



# West View Area Structure Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase One  
What We Heard Report – Summer 2018

## Project overview

The City is in the process of drafting an Area Structure Plan (ASP) for the West View community. The West View ASP will provide a vision for the future development of 254 hectares (629 acres) of land located within the west sector of the city. The plan area is bounded by the Bow River to the north, the communities of Valley Ridge and Crestmont to the east, and by Rocky View County to the south and west.

The topography of the area is primarily rolling grassland with a significant wooded area to the north, adjacent to and rising above The Bow River. A ravine system provides a unique natural amenity along the western portion of the plan area, both north and south of the highway. The land rises to its highest elevation to the south and west providing views to the ranges of the Rocky Mountains.

## Engagement overview

The Engage Spectrum level for this second phase of engagement was 'Listen & Learn' which is defined as "We will listen to stakeholders and learn about their plans, views, issues, concerns, expectations and ideas."

Feedback collected through this phase will be used by The City to further analyze and refine the proposed land use concepts and develop policy direction.

The City-led engagement strategy was developed to facilitate multiple touch points and ensure inclusivity for all who wanted to provide input and learn about the project. Both in-person and online opportunities were offered for those who were interested in participating.

### In-person engagement

An in-person open house was held on Tuesday, May 15, 2018 at Crestmont Community Hall. At this session, we had project information and City staff on hand to share the proposed land use concepts and answer questions about the project.

Citizens were given an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed concepts by filling out a comment form, placing comments on each of the concept maps and participating in a dotmocracy exercise. We had 149 people attend this session and received 90 comments.

### Online engagement

An online survey was made available from May 15 – May 29, 2018 on the project website, [calgary.ca/westviewasp](http://calgary.ca/westviewasp). Citizens were provided with the information shared at the in-person open house and were able to provide feedback. We had 617 unique visitors to the webpage and received 32 completed surveys.

## How did people hear about engagement?

A comprehensive communications plan was developed to inform the community about the project and all of our engagement opportunities. Ongoing tactics employed throughout the life of the project have included:

- Project specific website ([calgary.ca/westviewASP](http://calgary.ca/westviewASP)) that shares information about the project. The website also shares notices about upcoming activities taking place in the community related to the ASP work.
- A project email newsletter, where interested parties can subscribe for project updates. An email is sent out about key project milestones, timelines and upcoming engagement activities.

The following communications tactics were employed to promote participation in our various engagement opportunities:

- Facebook advertisement to area residents, including Calgary and Rocky View County residents.
- Postcard mail outs to 2,708 surrounding area residents and landowners.
- Road signs located at high-traffic intersections sharing event details.

## What did we ask?

We asked citizens to answer the following questions to understand and evaluate both land use concepts.

1. Please tell us what you like about Land Use Concept One/ Two.
2. Please tell us what you don't like about Land Use Concept One/ Two.
3. In February you told us you valued a well-connected community with lots of pathways, bikeways, and good vehicle access. Which concept do you feel best achieves this?
4. In February you told us you had concerns with the transportation network and connectivity with the provincial highway and roads in Rocky View County. Which concept best addresses these concerns? (Choose one)
5. In February you told us you valued a multi-purpose regional recreation facility that was centrally located. One of the plans has a proposed recreational facility (land use concept one) and one does not (land use concept two) due to connectivity constraints. Which concept do you prefer?
6. Do you have any other ideas or concerns regarding the ASP that you would like to share with The City?

## What did we hear?

Overall, there was a high level of interest in the ASP and a wide range of input was received from the community.

Some of the main themes that emerged through all of the comments were:

- Citizens generally preferred concept one over concept two.
- Citizens value pedestrian and cycle connections in all directions (east-west, north-south).

- Citizens value good vehicular access and connectivity but want impacts on other surrounding roads mitigated.
- Citizens would like to see as much natural area preserved as possible.
- Citizens value lower density development with suitable community amenities.

For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses section](#).

