



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Engagement overview

The one public drop-in open house on Sept. 26, 2016, and related online feedback about 1 Ave NE as a Main Street as the 3rd Phase of the Main Street Initiative. The online engagement opportunity for 1st Ave NE was available from Sept. 26 – Oct. 6, 2016. There was a total of 88 full and partial responses for 1st Ave, including both online and in-person.

What we asked

Citizens were asked to provide their feedback in three main areas:

- Comments and feedback on the proposed changes along the main street (changes in density, retail/mixed-use and the area of those changes) and in the residential “transition” zone just off the main street (changes in density and the area of those changes).
- Reflection on the input already received, images of different land-use zones and other Main Street decision factors to provide a thoughtful overview of each participant’s preferences and visions for 1st Ave NE.
- Prioritize the factors that The City should consider in future evaluation of “large sites” that may be redeveloped (by the land owner, not The City) in the context of growth and vibrancy along the Main Streets.

What we heard

One of the main themes that was strongly agreed to by the vast majority of participants was that more retail along 1 Ave NE would benefit the community. Some people told us that this needed to be done in a way that preserves the current community while others wanted to see innovative changes. Of the 52/73 respondents online and in-person who answered the question (how well does this plan fit your vision of the main street?) overwhelmingly indicated that the current plan “somewhat” or “very much” fit with their vision of 1st Ave. However, a maximum of 4-6 storey building height was generally perceived as an important factor in people agreeing with the plan. Among all the comments there was a general sense of agreement with at least some aspects of the proposal (about 149 generally positive comments to 85 generally negative comments).

The boundaries suggested for transition area as well as the main street area got mixed comments but overall, the area was deemed to be appropriate with some changes to the length and depth (both to be longer/wider, keep it as proposed (most common) or to remove/reduce in select areas). The images people preferred generally indicated that it either fit in with the current community or contributed to keeping the community looking attractive by being unique and interesting. Images “A” and “G” has the most interest compared to their paired photo. Image set “I” and “J” was equally distributed with favour split exactly down the middle. Street improvements, being human-scaled/welcoming and more gathering spaces to improve community connections were also highlighted.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Retail input from participants' comments on the maps was analyzed by the Main Streets team. For 1 Avenue NE, the preference was for requiring active retail/restaurant uses opposite the Bridges redevelopment, reflecting a desire to provide a complete main street experience, with more flexibility to the east and west. For 4 Street/Edmonton Trail, the preference was for requiring active retail/restaurant uses along a select portion of 4 Street NE, generally allowing flexibility while creating an anchor destination for the foot of the Edmonton Trail couplet.

For the Large Redevelopment Sites the most common factors citizens felt The City should consider were: Locating the highest buildings in a way that shadows would have the least impact (43), Requiring Retail (38) and providing good connections through the site to other parts of the community (38). Others suggested that the heritage/historic component and park/green space should also be incorporated into any future large redevelopment site.

- ▶ For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.
- ▶ For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

Next steps

- ▶ The Main Streets team will be revising the draft maps and providing the final proposed land-use zoning changes to the public at an information session in mid-October.
- ▶ At the information session other concerns unique to this Main Street (e.g. heritage, pedestrian realm, streetscape) will be introduced.
- ▶ An email with a high-level overview of this report will be sent out in October with a final follow-up once all the October events are complete and the Main Street plans are finalized.
- ▶ The Main Streets team will be presenting results and final recommendations for zoning changes of all the Main Streets to City Council for approval in late 2016/early 2017. The process for any Council-approved land-use/zoning changes for 1st Ave would not occur sooner than Q1/Q2 2017.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Summary of Input (In-person & Online)

QUESTION 1 – PHOTO/IMAGE COMPARISON (only asked in-person)

	A or B	C or D	E or F	G or H	I or J
Preference count	34 and 15	28 and 23	20 and 33	30 and 19	26 and 26
Number of times 'both' was listed	2	0	0	2	1

From all the comments about the photographs some common themes arose. The majority of comments were about whether or not the visual appearance (143) was positive or negative but what made the appearance good or bad varied and were sometimes opposed. Typically, the main concern was about whether or not that appearance would “fit” with the current neighbourhood (45) either historically or to keep it modern and eclectic. Most people liked the idea of more retail (30) but wanted to ensure it was “human-scaled” and pedestrian friendly (30).

QUESTION 2 – Decision Factor Review (online and in-person responses)

THEME	Number/ Frequency	Examples
General Desire for Improvement/Change	29	“Too many dead zones at the moment.”, “Build baby, build. Make it happen!”, “Need the retail/services for the 2 new apartment buildings in the area.”
Desire for the current feel/look of the neighbourhood to be retained	25	“I would hate to have it become like all the other inner city neighbourhoods...”, “highlighting the character of each community is why we live here or there!”, “...runs counter to unique character and hurts public space ideals.”
Concern about Density	20	“High density has its negatives”, “Concerned with changes to density and how it affects adjacent residents.”
Like the idea of more retail	20	“Would like to see more commercial/retail in the area.” “1 st Ave as well as new high density builds should have commercial areas” “Rezone everything for mixed use.”
Want to see more community gathering spaces and vibrancy	17	“Retail on the bottom = vibrant.” “People will need public space.” “Want it to be a destination. Can add in gathering spaces.”
Want to see increased	11	“Must be an intentional effort to bring population up in the



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

density		community to support retail and corporate. Increase density.” “Growth is great.”
Concerns or suggestions about car traffic/parking	10	“Concerns around parking...” “Current zoning is restrictive to development. Constraints such as min. required parking, hinder densification.” “If the infrastructure doesn’t change... the cars in and out will become a huge problem.”
Desire for human-scaled, pedestrian friendly area	8	“...more conducive to a walkable neighbourhood.” “4-6 storey is great with room for pedestrians, bike parking...”
Desire a nice visual appearance	4	“current ugly box design – which is destroying our neighbourhood character” “Public Art” “European town square”
Comments about the transition area (positive or suggestions for more)	4	“need homes, and just living spaces” “we need to have all types of housing so we can increase kinds of families”
Concern about not planning the whole community or have missed areas of the community in this map	4	“We are a unique community so a local solution matters. It makes sense that is part of a wider plan and ARP update” “the BRCA’s work towards a new ARP...allowed to continue and supported by the City of Calgary prior to any zoning changes”
Comments about the transition area (negative or suggestions for less)	3	[don’t] “replace the single family homes north of first Ave with multifamily” “max building height in the north side of the street should be 4 stories”
Desire to see small business/local business (not chain/franchises)	3	“focus on small business incubation”, “try to limit the number of big chain stores”
Safety	1	“a street that is regularly busy with lots of “eyes on the street” at as many hours of the day as possible”



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

QUESTION 3 & 4c – First Impressions of the Main Street Map & Map proposal ‘why?’ (online and in-person responses)

THEME	Number/ Frequency	Examples
Comments about the transition area (negative or suggestions for less)	19	“Yellow area should be left for residential single houses or attached homes.” “transition is too far north.” “prefer a shrunken version of this.” “...prefer single family dwellings near the main street...”
Like the idea of more retail	18	“like the idea of more retail for mixed use on the main street.” “More retail along 1 st Ave – specifically shops.” “make it shopping friendly.”
Comments about the transition area (positive or suggestions for more)	17	“...the transition area zoning should extend further east...” “Tiered density, stepping away from the main street, makes a lot of sense.”
Concerns or suggestions about car traffic/parking	15	“Parking is already an issue.” “Parking lot would be great, and or free parking for 90 minutes.” “traffic flow concentrated west of 9 th street...”
Desire for the current feel/look of the neighbourhood to be retained	14	“Concerned (somewhat) that the main st. could become ‘too generic’ and lose its unique character” “maintain the character of the area.” “As long as this development does not conflict with the historic character of the area.” “Want to keep ‘community’ feel.” “Do not rezone any residential north of... 1 Ave...you are destroying the character of the neighbourhood.”
General Desire for Improvement/Change	14	“I love to see the growth, would like to look at the map and what comes in 30 years”
Concern about not planning the whole community or have missed areas of the community in this map	13	“why not more emphasis on connection to transit and development along 9 th st.” “it is vague and non-specific when divorced from the context outside the Main Streets scope...” “need a link to East Village” “6A st-7A st were earmarked by the City for a Conservation Zone...this should be honored.”
Concern about Density	12	“definitely like to keep some areas with single detached units”, topology and traffic concerns with additional density. “apartments and row houses in this area would require complete revamping of existing infrastructure. I am completely against this type of future development.”
Want to see increased density	10	“density = better supported retail.” “Must be increased residential density to ensure retail success...” “Perhaps the yellow transition zone should go further back [and] focus on mixed [use]...at the end and corners of blocks.”



