritage policies limited the focus for the large public sessions to height and density. As a result, topic areas outside of height and intensity were discussed during the small-group meetings. Other ARP topic areas that required recommendations included:

- Mapping accuracy
- ARP naming
- Open space
- Heritage
- Character
- Community connectivity
- Pedestrian and cycle connections
- Public improvement projects
- Row housing
- Secondary suites
- TOD circles

Appendix B: What We Heard

B&A is committed to clearly demonstrating the reasons and rationale for our recommendations. Throughout engagement, there have been a mix of opinions that sometimes conflict. The participation of various stakeholders during the previous and most recent engagement opportunities has provided valuable feedback and direction to the ARP revisions. The feedback, balanced with City policy and planning expertise, contributed directly to the recommendations detailed in this report.

The following what we heard summary is intended to document key feedback themes and the response or recommendation based on the feedback. In order to facilitate connecting the recommendations to the stakeholder feedback collected, we have provided a summary of the themes below along with corresponding recommendations or responses. Discussion sections are provided before each recommendation in order to highlight the “why”, or rationale, for a decision.



Theme: Trust and Process

Despite extensive engagement, lack of trust and certainty was a common theme to stakeholder feedback during the most recent process. Stakeholders feel their feedback is not being considered or incorporated into the ARP. People expressed frustration with engagement processes and outcomes.

Our Response: Given the variety of stakeholders and opinions, there are recommendations that do not fully align with certain feedback. The goal for engagement is not consensus, rather to demonstrate clear rationale based on a balance of stakeholder opinions, City policy, and sound planning practice. A discussion section is provided for context and background for the recommendations.

B&A Planning Group should address their professional code and their approach to this project.

Our Response: B&A has 30+ years of experience working in Calgary and area for a variety of different municipalities, developers and industries. Our commitment to our profession guarantees that all work is undertaken in good faith; with the utmost integrity and ethics; and without conflict of interest. As registered professionals we adhere to the Professional Codes of Practice for both APPI and CIP. In addition to our commitment to our Professional Code of Practice, B&A will not pursue any additional work in the Inglewood and Ramsay communities until the completion of our contract.

More details should be provided on how an ARP relates to other City policies such as the new Guidebook for Great Communities.

Our Recommendations: A.1, A.3, A.4 page 9; D.1, D.2 page 14; E.1 page 16; L.2 page 27; M5 page 28

Stakeholders want the mapping within the ARP to be clear, accurate, and easily interpreted.

Our Recommendation: A.2 page 9; M.3 page 28;

Stakeholders expressed their dislike for the Historic East Calgary name for the ARP document.

Our Recommendation: M.9 page 29

Theme: Height, Density, Intensity

Many stakeholders requested the ARP policy state clear density targets, as referenced in the March 2017 drafts.

Our Recommendation: M.8 page 29

Stakeholders generally expressed support for the 80/20 rule from the previous draft ARP.

Our Recommendation: M.9 page 29

While there is general acceptance that transit areas can support higher density development, stakeholders are concerned with how the TOD policy may impact existing neighbourhoods. There is hope that the ARP can guide TOD areas to complement neighborhood character and context.

Our Recommendations: See TOD focused sections H, I, and J; K.1 page 26; M11 page 29;

Some residents expressed support for increasing intensity. Individuals felt that redevelopment can contribute positively to their communities. These comments often described intensification through appropriate mid-rise developments.

Our Recommendations: D.5 page 15; K.2 page 26;

Some community members feel height is generally too high across the maps. There is concern that redevelopment will create dark corridors and shadow impacts on neighbours.

Our Recommendations: *D.6, D.7, D.8 page 15;*

Many comments want to ensure protection of existing residential areas.

Our Recommendations: *K.1 page 26; M.5 page 28; M.6 page 29;*

Many stakeholders expressed concerns on height transitions between taller buildings and single-family areas and heritage buildings.

Our Recommendations: *D.4, D.5 page 15*

A key concern on building heights, in particular on 9 Avenue SE, is shadowing and the impacts on existing buildings. Community members feel that the natural light and openness is a key element of character.

Our Recommendations: *Section G page 20 and figure G-2 page 22*

There is support for increasing intensity in future comprehensive sites. Many stakeholders feel these sites can increase community connectivity. However, stakeholders want to ensure that the development is still in context with surrounding areas and want more clarity for these areas in the ARP.

Our Recommendations: *Section F page 18; I.2 page 24; Section J page 25;*

Theme: Heritage & Character

Community members want to ensure that redevelopment will fit into heritage streetscapes and contribute to local character.

Our Recommendations: *B.1, B.2 page 11*

Stakeholders feel that heritage conservation goes beyond buildings. Inglewood and Ramsay are unique due to landscaping, trees, industrial history, character buildings, cottage streetscapes, and sunny open spaces.