## Summary of input

Below is a summary of the main themes that were most prevalent in the comments received. Each theme includes a summary and examples of verbatim comments in italics. These are the exact words you used. To ensure we capture all responses accurately, verbatim comments have not been altered. In some cases, we utilized only a portion of your comment that spoke to a particular theme.

| <b>Land Use Concept 1 – Likes</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Theme:</i>  | <i>Explanation and/ or sample comments:</i>   |
| Citizens like the highway access / partial interchange provided in concept one | <p><i>(Like) The Partial Interchange, which is needed to relieve the addition of residents and therefore traffic on Crestmont BLVD.</i></p> <p><i>(Like) Highway access and the communities on both sides of the Trans Canada are connected</i></p> |
| Citizens like the proposed recreational facility in concept one                | <p><i>I like that it includes a regional recreation facility and a community activity centre with retail/business.</i></p> <p><i>(Like) I like the location of the rec facility</i></p>   |
| Citizens value the pathway connections proposed in concept one                 | <p><i>(Like) Pathways and connectivity for residents</i></p> <p><i>(Like) Plan #1: superior public connectivity between the 2 neighborhoods and river and pathway system</i></p>  |
| <b>Land Use Concept 1 – Dislikes</b>   |   |
| <i>Theme:</i>  | <i>Explanation and/ or sample comments:</i>   |
| Citizens shared concerns about access to Old Banff Coach Road                  | <p><i>(Dislike) Do not transfer (dump) traffic on to OBR and RR31; 50% increase</i></p> <p><i>(Dislike) Don't like Crestmont Road joining Old Banff Coach, especially with The City not responsible for OBCR upgrades</i></p>                       |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Citizens shared concerns about additional congestion or access impacts through neighbouring communities | <p><i>(Dislike) Concerned about heavy traffic on the blvd if it becomes a throughway (highway diverters)</i></p> <p><i>(Dislike) Crestmont needs different entrance other than Valley Ridge exit</i></p> <p><i>(Dislike) One Valley Ridge exit is not convenient. Neither is connectivity to this new space</i></p> |
|---|---|

**Land Use Concept 2 – Likes**

| <i>Theme:</i>   | <i>Explanation and/ or sample comments:</i>   |
|---|---|
| Citizens stated that they did not prefer this option                                | <p><i>(Like) Do not like this scenario</i></p> <p><i>(Like) There isn't anything much to like about it.</i></p> <p><i>(Like) Nothing!</i></p> |
| Citizens stated that this concept may mean less traffic impact on surrounding roads | <p><i>(Like) Should have a reduced traffic footprint.</i></p> <p><i>(Like) A little less traffic will enter onto OBC rd.</i></p>              |

**Land Use Concept 2 – Dislikes**

| <i>Theme:</i>  | <i>Explanation and/ or sample comments:</i>   |
|--|---|
| Citizens shared concerns about the highway access and connectivity for concept two | <p><i>(Dislike) Poor connectivity. No access to Hwy 1. I don't even see the access from Valley Ridge through to the North side community. Too few city roads.</i></p> <p><i>(Dislike) It puts local vehicle and pathway traffic directly on to old banff coach road which is already too busy and too dangerous.</i></p> <p><i>(Dislike) Limited and divided access to the neighborhood</i></p> |
| Citizens do not like that this concept does not have a recreational facility       | <p><i>(Dislike) No Regional Rec Center</i></p> <p><i>(Dislike) There is no rec centre</i></p>   |

**Dotmocracy Results**

In February you told us you valued a well-connected community with lots of pathways, bikeways, and good vehicle access. Which concept do you feel best achieves this?

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| Land Use Concept One | 106 |
| Land Use Concept Two | 24  |

In February you told us you had concerns with the transportation network and connectivity with the provincial highway and roads in Rocky View County. Which concept best addresses these concerns?

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| Land Use Concept One | 108 |
| Land Use Concept Two | 22  |

In February you told us you valued a multi-purpose regional recreation facility that was centrally located. One of the plans has a proposed recreational facility (land use concept one) and one does not (land use concept two) due to connectivity constraints. Do you prefer the plan with the recreation facility or without?

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| Land Use Concept One | 108 |
| Land Use Concept Two | 22  |

## What are the next steps?

Feedback collected during the in-person and online engagement will be shared with the project team as they refine the land use concept and write new policy.

We will be returning to the community later this fall for phase three of engagement to share more details which will include sharing the draft area structure plan. We will be seeking input from the community to help confirm this work prior to it being finalized and presented to Calgary Planning Commission and Council.