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Interest in improving/maintaining and suggestions for streetscape	9	“make sure to plant or respect the trees, they give character and are valuable assets.” “Lighting, safety, green space.” “great opp. for a sunny retail area with benches, coffee shops etc.”
Desire for human-scaled, pedestrian friendly area	9	“We really need to make 1 st Avenue into a very vibrant, walkable community!” “more people-orientated retail eg. grocery stores, definitely a good addition.” “..would like to see Edmonton Trail...more attractive to pedestrian traffic.”
Safety	7	“Beautification and safety (lighting, accessibility) can be improved.” “make safer for pedestrians.” “...it will become more difficult to navigate, and more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.”
Want to see more community gathering spaces and vibrancy	5	“vibrancy” “[want] greater clarity on reinvestment in community with increase zoning.” “Not just a street to get from A -> B.”
Desire a nice visual appearance	4	“Ultra modern townhouse ‘boxes’ do nothing for this community.” “Six stories on 1 st Ave will look silly.” “There should be an incentive for developers to create medium-density buildings that are both respectful to aesthetic and income...” “...having a good mixture of housing and commercial buildings so nothing can get too industrial and things may stay in better repair.”

QUESTION 4 – How well does this proposal fit with your Vision of the Main Street (see above for “why” responses)

	Very Much/Completely	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat no	Very little/Not At All
In person	15	28	2	7	5
Online	4	5	0	4	3



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

QUESTION 5 – Evaluation Factors for Future Large Redevelopment Sites

Line main street with tall buildings for more interesting street view	Require retail	Locate highest buildings where shadows would have the least impact off-site	Through site connections (more sidewalks, pathways or bike routes)	Along the non-main street edge match redevelopment scale to existing building scale	Use green infrastructure (rain water capture, solar power generation)	Other
15	38	43	38	26	28	10*

Other (in no particular order)

Affordability, Increased residential population, Contribute Positively to the Street-level vibrancy, Contribute Positively to the Heritage and Character of Neighborhood (multiple times), Contribute Positively to Walkability and Pedestrian Safety, Green space and trees (multiple times), Part of a complete community, Prevent additional negative impact of parking and traffic congestion; and Contribute to the amenities of the community (i.e. library, rec centre, theatre). [*please note: there were an additional 9 ‘other’ selections but those were either blank all fell into the originally provided categories and so were added to the totals of those columns]



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Verbatim Comments

QUESTION 1 – Image/Photo Comparison (only asked in-person)

	A or B	C or D	E or F	G or H	I or J
Preference count	34 and 15	28 and 23	20 and 33	30 and 19	26 and 26
Number of times when 'both' was listed	2	0	0	2	1
Verbatim comments A or B	<p>A - Matches retail fronts that we have currently. It would be consistent with the current look</p> <p>A - I like the large rounded corner unit on B, but I feel A has more character/personality. The bright red brick adds to the positive vibes of the street.</p> <p>B - Building setback off the street. Corner transition</p> <p>A - a lot more - more entries - more charm</p> <p>A - Like red brick, recessed doorways because that allows for more windows. Also not so modern looking.</p> <p>A - human scaled. - better sight lines</p> <p>A- Looks brighter. More windows?</p> <p>A- more appealing visually (brick, trees). More of local convenience store/local shops not chains</p> <p>A - Looks warmer, more open. But both look pretty similar.</p> <p>B - closer to what is now a piazza, a neighbourhood hub</p> <p>Both are nice</p> <p>B - Better aesthetic</p> <p>A</p> <p>A - like the storefront signage. B - like the sidewalk sit-back with benches. Both need awnings and sitting/gathering space at front.</p> <p>B - Rounded looks more interesting and street friendly for me.</p> <p>A - Definition between stories</p> <p>B - Rosso coffee prefer :) Sidewalks</p> <p>Neither are inviting. Seems closed off.</p> <p>B - benches are nice.</p> <p>A - more obvious door wrap and points of interest</p> <p>A - more modern</p> <p>A - Colour differentiation across façade</p> <p>A - colors, more windows, more inviting/open-looking</p> <p>B - retail appears less dense</p>				



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

A - for uniformly branded, less invasive signage

I would recommend building a medical clinic in either A or B. A or B don't seem interesting to me. We have enough building, condos, houses. We need more stores and medical clinics. Unless your building them for low income people

A

A - better signage, very clear that this is retail space

Equal -> seem very similar

A - I like how the retail is distinct from the residential and there is a metal awning separating them. I also like the larger retail windows so you can look into the shops and it just isn't a sea of doors

A - trees, more inviting, benches

B

A - minimal setback from street

Not particularly enamored with either. Would prefer less historical architecture and use of [les?] sucks. More contemporary design.

A

A - Close call - both are nice. I like Inglewood feel in A.

A - looks more attractive, approachable

A - more approachable looking, accessible store fronts

A - better retail options

B - I like patio, lots of windows, welcoming doorways. Prefer B but it's very dark and unwelcoming.

A - none of them look very good actually. Industrial look = bad

B - more modern. More character. Wide sidewalks with benches

B - retail blends into residential. Large walking paths. Mix of large and small retail spaces

B

A - Clear what retail and what's not

B

A - more inviting, friendly, like recessed entrances, less high main floor

A - shows what shapes actually exist.

A - large, tall glazed windows make it look unfriendly. More accessible and friendly - 'real'. Would like to see more benches with backs in front of retail. This is a seniors community and seniors need benches that have backs.