Our Recommendations: *B.1, B.2 page 11; C.8, C.9 page 13*

Many people identified the difficulty with defining and providing a description of the very eclectic local character. Like heritage comments, character descriptions need to go beyond physical assets to include cultural activity, walkability, century aesthetics, and the sunny, open feeling of the existing neighbourhoods.

Our Recommendations: *B.1, B.2 page 11*

Stakeholders want to ensure that heritage resources are documented in the ARP. Some specifically identified the need for heritage assets to be mapped.

Our Recommendations: *C.11 page 13; M.3 page 28*

There is interest in learning more about heritage preservation policy options and which heritage approaches The City of Calgary plans to implement.

Our Recommendations: *C.2, C.3, C.4, C.5 page 13*

Theme: Open Space

Stakeholders want to ensure that public open spaces are maintained and developed in accordance with increased density and redevelopment.

Our recommendations: F.2 page 18; *Section L, points 8 and 9, page 27*

Theme: Connectivity

Due to the rail lines, imminent closure of 8 Street S.E., large future comprehensive sites and other existing conditions, connectivity is an ongoing concern for community members.

Our recommendations: *F.2 page 18; Section L, page 27*

Stakeholders appreciate the walkability of the communities and support ongoing development of pedestrian infrastructure.

Our recommendation: *F.2 page 18; Section L, point 6 page 27*

Many stakeholders expressed support for cycle routes and infrastructure.

Our recommendation: *Section L, point 4 page 27*

Appendix C: Consolidated Feedback on the First Draft Report

On September 5, 2019 B&A released the first draft of the Recommendations Report. Since the release, stakeholder feedback and reactions to the document have been collected through emails, stakeholder meetings and a public information session held on October 29, 2019. The feedback collected has been summarized in this Appendix.

During the final round of engagement, we asked stakeholders to:

- Provide their thoughts and reactions on the Recommendations Report and
- Advise if they saw any inaccuracies in the document.

Following the review of the feedback, B&A updated the Recommendations Report to:

1. Provide corrections and clarifications throughout the document as identified; and
2. Summarize and share the collected feedback in the Final Recommendations Report.

The Final Recommendations

This Report is a result of extensive stakeholder engagement, built on significant consultation previously completed by the City of Calgary, and matched to B&A's professional experience. It is our opinion of a fair balance of needs amongst all the stakeholders.

While we stand by our recommendations, we recognize that they represent one opinion. As The City pursues the next draft ARP, we believed it to be important to include the reactions to our recommendations in order to better assess how to move forward.

The feedback included in this Report has been consolidated, grouped into common themes, and rephrased to avoid repetition. More extensive verbatim comments have been passed on to The City's Administration alongside the submission of this Report.

Feedback was collected informally through discussions and formally through email, recorded official meetings with the Inglewood and Ramsay Community Associations, a landowner and industry member session, and a public open house. Official meetings were conducted by B&A and attended by The City's Administration representatives. Feedback collected in response to the September draft Recommendation Report were grouped into two categories: site specific themes and general common themes. Site specific themes have been mapped.

Mapped Feedback

Comments received on specific locations that can be mapped are as follows:

A. South Side of 9 Avenue S.E., West of 11 Street S.E.: Conflicting opinions between area remaining as currently designated with no height increase and increasing the entire length to a Mid-Rise building scale (up to 12 Storeys) due to proximity to TOD and Railway.

B. Connectivity in Lieu of 8 Street S.E. Closure: Connectivity is not adequately addressed in the Report, particularly as it relates to the closure of 8 Street S.E. and other possible connections such as at 9 Street S.E. as shown.

C. Correct Building Scale: Building scale corrected to reflect underlying land use designation.

D. Connectivity: Support for and against exploring a connection from MacDonald Avenue SE to a 9 Street SE rail crossing.

E. Like Across from Like: Parcels should reflect the Limited - Local building scale allocation of similar lots across the street.

F. 8 Street S.E.: Comments reflected support of the proposed scale, but more often urging increased intensification particularly at intersections. Some concerns on preserving commercial services at historic corner stores while also supporting more intensification. There are concerns that the Report does not respond to changes along this corridor resulting in the closure of the rail crossing.

G. Park Frontage: Underutilized/poorly utilized public spaces should be identified for better frontages and uses. Noted here is a parking lot and lane frontages that could convert to more active frontages.

H. Corner View Corridor: Mid-Rise building scale to the corner will reduce visibility to historic National Hotel. Recommended setting back at corner to open view corridor.

I. Corrected Building Scale: Building scale for the National Hotel corrected to Low-Rise.

J. Park Frontage: Underutilized public spaces should be identified for better frontages and uses. Noted here are concepts currently being considered for improved frontage, usage, and design of Mills Park.