## Verbatim comments

Content is captured as it was provided by citizens. No edits have been made unless there was personal information or offensive language which is removed with an indication that this has happened.

|  |
|--|
| <b>Please tell us what you like about Land Use Concept One</b>   |
| Multiple access points - HWY 1, Old Banff Coach Road   |
| Community and neighborhood activity center (both)  |
| Like the access to HWY 1   |
| Connectivity to development  |
| Walkability of community   |
| Rec centre   |
| Zero access through Valley Ridge   |
| Community activity centre  |
| Pathways   |
| Preservation of natural forested areas in Valley Ridge   |
| Joint use sites  |
| Regional pathway opening both sides up for ped and cyclist traffic   |
| I do not like partial developments. Why not develop to OBC Road and redo that clover leaf. This large, fairly flat land package No #1 would make a great mall location |
| Intersection with Transcanada Highway. If it has to be built to serve the north community it might as well serve both communities                                      |

|  |
|--|
| Roads run parallel to HWY 1  |
| Interchange should take traffic load off SB area   |
| Roundabout to get to 30 km   |
| Partial interchange  |
| Regional rec facility  |
| Joint use sites  |
| Need the Regional Recreational Complex   |
| Highway access is essential to support intended population   |
| Love the regional pathway connecting north and south   |
| Love the regional pathway connecting north and south   |
| Big roundabout   |
| Extend road at Valley Creek Rd NW / Valley Ridge Dr NW and make roads 2 directional  |
| Happy to have an interchange here  |
| Good access to HWY 1 compared to Plan 2  |
| Nice to have trails  |
| Good to have no access to Valley Ridge   |
| Great having access to Old Banff Coach Road, especially for westbound  |
| Even without any access to HWY 1, the road connecting N to S is a good idea  |
| With access across HWY 1, it gives communities N & S of HWY 1 access to both Community and neighborhood activity centers   |
| Interchange - like the connectivity for bike / walk path N/S. It integrates 2 communities  |
| Like lots of green space and family access (pathways for walking and bicycles)   |
| Like pathway connecting green spaces   |
| I like the pathway connections and green space. I like access to Old Banff Coach Road  |
| Happy to see an interchange here to fluidify traffic and ease access to the communities  |
| Plan #1: superior public connectivity between the 2 neighborhoods and river and pathway system   |
| We like the access if emergency happens or need access to HWY  |
| I like the pathway connections connecting both sides / both communities together   |
| Need 1/2 intersection to remove traffic from the existing with its new mall / shopping centre  |
| Regional Recreational Facility   |
| I like connectivity to Old Banff Coach Road  |
| A bike road on side of Old Banff Coach Rod would be a great and safe idea!   |
| Provide second access / egress to Crestmont  |
| Connectivity between northern and southern sides of Trans Canada Highway, increased pathway access, and community activity centre for retail services.   |
| Interchange to the highway. Has better facilities overall.   |
| Adding an extra access road to each community is great! Love the centres being grouped at a 4 way intersection. Recreational Facility. Road doesn't extend as far into green space.  |
| Please fix the Westbrook LRT station before doing anything else. It is atm a giant meth market/homeless shelter surrounded by 10 acres of mud and garbage. Most neighborhood residents wont even set foot in the station it is so scary. |
| Green Areas, Pathways  |
| There needs to be public access off the highway, plus only one neighbourhood activity centre is required.  |