B

A - more inviting, friendly, like recessed entrances, less high main floor

A - shows what shapes actually exist.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

	<p>A - large, tall glazed windows make it look unfriendly. More accessible and friendly - 'real'. Would like to see more benches with backs in front of retail. This is a seniors community and seniors need benches that have backs.</p> <p>A - has more of the feeling of a village. Is more friendly and welcoming. Allows more personality from the shop. B is too blah! Feels more as if it should be in a suburban setting with little [illegible]</p> <p>A - while I like the idea of more commercial entrances and slightly smaller retail spaces, I believe a few larger retail spaces are OK along the street (ie. Key/major retail tenant). In all cases I would like more patios for retail to encourage foot traffic.</p> <p>A - seems more inviting</p> <p>A</p> <p>B - prefer service-type businesses eg. Coffee shops, restaurants. Social-type places rather than fragmented grocery shopping.</p> <p>B - this is more unique style</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments C or D</p>	<p>C - Matches the exterior of most Bridgeland condos, consistent!</p> <p>C - Varying colours, more modern shaping. More glass, less uniform. All those reasons.</p> <p>C - Glass vs. metal railings on balconies are less busy. Building colors are warmer and appear less severe. neither. Looks 100% residential.</p> <p>C - D is not architecturally appealing. It looks like a parkade with "prison-like" apartment. C is more visually appealing.</p> <p>D - human scaled. - better sight lines</p> <p>D - Better street proportion (but a bit fall)</p> <p>D - Retail opportunities at ground level</p> <p>C - Based on façade colour (D is too beige)</p> <p>C</p> <p>D - Blends in with what is currently on 1st Ave</p> <p>D - Allows more options for building</p> <p>C - more modern</p> <p>D - Clearly defined business with sit-back residential above.</p> <p>D - Looks more interesting and human scale</p> <p>D - Commercial space on main floor step back.</p> <p>D - Bank. Work</p> <p>C - More curb appeal. More open. I lived near "D", closed off and not ped. friendly.</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

D - like trees
C - the architecture in D is so bad I can't get past it's ugly!
D - more urban

C - The repetitive balcony design of D as a means of achieving setback and texture creates a massive, uniform feel.
D - more interesting architectural design
C - appears less institutional
C - esthetically more pleasing to the eye
N/A
C - D is too big looks industrial
D - more interesting design
D - looks more interesting. Horizontal vs vertical focus

C - I would refer if this was set back further (the residential) I do not like in D you have exposed parking (parking should be underground)

C - little more private, not all balconies starting down at the street as you walk by
C
C -Maximizes density as there is no setback

Prefer D, but architecture of both is rather bland. Look to European cities to push boundaries.
D
D - More contrast, in D - Depth

D - different frontage more interesting but missing trees of C - so combo of both would be better
Indifferent. Both don't look very nice
C - more trees. Better differentiation.
D - like the set back of apartments above courtyards.
C
C - D looks mismatched. C looks more modern
C - like the look of C better but like the retail level of D.
C

D - large balconies, different suite options. C is too cookie cutter and great options for retail.
C
C

D but only because I have to choose. They are both not very inviting looking and the arches at the bottom of D are weird. What are they for? It's nice that D is not one solid front.

Neither look particularly good but D looks uninhabitable - just not nice



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

	<p>Hate 6 storey - too tall and out of character for Bridgeland 1st Ave. Too much shading in the north - unacceptable.</p> <p>C - has more diversity of style in the architecture. This is a good thing as it reflects the diversity of the community as a place that has historically welcomed people from around the world. I am not particularly fond of either as they both have a 'blah' front and look too much like every other development (new) let's see some creativity.</p> <p>D - more interesting to look at, patios facing the street.</p> <p>C - the vertical aesthetic seems less clunky</p> <p>C</p> <p>D - Prefer cars off the streets and traffic at a minimum using traffic calming measures</p> <p>C - like the look of the total building</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments E or F</p>	<p>F</p> <p>F - like balconies, use of different materials but the main floor is strange looking, too recessed. Looks/feels like a parkade. Business/retail on pic E is more visible.</p> <p>F seems more visually appealing. The balcony also adds a human element, even if no one is on the balconies.</p> <p>F - E looks like a Big Box store. F has a feel of real people living here. Like friendly entrances -windows not oversized and glazed.</p> <p>F - I am not fond of either option. What made me more interested in F over E is that there are more entrances vs E. On the main street proper I want to see businesses, shops. If this is residential keep the individual entrances at ground floor, even though there may be apartments, condos etc. above.</p> <p>F - more interesting to look at, patios facing the street.</p> <p>F - more inviting. Don't mind E but think it would look too industrial without the trees.</p> <p>E</p> <p>F - set-backs and varying architectural style create texture in a community rather than predominantly square box development</p> <p>F - more attractive</p> <p>F - Matches the new infills we are seeing being built now</p> <p>E- Probably the one I'm most passionate about. Large glass window give a very modern/trendy look - almost Vancouver-esque. Would either make stunning lofts or impressive retail units. Couldn't advocate more strongly for E.</p> <p>E - Like the industrial/loft appearance of the building. Provides variation of building type to that which is already existing in the neighbourhood</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

E - Would look more consistent with what the use is on the South side
F - Like the front porches - porches facing the street are disappearing but I think they add to sense of community
E - human scaled. - better sight lines
E - More commercial though the articulation in F is good.
E - Retail activity. More integrated with surroundings
E - Brick cladding is better.
F
F - Nicer design
E - Better integrated into traffic & community
F - more building articulation

F - Like to see patios and "people" facing the road. Gives sense of community.
F - more interesting
F - more interesting
E - More proportional
F - more inviting
Not sure context.

E - Design looks unified and provides "destination". F, looks haphazard and too fragmented!
E - it looks more trendy

E - Massing of first three floors makes the result more at the scale of the street.
E - Industrial modern appeal.

F - more residential, each unit stands alone better but multiple entrances may have security issues
E - larger windows
N/A
F - E is bland looking
F
F - more appealing (as a pedestrian)

E - I like how the 4th floor is set back so you don't have a huge "wall" of condo.
E - more interesting design. Lost of windows, less balconies.
E - fits in with area more
F - townhouse look and feel

F - more human scaled. E is a bit too imposing to fit on a street like 1st.
F - less boxy
F - more aesthetically pleasing not so boxy



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

	<p>F - differing heights - less monolithic</p> <p>F -visually more interesting, more residential feel. "E" looks to 'clinical'</p> <p>F - Better mix of retail/residential.</p> <p>F - like the look of the buildings "small town friendly feel"</p> <p>F</p> <p>E - looks more unique. F looks like the houses you see everywhere (?). Better for a main street [E]</p> <p>F - appears to have more capacity for mixed use.</p> <p>E</p> <p>F - not too blocky, but really like both.</p> <p>F</p> <p>F - like balconies, use of different materials but the main floor is strange looking, too recessed. Looks/feels like a parkade. Business/retail on pic E is more visible.</p> <p>F seems more visually appealing. The balcony also adds a human element, even if no one is on the balconies.</p> <p>F - E looks like a Big Box store. F has a feel of real people living here. Like friendly entrances -windows not oversized and glazed.</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments G or H</p>	<p>H - it's more modern, blocky, like most buildings near the train and other commercial/retail</p> <p>H - same with above, H is a clean, innovative, trendy, modern look. G is too much like suburbia. We are not in the suburbs, we are inner city. We need a modern, artsy look like H.</p> <p>G - Aligns with character of original neighbourhoods vs. contemporary developments</p> <p>Again - don't think 1005 residential is appropriate.</p> <p>G - Definitely G. Hate the look of H: industrial, 3 storey and monster homes like those being built in Bridgeland.</p> <p>G - human scaled. - better sight lines</p> <p>G -More ageless, less imposing due to roof slope.</p> <p>H - Modern look. More density.</p> <p>G - The mixed style between buildings is nice. (It is a big grey box)</p> <p>H</p> <p>H - Blends in with what is currently on 1st Ave</p> <p>H - Cleaner Look</p> <p>H - more modern</p> <p>G - more residential look.</p> <p>G - interesting, different design, human scale</p> <p>H - I like both</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