K. Park Frontage: Underutilized public spaces should be identified for better frontages and uses. Noted here is the opportunity for conversion to active frontages along the park.

L. Park Frontage: Underutilized public spaces should be identified for better frontages and uses. Noted here is the opportunity for converting a parking lot into more active uses and exploring redevelopment opportunities.

M. Intersection Improvement: The Plan does not reflect explorations on improving this intersection for better circulation by all users and more productive redevelopment of parcels to the West.

N. Green Space: Although site owned by the Parks Department is zoned for development, there is a general consensus that this parcel is intended to remain as public space and should be confirmed for the next ARP draft.

O. Connectivity and Park Space: Comment that the Plan does not reflect explorations on improved connections and park/pathway improvements along this corridor. Comments that the recommended trade-off to explore redevelopment opportunities that support improved, permanent pathway and green space improvements is not in line with community desires.

P. Roundabout: The roundabout is not reflected on the map, creating some disorientation. Roundabout green was added to the recommendations maps.

Q. Intersection Improvements: There are several city-owned parcels that can be redesigned in support of a Main Street concept.


R. Increased Intensity: There is concern that much of Ramsay is recommended at the Limited - Local and Limited - Minor Building Scale with the exception of the 11 Street S.E. corridor. There is support for areas near the LRT line and station to allow for increased intensity.

S. Spot Zoning: The recommended Mid-Rise (12 storeys or less) scale at the corner of 9 Avenue and 12 Street S.E. was a concern for many stakeholders.

T. Spot Zoning: The recommended Mid-Rise (12 storeys or less) scale at the West entrance to 9 Avenue SE was a concern for many stakeholders. Some comments disagreed with the "Gateway" description.

U. 9 Avenue S.E.: Generally, stakeholders agree with the description of the historic 9 Avenue S.E. Mid-Rise as 20-22.5m. Some stakeholders expressed concern with the recommended Building Scale of Low-Rise (6 Storeys or less) as too limiting for new development. Some stakeholders strongly support the Low-Rise recommendation along the majority of 9 Avenue SE.

V. 11 Street S.E.: Support for increasing intensity along 11 Street S.E., with some opinions stating that the recommended building scale is too limiting.



Appendix C: Mapped Feedback

- Limited - Local (3 storeys or less)
- Limited - Minor (3 storeys or less)
- Low-rise (6 storeys or less)
- Mid-rise (12 storeys or less)
- Industrial/Railway Use
- Public Space
- Waterway
- LRT/BRT Station
- Active Frontage/ Major Activity
- Major Activity (All others Minor/Local)

General Feedback

Comments received generally have been summarized and grouped by topics area.

Height, Density, Intensity

- Generally, there is a mix of reactions to the recommended building scale map. Some felt recommended heights are too tall while other comments indicated that the recommendations did not allow for adequate intensity given future transit investment in the area.
- Support for setbacks and transitions described in recommendation D.4, G.4, and G.5. Though some concern was expressed that this may not work well for all sites.
- Generally, there is support for increased intensity on Future Comprehensive Sites and TOD areas.
- Support for the recommendation to ensure Future Comprehensive sites are cohesively designed master-plan sites.
- Support for Recommendation A.1 to align the ARP with the Guidebook for Great Communities and want to ensure the ARP is consistent with Guidebook language and definitions. However, some stakeholders are concerned with recommendation to use the Guidebook for Great Communities Urban Form Categories rather than FAR.
- Concern with recommendation in support of the 80/20 rule as this does not support development that is most likely to occur in the near to medium-term.

Heritage, Character, Vision

- There is both concern that recommending a City-wide approach to heritage does not align with the unique qualities of the communities and support for a City-wide solution.
- Concerns that the description of “eclectic” character might conflict with heritage conservation.
- Concern with recommendation that community character elements be communicated as part of a narrative rather than a policy or bylaw.
- Support for uncoupling heritage preservation from density.
- Recommendations do not clearly identify the vision for the ARP, communities and what is unique to this Local Area Plan.

Block-End Row Housing

- Many comments expressed concern for allowing block-end row housing and disagree with the characterization of the Recommendation M.5.

Public Improvements

- Recommendations did not clearly identify how developers can provide community benefit.

Connectivity

- Recommendations missed the opportunity to address connectivity issues across both communities. The ARP should address connectivity.

Trust and Process

- Concern that the 2018 Draft ARP was never endorsed or supported by the Communities.
- There is ongoing confusion about the role of an ARP and what it can enforce. The Recommendations Report did not provide additional clarity.



HISTORIC EAST CALGARY
**Area Redevelopment Plan
Recommendations Report**