|   |
|---|
| I like the Joint use area (school), Recreation Facility, many storm ponds, Partial Interchange and pathways. Green Corridor and Environmental Open space.   |
| Allows for a all purpose community where residents do not need to leave the area for services.  |
| It has feature of a community. It must maintain access. It has community, recreation, open space and amenities  |
| connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists across the trans Canada   |
| Everything. Mostly - Regional Rec Centre and connectivity between the north and south planning cells  |
| Regional Recreation Facility, Highway Access  |
| Direct access to highway 1, regional rec Centre, connection of the north south pathways   |
| Access from Highway 1 to both communities; both a community and neighbourhood activity centre and a regional recreation facility.   |
| The Partial Interchange, which is needed to relieve the addition of residents and therefore traffic on Crestmont BLVD. The Regional Recreation Facility would be a great addition.  |
| There is insufficient information to give this concept serious consideration. I note there is one significant improvement: the temporary road" is removed in favour of a more logical location taking city residents to a direct access to highway 1.   |
| These two communities should connect to each other for regional purposes.   |
| Rec centre  |
| Highway access and the communities on both sides of the Trans Canada are connected  |
| The communities will have good access to enter/exit via the interchange. Keeping the communities close together (shared activity center, etc) should distribute costs for each homeowner, but also allow for more diversity in commercial services.   |
| I support the idea of easy access to some of the main roads in the area. Also the activity centres and recreation facility. Green areas are a must.   |
| Crestmont exit roads that parallel Hwy #1 and exit the development on Range Road 31. A new interchange on Hwy 1 that provides access to Crestmont.  |
| Not much unless Alberta Transportation's Functional study recommendation to cul-de-sac Old Banff Coach (OBC) Road is implemented, and for there to be no access to Horizon view Road from Westview.   |
| I like the Environmental open space but fear it will not end up being protected as reserve.   |
| Partial interchange   |
| There is enough urban sprawl in Calgary . It doesn't need to encroach any further into Rockyview County.  |
| Direct access to Highway 1, which is a must for any development out here. There is currently too much pressure on the existing Valley Ridge and Crestmont single-access-to-each roads to not have direct access to Hwy 1. In a similar vein, I really like the pedestrian, cycling, transit and vehicle connectivity between the two planning cells, as that promotes an integrated community. Also like the recreation facility - new YMCA is extremely well-used/great addition to NW - West could support. |
| I like the interchange with access to Highway 1. I like that it includes a regional recreation facility and a community activity centre with retail/business. Because I live on the Crestmont side I like that I could access any amenities on the Valley Ridge side without a lot of travel through the Valley Ridge Community.  |
| Pathways and connectivity for residents   |
| The east—west city road shown accessing Old Banff Coach Rd to the west could be acceptable pending the exact location of the intersection.  |
| It will hopefully leave a larger environmental reserve land space. We also like the fact Valley Ridge doesnt have a vehicle road connected directly from Valley Ridge into the new area - to keep traffic flow low, but still has bike and walking path connections.  |
| Partial interchange allows residents direct access to Hwy 1 reducing impact on Rocky View residents. The overpass needs to have roundabouts on both north and south sides of Hwy 1 to facilitate crossing of Hwy 1 without having to rely on Old Banff Coach Rd overpass. Why don't you consider a tunnel underneath Hwy 1 similar to Valley Ridge to minimize impact.  |

|  |
|--|
| One Community Activity Centre, Pedestrian, cyclist, transit and vehicle connectivity to the north and south planning cells, One Neighbourhood Activity Centre, Regional Recreation Facility  |
| Centralized commercial and community area. Greenspace likely to remain is a huge plus  |
| I like the location of the rec facility  |
| <b>Please tell us what you dislike about Land Use Concept One</b>  |
| No green space south of HWY 1  |
| Why 2 distinct community associations?   |
| Access to HWY 1 and Old Banff Coach Road should be mandatory prior to development  |
| Dust and noise during construction. What steps can be taken to mitigate?   |
| Wind and water erosion, silt in Bow River from development   |
| Concerned about the Enviro Open Space Study Area findings and potential development. Will a copy of the report be available?   |
| Patchwork development  |
| Do not connect city road directly to Old Banff Coach Rd - not designed to take additional traffic. Implement AT's 2014 Functional Study Intersection on HWY 1 was not approved by AB Transportation - dangerous hill and too close to existing intersections |
| Density is too high  |
| Pathway connects on northside? (N or S?)   |
| Regional pathways are overdue to have linkage above to Artist View and upper escarpment  |
| What do you mean by "partial"? Given the traffic concerns already existing in the area - this will cause even more. Two direction would be better?   |
| Crosswalk and school bus stop is dangerous   |
| Four way stop is dangerous if you are coming off Trans Canada. Needs to be a traffic circle  |
| Bus stop at intersection is dangerous  |
| Gas "pigging" station has a house within 60' of the vent   |
| 10,000+ new residents concerns me for increased traffic on Hwy 563 overpass and on to RR31   |
| Too great a population having access to an Environmental Preserve / Biodiversity area (forested area)  |
| This proposed intersection is way too small for the volumes of traffic entering and exiting Crestmont and north of HWY 1   |
| Why does this intersection not line up with RR31?  |
| This does not follow Alberta Transportation Functional Study   |
| Rec Centre should not be located at this intersection. Too much traffic for Crestmont. Corner by Forzani Way better location for Rec Centre  |
| Too much traffic with road here  |
| More low density housing is not a good idea  |
| Concerns about increased traffic and noise in Valley Ridge   |
| We find one Valley Ridge exit inadequate   |
| Want more noise instigation in Valley Ridge, i.e. higher berm and concrete wall  |
| Valley Ridge needs a 2nd connector as the existing will be choked by the new shopping center   |
| Concerned about increase in traffic and the noise  |
| One Valley Ridge exit is not convenient. Neither is connectivity to this new space   |
| Concerns about additional development if EOS is not deemed an ER   |
| Concerned about all the extra traffic coming in through single entrance roundabout   |
| Crestmont needs different entrance other than Valley Ridge exit  |
| What is the green space south of the highway?  |