<p>G - More URBAN look vs UGLY!</p> <p>H - too suburban</p> <p>G - like architectural style better.</p> <p>H - G is too pastiche/Disney-esque in trying to be something its not</p> <p>H - it look, it can be used for business</p> <p>H - the "old towne" feel of G seems fake to me.</p> <p>H - more modern design that meshes well with current Bridgeland architecture</p> <p>G - better residential character</p> <p>H - standardized facades (although they need not be identical)</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>G - is more interesting</p> <p>H - more appropriate design for 1st Avenue</p> <p>G - more "community" look</p> <p>G - I like that the roofs are pitched rather than flat and boxy. You are also incorporating different architectural elements which is important in an older neighbourhood</p> <p>G - different design. Obvious its residential and not retail.</p> <p>G</p> <p>H - contemporary look - will suit infill type housing</p> <p>G - more natural, less boxy design of the building</p> <p>H - G = too European</p> <p>G - like mixture of styles - and more traditional look. Find the ultra modern flair too cube style very cold (plus flat roofs with our snow -> water leakage!)</p> <p>G - H is visually unappealing</p> <p>G - looks more like a home above, more welcoming.</p> <p>G - like the tree's out front and character</p> <p>G</p> <p>G - G has more character. H is kind of bland and you already see a lot of these in Bridgeland.</p> <p>G - more opportunity to capture the neighbourhood character</p> <p>H</p> <p>G - like the townhouse feel, gives the homey feel</p> <p>G</p> <p>G</p> <p>Probably both equally. I like a mix of building styles and find a too 'cookie cutter' look plain boring. It has more balconies facing the street which is nice.</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

	<p>I lean toward H. G seems phony in our setting, even if well done. Warmth is the key.</p> <p>H is ugly box - do not want to see this here. G fits with more of a village theme.</p> <p>G - has more interesting architecture with a diversity of facades. Please do not do H. it had no personality. We have far too much of this crap in the city already.</p> <p>H - greater value for residents/owners by having more usable space.</p> <p>Like them both. G - looks more residential and homey. H- looks more modern.</p> <p>G</p> <p>G - same as above</p> <p>G - this has more caeature</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments I or J</p>	<p>J</p> <p>J - the lower floor on I looks like an afterthought. Not very accessible. I like the street access in J. No preference - they both seem cold and void of life.</p> <p>4 storey too tall for transition. Should be 3 storey. "I" is boxy and ugly - very intrusive in our 'village' character. Prefer/want to see 3 storey with / \ angled roofs, friendly entrances- front of units and balcony/pation and nice stairs - friendly doors - no 'fort knox' unfriendly front entrances.</p> <p>I - as a transitional space I like seeing some businesses on side streets mixed with residential. Please do not have a clear demarkation between commercial and residential. We need a pub in the community. A pub helps establish community in an informal way.</p> <p>J - less stress on area parking</p> <p>I - aesthetically more pleasing</p> <p>I</p> <p>I - retail adds texture and pleasurable activities for a community - a balance between housing (residential) and retail is good</p> <p>J - looks more inviting</p> <p>J - It feels more like Bridgland to me, the other photo is dated, reminds me of downtown crowded areas</p> <p>I - The large glass windows and panels providing for beautiful restaurants etc. That trendy modern look is exactly what we need to revitalize Bridgeland.</p> <p>J - Like the appearance of townhome/walk-up to apartments</p> <p>I - mixed use</p> <p>I - I like ground floor retail incorporated into housing - brings people out and about = more lively community</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

	<p>I - (no comment)</p> <p>J - human scaled. - better sight lines</p> <p>J - Also less imposing, through commercial in this style would be good also.</p> <p>I - Business/Retail opportunity</p> <p>J - I like the design better.</p> <p>I</p> <p>J - Blends in with what is currently on 1st Ave</p> <p>J - Cleaner look</p> <p>I - better interface with street</p> <p>I - sit back residential with patio above business.</p> <p>J - prefer and INTERESTING streetscape for walkability. "J" looks more interesting to me.</p> <p>I + J - a mix of both</p> <p>I - Modern</p> <p>I - more commercial opportunity</p> <p>J</p> <p>J - Broken up mazing of the block. Pedestrian pathway through the block.</p> <p>I - more urban</p> <p>J - "Residential" feel of ground level is more apt to transition zone.</p> <p>J - mixed building type</p> <p>I - necessary to have some mixed use/commercial</p> <p>J - more modern townhouse feel</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>J</p> <p>I</p> <p>I</p> <p>I - I like the patios which connects the residents to the street. For J, I don't like the steps up. It really seperates the street from the building.</p> <p>I - trees, less stairs</p> <p>I</p> <p>J - Townhouse feel, with good combination of brick and metal paneling</p> <p>J - prefer this as is more human scaled</p> <p>J - nicer design (but 'I' colour is better)</p> <p>I - Rounded buildings, less like row housing</p> <p>I - I like the curvilinear shape and arched windows better than the black and red rectangular look of J</p>
--	--



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
5 October 2016

	<p>J - visually appealing</p> <p>J - more approachable, less commercial.</p> <p>I - retail space, gym is appealing, lots of trees, need traffic modifiers because sunrise and sunset are too bright! To see people at crosswalks.</p> <p>J</p> <p>I - nice to have mixed use. Good on a main street. More modern.</p> <p>I</p> <p>J</p> <p>J - like the row, town houses -give them a homey feel.</p> <p>J</p>
--	--

QUESTION 2 – Decision Factor Review Comments (Online and In-Person)

unique to the community, allows people to be drawn to specific events, periodically, no over crowding
Let's make a vibrant trendy neighbourhood. I would love to see Bridgeland become the next Kensington.
The neighborhood draws people in through its historical restaurants and homes. Keeping that theme with the development of 1 Ave is important, versus congesting the street and impacting that feel.
unique character which would then fulfill the other criteria
A community can have cool attractions that bring people from other communities and contribute to the excitement.
Both are attainable
Place of gathering community. Activity without overwhelming vibrancy. Place to relax and meet. Safety.
All are interesting and important to me. Also a street that is regularly busy with lots of "eyes on the street" at as many hours of the day as possible.
Original ARR (ARP)?
we moved to Bridgeland to be part of an inner city COMMUNITY.
European town square.
want it to be a destination. Can add in gathering spaces.
Public art! Benches! Trees! Nightlife!
Having a Vibrant Public Realm will make everything work. Public and park space is part of a public realm discussion. Creating a Disney-fied main street and charm and small town feel is NOT part of that. We do not need to create "heritage park" in our modern, forward thinking, entrepreneurial and eclectic neighbourhood.
These are about <u>amenity</u> . The other points are aesthetic/value 'judgments.' Small town feel is particularly meaningless pap.
Additional green space would be ideal. Beautification considerations along Main Street; community entry signage; lighting (also for safety) street parking is already an issue, so this needs to be considered in future development plans. It is insufficient and with growth it will become even more critical. Please consider lowering speed limit on all 1 Ave.
Bridgeland has a very rich cultural history, making it a very interesting area for residents and visitors to visit
I think we have a small town feel and I don't want to lose that.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

love the small town feel and having a main street and meeting neighbours everyday
Too many dead zones at the moment.
Bridgeland is an 'urban village' - historic prairie town yet 'European' middle density. I would hate to have it become like all the other inner city neighbourhoods - crowded, busy.
Particularly vibrant realm - if there are more condos and apartments, people will need public space.
because this often allows for people to congregate outside public spaces and feel relaxed
NE
I agree to all three being important
highlighting the character of each community is why we live here or there! Also separates our boundaries.
There needs to be more basic retailers for residents: groceries, etc, but still keep independent businesses
Let's follow the Kensington/Inglewood model.
There is substantial empty land south of 1 st Ave that can be considered for residential. I think a mix of 4 level/or lower mixed or commercial spaces would be more appropriate.
Would like to see more commercial/retail in the area
We lost our City Bakery to Molson's which adds nothing to our community -> bad use of great space.
One relies on the other
Close proximity of necessities, restaurants.
1 - Nice! 2 - Makes sense to me.
Amenities will be forced by how to be balanced with development. High density has its negatives.
is retail viable?
Must be an intentional effort to bring population up in the community to support retail and corporate. Increase density.
Confusing board what info are you looking for? Additional commercial is important.
Need people to bring commercial but need proper commercial which relates to point above.
Drill baby drill. Oops, I mean build baby build. Make it happen!
Because it's true. The other is speculation. I have lived here 20+ years and watched a parade of local business start and fail.
Smart growth plan
Increased population at too high a level runs counter to unique character and hurts public space ideals
Additional retail would be convenient and conducive to a more walkable neighbourhood.
I like being able to shop, work and live in my community
would love to see a few more retail businesses but don't want to be Kensington or Inglewood.
There needs to be enough opportunity to meet this demand.
would like to see more vibrancy for pedestrians and locals
More retail esp. groceries (of normal price) would be great and if need more growth to get, ok - as long as done well.
In favour of amenities within walking, biking distance
love to see more successful retail on 1st ave.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

interesting because business draws people from out of community but in the future opportunities will be driven by population growth in immediate area
commercial and retail should be guided by city planners to ensure that communities needs are met
great for growth and bringing more people into community. Add to the # of people accessing retail and businesses.
I would like to see more growth here
Put a 4 story mixed use in that area, not another huge apartment building. Need the retail/services for the 2 new apartment buildings in the area.
As mentioned above, concern around parking/encroachment on existing residents is a major concern.
need enough density to engage more business but not too much
was supposed to include a stop light at 9th street and 1 ave. Speed limited in Bridgeland s/b 40km/h.
But does so in a specific way
Keeps visual appearance of neighbourhood unique character
4 - Makes sense to me. 5 - Opportunities for subtle densification should be pursued.
Must meet expressing development improvement that Bridgeland does not look like downtown with high rises
What was outlined in
growth is great. More people = more businesses.
Bridgeland will not have a thriving community if businesses are not able to survive along 1st Ave NE
again, all interconnected
It does NOT!
If the implicit intent is to suggest the age and limitations of the ARP, fine, but then we need a 'local' plan for the whole neighbourhood not just a "Main Street"
Room for higher density growth
the commercial changes that have been made since redevelopment have been good. Over-commercialization must not be allowed to ruin area.
Need an updated ARP based on current conditions
I don't think this matches where we are today or what current residents view as important
Bridgeland isn't like Renfrew RE: housing -it is unique mix and I'd hate to see it become uniform.
prefer low rise density, especially on 1st ave.
ARP is out of date as the community has changed a lot since then
1 ave as well as new high density builds should have commercial areas
important to have the infrastructure in place for when things are going to change or grow
It would spread different businesses
Rezone everything for Mixed Use. Retail on the bottom = vibrant neighbourhood a la Inglewood. We moved here BECAUSE of the mixed use buildings and I'm sure that will attract others too.
I encourage north side development with sensitivity around height impact on current residents and lack of well planned parking/sidewalk space resulting in congestion.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
5 October 2016

Rezoning as necessary to add the mixed use the area needs
and NO LANEWAY HOUSING!
Indeed
Barrier to meet targets of density. Argument for general rezoning of area to allow more opportunity for growth.
6 & 7 - that's not good, we need to do more to meet the MDP targets! 8 - Yes! Do it. Just be careful not to build too high to cast too many shadows to the north.
again a balanced development while maintaining character
rezoning 1st ave to allow for more commercial. Needs more services and businesses on 1st Ave
how will zoning change?
rezoning is key. Concerned about resident push back so open houses are great.
Well thought out re-zoning will allow for a vibrant and mixed community. DO NOT need to be homogenous.
More businesses are needed.
but can't change sizing after the fact. If going only for 4-6 stories, stick with that.
True. Fix it.
Look at the next panel - we're very close even with out a big push from City Hall.
Rezoning is important for smart growth and higher density.
any rezoning should not allow for height increases beyond current levels
some rezoning considerations would allow for updated conditions, mandate is to grow, so it is great that you are organizing community consultations.
Need to ensure our zoning gives greater flexibility for housing and businesses
I support rezoning but only if it is done with a view to the entire community not "spot" rezoning.
need flexibility
Most relevant. Current zoning is restrictive to development. Constraints such as min. required parking, hinder densification.
keep 'village' feel north of 1st - a mix of some townhouse sized developments to, but keep small town feel. -? Room for more density in the east Riverside. (6) sign says we are close to target-area "grey ghetto" -> more mixed age use then?
Concerned with changes to density and how that affects adjacent residences eg. Multi-storey building next to a bungalow.
I would be ok with rezoning but do not want traffic jams like Kensington.
Densification but it is missing impact on increasing traffic
rezoning will be important for that side of street
rezoning is necessary to meet goals but must be done in a well planned manner - not piecemeal or haphazard.
yes! All about providing growth for both the homes and businesses.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

there a very few, if any historic communities with the kind of homey friendly 'feel'! The village character of our community.
focusing on small business incubation
would like things going on at all times during the day, love the 'people on the street' feel.
try to limit the number of big chain stores/franchises. We want a unique, vibrant street with character, not a street over-run with big chain franchises.
a balance essential to great communities
this is important to give us our own identity
We are close to downtown and thousands of jobs. Have a few work/live spaces and retail that is useful. Need homes, and just living spaces.
incorporate diversity to reflect diversity in community. Provide a diversity of spaces for all demographics from low income to high. Keep social agencies like womens' shelter, etc.
would love to see growth in retail stores in our neighbourhood
Bridgeland is a great, unique inner-city neighbourhood.
mix and texture are important as long as it doesn't result in more vehicle traffic
we need to have the commercial growth
Parking entrances at street level are incompatible with our community. Go for underground with entrance off the lane.
Please do not separate into age driven segmentation (eg. 48)
low scale density is great but don't mind higher density where it makes sense. Would like more residents so we can support our businesses and fill our schools.
we need to offer scope in development by being able to [illegible] forward and approve in public forum eg. Small grocery stores in area
same as above
Maximize high density zoning in areas south of Centre Ave, including East Riverside institutional ghetto - closer to C train and accessible to pathways. Do not want or really need to increase density north of 1st Ave - R2 is sufficient - will destroy appealing street scape that exists and replace with current ugly box design - which is destroying our neighbourhood character.
generally good. Generally agree with all objectives on #2
The north side of 1st Ave not matching the south side looks odd and does not best utilize the sough facing lots.
supportive of mixed use zoning. Supportive of zoning that allows more multi-housing and secondary suites
maintain the character and look of the main street. Once you get too tall it becomes like any other big main street.
Rezoning will facilitate complementary housing and business opportunities in Bridgeland.
we need to have all types of housing so we can increase kinds of families
need to extend the development and aesthetic of The Bridges along 1 Ave AND connect to Edmonton Trail. 4-6 storey is great with room for pedestrians, bike parking, spaces for gathering etc.
Max building height in north side of street should be 4 stories, not 6 as proposed. 1.0 stalls per unit, not 0.75 as proposed.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