|   |
|---|
| Don't connect Crestmont to Horizon View   |
| We don't like the Crestmont Rd that is going to possibly open onto OBCR   |
| Do not connect to OBC Rd. Not designed to take additional traffic   |
| Concerned about heavy traffic on the blvd if it becomes a throughway (highway diverters)  |
| Don't want Crestmont Road access to Old Banff Coach Road dangerous. 10,000 too small road   |
| Keep OBCR open. Distribute traffic  |
| We must stop spreading outwards with low density  |
| Calgary already has the largest single home ownership in Canada (i.e. W. America, the world). This increase in R1 zoning is irresponsible on a global level!  |
| Good exit from Crestmont  |
| Not a good location to join Old Banff Coach. You will need a light and road improvement   |
| Don't like Crestmont Road joining Old Banff Coach, especially with The City not responsible for OBCR upgrades   |
| Do not transfer (dump) traffic on to SBR and RR31; 50% increase   |
| Possible interruption of Trans Canada Highway. Lack of community activity centre would mean residents will need to travel further for basic retail needs.   |
| There is no school. This should be a priority for this area and the Crestmont/Valleyview Area.  |
| Nothing :)  |
| Location of Regional Recreation Facility<br>Too much traffic on Crestmont Boulevard now with construction vehicles and construction workers, way too much dust in the air and dirty roads<br>Crestmont Boulevard cannot sustain the traffic as it is, never mind the new housing and also a recreation centre. Pathway across the highway.  |
| High density neighborhood activity Centre, Community Association site (most in Calgary loose money)   |
| It feels "dense" especially around the two main community intersections, perhaps these services can be spread out?  |
| Explain what is partial interchange? it must not impeded traffic, create additional issues.   |
| Partial interchange. full interchange would be better.  |
| I do not like the connections into Valley Ridge or Crestmount.  |
| The recreation facility could add more traffic congestion to the community.   |
| n/a   |
| Highway access clogging up hwy 1 and likely reducing speed limits.  |
| Not enough green space  |
| Highway 1 can already get quite congested. As a Valley Ridge resident there are times that access to the community is impacted by the traffic volumes on Hwy 1. However, in general, traffic congestion isn't too bad connecting directly to Hwy 1.   |
| There are no saved green area's in the south part of this plan. Some should be added.<br>I do NOT support a high density model. This should be low to medium density only   |
| As extra traffic will cross over highway 1 from north to south if OBC road is not made into a cul-de-sac even more traffic will flow onto OBC rd. This road is not capable of taking that volume of traffic safely. As a resident of A.V. West I have already witnessed too many accident on this highway and it can not be fixed. Safety is my concern.<br>The road shown along the Horizon view alignment going to the boundary of Rocky view.  |
| With highway access comes increased traffic flow through the community.   |
| It puts local vehicle and pathway traffic directly on to old banff coach road which is already too busy and too dangerous. The last regional planning study i attended some years ago had old banff coach cut off from the highway and made into a local road. Now it's a major connector from the west city to he highway and also to the new population in the ASP. That is insane. It's a small windy road with absolutely NO shoulder. It should be not connected to the highway or the new neighbourhoods. |