<p>Interesting and ironic that small town feel is desired outcome yet planned zoning appears to be in direct contradiction. Building heights created than 4 stories is not "small town". Replacing the single family homes north of first Ave with multifamily is not small town</p>
<p>Of the important outcomes that were identified, community gathering spaces and small town feel seemed the most relevant. If Bridgeland is going to maintain its heritage and ethnic European feel these would seem to be very important outcomes.</p>
<p>1st Ave feels like a half finished/though of street. It would be good to see a similar height of buildings (3-4 stories) on the north side of the street. More interaction at street level. The zoning on the north is a barrier.</p>
<p>Current zoning does allow for more population and jobs on 1 AV! The number presented are a lie. There are vacant & under-developed lots on the north side of 1Av. all of the population coming to the remainder of the bridges lots should be factored into 1 AV viability</p>
<p>It's getting really cramped in that space. If the infrastructure doesn't change (walking from the Ctrain, groceries stores, biking) the cars in and out will become a huge problem.</p>
<p>I would like to see the BRCA's work towards a new ARP (started with the university of Calgary in the last year) be allowed to continue and supported by the City of Calgary prior to any zoning changes give the community opportunity to decide where to have higher density</p>
<p>It sounds like many people are about to be joining bridgeland. If we are not careful we may damage the laid back feel of the community with poor zoning planning and development that happens to quickly</p>
<p>There is so much potential for Bridgeland to be a place people come to gather and meet rather than going downtown or to Kensington or another neighbourhood. There are many small communities near Bridgeland, especially to the north, that would also use these spaces.</p>
<p>We want growth in the community along 1st Ave but not at the expense of the small town/unique neighbourhood feel. Adding mixed use and density to 1st Aces north side makes sense but it has the potential to bleed into the housing around it and ruin the community feel.</p>
<p>I think the current zoning on the north side of the street needs to be addressed to allow for appropriate amount of new development to balance the north and south sides of the street. Ultimately the main street needs to be pedestrian and cyclist friendly.</p>
<p>We want to keep the character of our community that everyone loves; small town feel, etc. but increase vibrancy and opportunity to develop further. We are a unique community so a local solution matters. It makes sense this is part of a wider plan and ARP update</p>
<p>Retail space needs to be affordable. Friendly streetscape, sidewalks, Bike parking space important. Safe street crossings. Maximize density south of Centre Ave and into East riverside. 25% seniors - where does their voice get heard? Need seniors friendly space</p>
<p>Missed key feature- heritage& early immigrant pop'n Feels like a real village, walkable friendly. Sidewalk space and street scape is critical European village theme fits... don't lose it. include 4St Need affordable Get high density sth of CentreAv. Jobs found downtown.</p>

QUESTION 3 – First Impressions of the Main Street Map

<p>Good, no high rises!</p>
<p>Looks great. Make an amazing "strip" along 1 Ave NE</p>
<p>With well thought out scal of specific building resulting in the least impact ot existing residents I don't mind it. I would not want to see the North side of 2nd Ave change its land use resulting in more congension for existing residents. I would not want to see 6 story buildigns on 1 ave (Edm 4th St okay).</p>
<p>I like the plan for the whole area.</p>
<p>Tiered density, stepping back from the main street makes a lot of sense to me.</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

A good street, but more explanation and residents involvement. The session was not well advertised. Concerned about limited feedback.
Looks great! The changes reflect what residents have requested in past meetings.
Looks great. Density = better supported retail.
I like the concept. Perhaps the yellow transition zone should: - go further back. - focus on mixed planning with multi-family strategically at end and corners of blocks.
Don't understand why not more emphasis on connection to transit and development along 9th St.
Trees, benches, lighting, mobile phone charging, public art, retail, commercial, gathering space.
There is a lot of green space being used up. Concerned about access to retail along Edmonton Trail.
4d. [area of the map] still seems like an after thought and not part of the overall community plan - which is its current problem.
That it is vague and non-specific when divorced from the context outside of the Main Streets scope but within the neighbourhood. And also that it is a forgone conclusion.
Beautification and safety (lighting, accessibility) can be improved. Parking is already an issue along higher density areas of the community. Please review and consider parking needs to catch up with current and future development.
Need to link East Village and Bridgeland walking and riding. Shared 1st Ave car and bikes, Not a comfortable Bike solution.
Very exciting. We really need to make 1st Avenue into a very vibrant, walkable community! So much potential for the area!
I think the plans need to be cohesive and considered as a whole.
Build some useful businesses such as regular grocery stores, hardware etc. so that the main street becomes more useful instead of restaurants and other useless businesses.
Cycle track down 1st Ave please!
I like the graduated heights idea tapering off 1st Ave. Concerned that some historic buildings may be lost to the higher density areas - can you do a survey of historic buildings before deciding? I like the idea of 4-6 stories as a height limit - please don't go higher than existing heights (6-7-8, not 9-10) in Bridgeland area.
We liked the public spaces (art, sitting areas, trees, street lights, benches) vibrancy we see in Bridgeland Main Street as a destination. It should be walkable and cycling - Right now it is a busy street as a conduit through Bridgeland. No traffic lights on 1st Ave please.
it don't like where it is going
seems logical wrt the densest development close to 1st ave and then gradually decreasing to the north. Concerned (somewhat) that the main st. could become 'too generic' and lose its unique character -> think 10th st NW (in Kensington) as an example of this. But it could add a lot of great things to the community.
I love to see the growth, would like to look at the map and what comes in 30 years! Parking Lot would be great and or free parking for 90 minutes.
o.k.
like it, looking forward to see more.
I think the goal needs to be to build enough density to support vibrant street life along main corridors. Less density than the beltline but more than we have in Bridgeland now.
Need to work harder to retain character. Improve infill guidelines so that decent homes are built.
All 9th street between 1st to Memorial as part of the plan. Keep chunks and create sense of different styles from different ages. The community is over 100 years old. Refurbish old buildings. Keep Armour Black [correct?], refurbish Bodes [Budes?]
Please see comments on back for A, B and C marked on the back map. I would extend the 1st Ave stretch further east to better connect with the probable redevelopment with area 4d.



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

makes sense can see the logic. Would definitely like to keep some areas with single detached units. Would like to make sure 1st ave still gets some sunshine where possible. Would like to bring life to the main street. Would like to see Edmonton Trail be a bit more attractive to pedestrian traffic between memorial and 1st ave. Would like to see a better transition between 6 st and 6 A st; the school really cuts up the flow of the main street between the block with Luke's Drug Mart and the block with Blue Star Diner. Would like to see parking taken off 1st Ave and cycle tracks put in and/or sidewalks made more pedestrian friendly

I like the tiering idea (yellow, white). Just try to maintain the character and feel of the area.

Density is important factor that will influence zoning on a bigger scale - considerations of increasing density may result in more people-orientated retail eg. Grocery stores, definitely good additions to a community.

this should help again to make the neighbourhood thrive to all types of family - singles, family, seniors

QUESTION 4 – How well does this proposal fit with your Vision of the Main Street (see above for “why” responses)

	Very Much/Completely	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat no	Very little/Not At All
In person	15	28	2	7	5
Online	4	5	0	4	3

I'm not sure retail/commercial should be so close to new apartments etc., as I like the idea of having everything on the main street, making it easily accessible from the train/open area. It would also avoid unwanted people walking into secluded neighbourhoods which would disrupt the serenity of Bridgeland.

High density close to retail = great for business and the neighbourhood. Mixed use as much as possible. I think this is a great proposal.

I like the idea of more retail opportunity along Edm Trail and 4 street as there are many 'dead zones.' Potential for additional retail opportunity on 1st ave is important but I wouldn't want to see more than 4 storeys. Mixed retail/residential would be nice to see along Ed Trail and 4 st as well.

As long as the majority of new developments is mixed use and not greater than 6 stories I think that would be great.

I have x-ed all the areas of where the rowhouse/townhouse may not be ideal, pushing too far.

Makes sense given the current existing development. Would be main artery of the neighbourhood.

The tiered density, stepping away from the main street, makes a lot of sense. The 6-storey maximum seems like a good balance between density and not overshadowing the neighbourhood.

As long as the development does not conflict with the historic character of th area. More green spaces and areas of local gathering not too high buildings. Otherwise it would look like downtown. The beauty of the area is that while close to downtown it feels more family friendly. A place to bring up kids.

Yellow area should be left for residential single houses or attached homes.

Must be increased residential density to ensure retail success and thriving urban community.

I'm not seeing any attention to 9th St and this is a MAIN CORRIDOR FROM TRANSIT!

Don't want it all apartment buildings, Bridgeland is a very friendly community and if there are so many high rises there is more transient people. Want to keep "community" feel. And don't want random 25 storey buildings like in Connaught



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

<p>I think south of 1st Ave NE could accommodate additional zoning increases in addition to what is proposed [4th Ave & Edmonton Trail north of Memorial Drive is marked on map with an arrow]. Would like to also see zoning extended to 12 St NE [along the main street & transition area as indicated on the map with arrows]. Greater clarity on reinvestment in community with increase in zoning. Help establish to a BRZ for area to support business. Include commercial office space on Edmonton Trail corridor. Allow for smaller retail business to encourage startups.</p>
<p>Switching typology mid-block seems weird. Take it all the way to street or avenue to provide the additional buffer space between apt/rowhouse or rowhouse/single family.</p>
<p>transition too far North - not past 2 Ave.</p>
<p>Seems to align with smart growth plans and higher density.</p>
<p>As areas are re-developed, please make sure to plant or respect the trees, they give character and are valuable assets to our community. Please add lighting along corridors leading to LRT and bus routes. This would enhance safety.</p>
<p>Connect East Village & Bridgeland with EASY walking and biking routes.</p>
<p>Fully support</p>
<p>4B - east of 10 St already retail, but low level. Seems an appropriate transition point to end retail [10 St NE along 1 Ave]. 4 storey buildings along 1 Ave seem appropriate but not higher.</p>
<p>This area is quite residential. I think adding a variety of housing would work but not businesses.</p>
<p>like the idea but the area stretches too far. Prefer a shrunken version of this.</p>
<p>the City needs to do more to preserve historic buildings in this neighbourhood. The area west of 8 the St is more historical. Don't destroy it as so much of the City has already destroyed. Protect the heritage that makes Bridgeland unique. Ultra modern townhouse "boxes" do nothing for this community. This is a [conservation?] area along 7th St and west.</p>
<p>Growth in Riverside should be the priority. Develop vacant lots. Six stories on 1st Ave will look silly.</p>
<p>Great initiative. Biggest challenge will be parking, consideration in rezoning. Would be great if 'blanket rezoning' included relaxation of parking.</p>
<p>Would prefer to see no yellow north of 2nd [Ave]. No yellow east of 10th st. Good south and west.</p>
<p>It would allow for great density without compromising the feel of the community. Should not have any more height.</p>
<p>Important not to lose the historic village feel - if any of the existing homes in these areas are historic or even just 'charming' aesthetically, would hate to see them go to 4 storey buildings. Maybe ease off on the transition zones a bit - have more of a core area as market on Edmonton Trail and on Centre of [illegible] but allow more mixed patterns in the periphery.</p>
<p>As long as it respects the neighbouring residences including heritage value if applicable. Heritage homes may dictate a more diverse planning of adjacent development. Also must preserve mature trees.</p>
<p>We prefer single family dwellings near the main street, within one block, particularly north of 1st Ave. South towards LRT seems better for more high density.</p>
<p>I like the idea of more growth and higher density character town houses close to 1st ave but less traffic near the schools.</p>
<p>seems to be the best location for this type of growth. We like the idea that the entire neighbourhood won't be converted to mixed-use/medium density. Like the idea of more retail for mixed use on the main street. North side of 1st ave needs the help! great opp. for a sunny retail area with benches, coffee shop etc.</p>
<p>my main concern with the transition areas identified (orange and yellow) is the number of character dwellings. If densification is chose in these areas, I fell it would be best to try and mix new with old in order to maximize the 'town like' or community feel of Bridgeland.</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

I think it needs to happen. I like mix land use seems to work. But with consideration to make those businesses viable and not a draw to the street but as a compliment.
great. Allot for LRT station!
I would like to see commercial and traffic flow concentrated west of 9th street as originally planned when the General Hospital was demolished with only commercial allowed along 1st Ave, this will only cause more traffic congestion.
Overall, looks like a good plan. More retail along 1st Ave - specifically shops. I would like to see the character of the neighbourhood maintained. Love the new bike lanes.
However, it very much depends on the height of these buildings. If they don't tower the currently build 3 storey homes it will be great.
Main concern - will this hinder anyone? What mechanism is in place to ensure someones finances aren't hindered? Otherwise, I love the plan.
Don't like the orange higher than ground floors. Don't like the yellow extending so far north of 1st Ave -should not cross 2nd Ave because it will shade properties to the north of there.
for transitional area do not be scared of some commercial development mixed in with residential. Would like to see residences above commercial. We need a local pub in the community. Instead of storey requirement consider height.
I'm all for it! (No opinion on where retail shouldn't go.) Make better use of our schools! :)
Great idea, some of the lots are in need of refurbishing, but too expensive for the average person, more housing options allows people of different income levels to live in the same area.
Increasing density will bring retail opportunities to meet the needs of the community.

QUESTION 5 – Evaluation Factors for Future Large Redevelopment Sites

Line main street with tall buildings for more interesting street view	Require retail	Locate highest buildings where shadows would have the least impact off-site	Through site connections (more sidewalks, pathways or bike routes)	Along the non-main street edge match redevelopment scale to existing building scale	Use green infrastructure (rain water capture, solar power generation)	Other
15	38	43	38	26	28	10*

Other (there were 19 selections of 'other' but 9 were either left blank or were repeats of an original category)

lots of market residential to bring life to this institutional/barren region. Some retail OK also.
Library/rec centre/theatre
Give them permission to go taller than 6 stories where shadows won't cause an issue.
lighting, safety, green space
Need to keep green space. Look at something like Thompson Park (16 Ave and 11 St Sw) Make it a destination park.
Green spaces. Accessibility



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Access to C-train. Dense population development.
Green spaces, trees
Retain the unique historic features of Bridgeland
(blank)
Traffic and parking causing minimal impact to existing residents
Use of passive solar design concepts
make safer for pedestrians
reduce traffic (cars) influx
not have these tower the neighbourhood, have ground level oriented buildings.
maintain character - verandahs, smaller windows, angled roofs, garden landscape and propose multiple storeys
don't go too high
(blank)
(blank)

Other Comments from in-person session– (written in margins or beside questions on the worksheet)

I'm not sure retail/commercial could be so close to new apartments etc., as I like the idea of having everything on the main street, making it easily accessible from the train/open area. It would also avoid unwanted people walking into secluded neighbourhoods which would disrupt the serenity of Bridgeland.
High density close to retail = great for business and the neighbourhood. Mixed use as much as possible. I think this is a great proposal.
I like the idea of more retail opportunity along Edm Trail and 4 street as there are many 'dead zones.' Potential for additional retail opportunity on 1st ave is important but I wouldn't want to see more than 4 storeys. Mixed retail/residential would be nice to see along Ed Trail and 4 st as well.
As long as the majority of new developments is mixed use and not greater than 6 stories I think that would be great.
I have x-ed all the areas of where the rowhouse/townhouse may not be ideal, pushing too far.
Makes sense given the current existing development. Would be main artery of the neighbourhood.
The tiered density, stepping away from the main street, makes a lot of sense. The 6-storey maximum seems like a good balance between density and not overshadowing the neighbourhood.
As long as the development does not conflict with the historic character of the area. More green spaces and areas of local gathering not too high buildings. Otherwise it would look like downtown. The beauty of the area is that while close to downtown it feels more family friendly. A place to bring up kids.
Yellow area should be left for residential single houses or attached homes.
Must be increased residential density to ensure retail success and thriving urban community.
I'm not seeing any attention to 9th St and this is a MAIN CORRIDOR FROM TRANSIT!
Don't want it all apartment buildings, Bridgeland is a very friendly community and if there are so many high rises there is more transient people. Want to keep "community" feel. And don't want random 25 storey buildings like in Connaught
I think south of 1st Ave NE could accommodate additional zoning increases in addition to what is proposed [4th Ave & Edmonton Trail north of Memorial Drive is marked on map with an arrow]. Would like to also see zoning extended to 12 St NE [along the main street & transition area as indicated on the map with arrows]. Greater clarity on reinvestment in community with increase in zoning. Help establish to a BRZ for area to support business. Include commercial office space on Edmonton Trail