|  |
|--|
| The partial interchange on TCH appears to be at 133 Street – AB Transportation has already stated that this location is too dangerous because of the steep hill and being too close to the Old Banff Coach Rd interchange. Therefore this location should not be used in your concept plan. Also the city road shown along the 133 St alignment to the south should not be accessing onto Old Banff Coach Rd which is planned to be a cul-de-sac (see AT 2014 Functional Study). |
| We would prefer to see the least amount of development, and preservation of as much trees and environmental reserve preserved as possible. By having direct access to Highway 1 and more centres, it may create too much traffic and denser development which may lead to a smaller future environmental reserve land space allocation. Also, denser development may lead to heavier traffic flows and higher crime rates.   |
| There are additional access roads to RR31 and Old Banff Coach Road. AT Functional Planning Study said to cul-de-sac Old Banff Coach Rd to manage public safety issues and address traffic on a country residential area. There is a south access on the drwg that is not transparent re intent or impact on Rocky View.  |
| Partial interchange with direct access to Highway 1  |
| Partial interchange to hwy 1. This will be added noise and traffic to what is already a high volume area that is well heard through the edges of each community (Crestmont & Valley Ridge).  |
| Please tell us what you like about Land Use Concept two  |
| I do not like partial developments. Why not develop to OBC Road and redo that clover leaf. This large, fairly flat land package No #1 would make a great mall location   |
| Not much. It is the poorer of the two plans  |
| Keeping any new development as a separate suburb / community with its own access (not linked to Crestmont) will keep traffic volume down and will allow less people to access the forested area  |
| Less traffic will mean less noise for those living in Westview and Valley Ridge  |
| Access to Old Banff Coach Road is great, especially for westbound traffic  |
| Minimal access preferred   |
| No access to Valley Ridge from new area  |
| Yes, I like there is no access to Valley Ridge from new area   |
| Big traffic circle at Crestmont & VR   |
| Like env res. Make it bigger!  |
| Like regional pathway  |
| Like: Valley Ridge does not connect to new development (road)  |
| 1 like to proposed intersection at HWY 1 connecting both communities. Will reduce traffic at roundabout  |
| I like that it is beautiful! Same with the ducks!  |
| I like the storm water pond  |
| I like limited access  |
| Fewer access points means less human impact on the Biodiversity Region / Environmental Preserve  |
| No access helps with traffic congestion  |
| It's important to lessen impact on the forest. Fewer people = less impact  |
| I would like to propose a pedestrian / cyclist connection over the highway to link the VR and Crestmont areas  |
| Keeps Trans Canada Highway unobstructed for free flow traffic. Calgary already struggles with traffic problems around the whole city. Priority needs to be made for steady traffic flow and high flow interchanges on highways and high traffic roads.   |
| Do not like this scenario  |
| Less concrete (regional pathways, roads, etc)  |
| Pathways, Green Areas, Rec Centre not located not located on Crestmont Boulevard Junction  |

|   |
|---|
| Storm ponds and the Joint use (school area)   |
| Very little, feels like "older" communities where residents leave the community to find services  |
| There isn't anything much to like about it.   |
| Neighbor hood activity centers  |
| I don't like it   |
| Nothing   |
| Finally I see city accesses intended to be connected as directly as possible to the existing OBC interchange.   |
| Two activity centres, no hwy access.  |
| Nothing   |
| Should have a reduced traffic footprint. Additional services (ie. community center) will reduce the load on those services, but this depends on how many people are expected to live in the community.  |
| Don't support this conceptl   |
| Not much.   |
| A little less traffic will enter onto OBC rd. The cul-de-sac will still be required as per Alberta Transportation functional study (a win, win ,win solution)   |
| No highway access   |
| There is enough urban sprawl in Calgary . It doesn't need to encroach any further into Rockyview County.  |
| I don't like concept two very much.   |
| No highway access   |
| No interchange onto TC Hwy is better and safer. Emergency access is acceptable. The east—west city road shown accessing Old Banff Coach Rd to the west could be acceptable pending the exact location of the intersection.  |
| It will hopefully leave a larger environmental reserve land space. We also like the fact Valley Ridge doesnt have a vehicle direct road direct into the new area - to keep traffic flow low, but still has bike and walking path connections.                         |
| Two Neighbourhood Activity Centres.   |
| Well proposed pathways, good spread of potential commercial and community venues. Pathways reach towards potential junior/middle schools which are desperately needed due to next current proximity in each community. Greenspace area should be maintained as listed |
| <b>Please tell us what you dislike about Land Use Concept two</b>   |
| No second access to HWY 1   |
| No connection between north and south of HWY 1  |
| Limited and divided access to the neighborhood  |
| No pedestrian or cyclist path connecting both sides of the neighborhood area  |
| No community activity centre  |
| Concerns about environmental open space study area not being preserved as an ER   |
| Do not connect city road directly to OB Coach Rd - not designed to accommodate additional traffic   |
| The access to Old Banff Coach Road will be costly and it is better to spend this money at the TransCanada interchange   |
| Puts too much traffic on Crestmont Blvd.  |
| Joining the two communities gives more opportunity to have more cost effective services   |
| To access each side, must go around (OBCR or VR) 4 miles?   |
| I would prefer no roads having access to the Environmental portion (see mark on map). Minimising human impact on this space is key to preserving it as a biodiversity region / area. Likewise, I would prefer that trails into this area be kept to a minimum         |