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

<p>corridor. Allow for smaller retail business to encourage startups.</p>
<p>Switching typology mid-block seems weird. Take it all the way to street or avenue to provide the additional buffer space between apt/rowhouse or rowhouse/single family.</p>
<p>transition too far North - not past 2 Ave.</p>
<p>Seems to align with smarth growth plans and higher density.</p>
<p>As areas are re-developed, pelase make sure to plant or respect the trees, they give character and are valuabel assests to our community. Please add lighting along corridors leading to LRT and bus routes. This would enhance safety.</p>
<p>Connect East Village & Bridgeland with EASY walking and biking routes.</p>
<p>Fully support</p>
<p>4B - east of 10 St already retail, but low level. Seems an appropriate transition point to end retail [10 St NE along1 Ave]. 4 storey buildings along 1 Ave seem appropriate but not higher.</p>
<p>This area is quite residential. I think adding a variety of housing would work but not businesses.</p>
<p>like the idea but the area stretches too far. Prefer a shrunken version of this.</p>
<p>the City needs to do more to preserve historic buildings in this neighbourhood. The area west of 8 the St is more historical. Don't destroy it as so much of the City has already destroyed. Protect the heritage that makes Bridgeland unique. Ultra modern townhouse "boxes" do nothing for this community. This is a conservation area along 7th St and west.</p>
<p>Growth in Riverside should be the priority. Develop vacant lots. Six stories on 1st Ave will look silly.</p>
<p>Great initiative. Biggest challenge will be parking, consideration in rezoning. Would be great if 'blanket rezoning' included relaxation of parking.</p>
<p>Would prefer to see no yellow north of 2nd [Ave]. No yellow east of 10th st. Good south and west.</p>
<p>It would allow for great density without compromising the feel of the community. Should not have any more height.</p>
<p>Important not to lose the historic village feel - if any of the existing homes in these areas are historic or even just 'charming' aesthetically, would hate to see them go to 4 storey buildings. Maybe eas off on the transition zones a bit - have more of a core area as market on Edmonton Trail and on Centre of [illegible] but allow more mixed patterns in the periphery.</p>
<p>As long as it respects the neighbouring residences including heritage value if applicable. Heritage homes may dictate a more diverse planning of adjacent development. Also must preserve mature trees.</p>
<p>We prefer single family dwellings near the main street, within one block, particularly north of 1st Ave. South towards LRT seems better for more high density.</p>
<p>I like the idea of more growth and higher density character town houses close to 1st ave but less traffic near the schools.</p>
<p>seems to be the best location for this type of growth. We like the idea that the entire neighbourhood won't be converted to mixed-use/medium density. Like the idea of more retail for mixed use on the main street. North side of 1st ave needs the help! great opp. for a sunny retail area with benches, coffee shop etc.</p>
<p>my main concern with the transition areas identified (orange and yellow) is the number of character dwellings. If densification is chose in these areas, I fell it would be best to try and mix new with old in order to maximize the 'town like' or communtiy feel of Bridgeland.</p>
<p>I think it needs to happen. I like mix land use seems to work. But with consideration to make those businesses viable and not a draw to the street but as a compliment.</p>
<p>great. Allot for LRT station!</p>
<p>I would like to see commercial and traffic flow concentrated west of 9th street as originally planned when the General Hospital was demolished with only commercial allowed along 1st Ave, this will only cause more traffic congestion.</p>



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Overall, looks like a good plan. More retail along 1st Ave - specifically shops. I would like to see the character of the neighbourhood maintained. Love the new bike lanes.
However, it very much depends on the height of these buildings. If they don't tower the currently build 3 storey homes it will be great.
Main concern - will this hinder anyone? What mechanism is in place to ensure someones finances aren't hindered? Otherwise, I love the plan.
Don't like the orange higher than ground floors. Don't like the yellow extending so far north of 1st Ave -should not cross 2nd Ave because it will shade properties to the north of there.
for transitional area do not be scared of some commercial development mixed in with residential. Would like to sea residences above commercial. We need a local pub in the community. Instead of storey requirement consider height.
I'm all for it! (No opinion on where retail shouldn't go.) Make better use of our schools! :)
Great idea, some of the lots are in need of refurbishing, but too expensive for the average person, more housing options allows people of different income levels to live in the same area.
Increasing density will bring retail opportunities to meet the needs of the community.
Plan a complete community all at once.
I'd like more of a high street feel on 1St with density nearby.
mixed ages - currently 'grey ghetto' of seniors - great to have an island of expertise in seniors care! But mixing in housing for other age groups would make it more interesting for the seniors

Retail Questions from Online Respondents (all incorporated into retail analysis)

Retail is a good fit:

all of it along 1 ave - extending the bridged development to where bridgland market is in the west
1st ave between 9a st and 10 st both north and south side
1 Avenue between 7A and 9A Streets
1st Ave from 11th ST to 6th ST & all of the areas around Edmonton trail that are highlighted.
the north side of 1Av is under-developed, there are many vacant lots & low job buildings (7-11!)
Between 4 and 6 Street (1st Avenue and Marsh Road)
1st AVE, Marsh Road, and Meredith Road between 6st and 4st
Nowhere, they need to be more south, where the high density condos are.
1st avenue between 8 -10 street & along McDougall/valley-does not make sense in rest of community
11st to 6a st on 1st ave
1st Avenue and 10 Street
Along Edmonton trail, from 2nd ave to Memorial
1st Ave on 7a street, 7 street. The north side on 1st ave. Also all along Edmonton trail
Between Edmonton Trail and 6 St. NE. South of 1 ave. NE
everywhere along 1 ave, especially between Edmonton trail and 10st



Main Streets – 1 Ave NE

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

5 October 2016

Edmonton Trail (n/s bound) in all areas that are in burgundy. High crime, low value area.
Edmonton Trail West-good, first ave looks good
4 st& Ed Tr between memorial & 2Ave within the couplet plus 1Ave 7 St to 10 St- only 2 lots deep

Retail should not go:

no. I think a continuous street frontage is important. active uses!
all burgundy areas should be considered for retail/commercial
1 Avenue east of 9A Street (except for existing grocery store and coffee shop).
In order to achieve a High Street feel the whole stretch should be developed.
the map is unreadable. but nothing east of 10st in burgundy. leave that zoning as is.
10th Street and 1st Avenue
Anywhere would be welcome if it increased the sense of community and didn't create ghost storefronts
NA
YOur map is not very good. But NOTalong Centre Ave/7st area(above escarpment)
Meredith, McDougal and marsh roads from 6st to Edmonton trail
1st Avenue and 5 Street near the Langevin School
south of 1ave around edmonton trail and 4 st can be challenging if you're driving
It's all fine.
Not around school
Not intruding as far east as 6 St except 1Ave. Keep commercial on west side of 4 St