|   |
|---|
| Multi use path connectivity between communities and access to green. Not present across Trans Canada  |
| Not having access to HWY 1 will cause extra traffic on other roads  |
| Do not like that there is no interchange on this plan. OBC overpass cannot handle 10,000 residents  |
| Not enough entry / exit points, which will force extra traffic on remaining roads   |
| Need to meet up to connect with Valley Ridge pathway  |
| Need to add access to existing forest path along river  |
| Take out this road to save grasslands   |
| Add more grasslands to Env Res  |
| No secondary access to Valley Ridge and Crestmont   |
| Concern increased traffic at roundabout   |
| Concern buses in cul de sac   |
| Don't like buses in crescent  |
| Need a turnaround or other access for school buses. They use 300 Cresthaven PI as a roundabout  |
| We don't like if there is access which is too far   |
| Great large piece of land. Why no large "mall". Because they are ugly   |
| Concerned about the increase of traffic on 48 Ave   |
| No HWY 1 access   |
| No Regional Rec Center  |
| Keep OBCR open. Distribute traffic. Install traffic calming roundabout  |
| Do not connect Banff Coach and Horizon View here  |
| Do not connect to OBC Rd. Not designed to take any additional traffic   |
| Separation of North and South sides of Trans Canada Highway. If a high flow interchange that allowed free flow traffic on the Trans Canada could be implemented, this wouldn't be a problem.          |
| Main road extends too far into green space (north). Rreeeeally want to preserve green space! No recreational facility.  |
| No direct public access - how would that even work just having emergency. It seems like the City came up with this option just so people would chose Concept One.                                     |
| High density Neighbourhood Activity Centre, Community Association site, there is no partial interchange and no recreation facility.   |
| As above  |
| Poor connectivity. No access to Hwy 1. I don't even see the access from Valley Ridge through to the North side community. Too few city roads.   |
| No connectivity across the trans Canada for bikes and pedestrians.  |
| no comment  |
| No rec center, no direct access to highway 1, no pathway between north and south  |
| I do not like the connections into Valley Ridge or Crestmont.   |
| The lack of forethought on the additional traffic with the amount of residents added and not having a secondary access point is foolish. The volume of Traffic on Crestmont BLVD would be ridiculous. |
| These 2 communities should be connected for regional recreation servicing.  |
| No rec centre.  |
| Not enough green space  |

|   |
|---|
| Having no direct highway access changes the traffic flow and will have people driving across the community. Make sure there are two entrances to each community, don't make the same mistake as with Valley Ridge/Crestmont access!   |
| Don't support this concept.   |
| Not enough access to Hwy 1 for Crestmont residents.   |
| The road shown along the Horizon view alignment going to the boundary of Rocky view. I was told the road may not be there - the why is it on the map we are asked to vote on. Without the cul-de-sac implemented there will be a significant safety issue.  |
| No community activity centre  |
| Does not have a community activity centre - local employment and retail services are a very important part of any community, providing a nice hub. Does not have direct access to Hwy 1 and is not an integrated cycling/vehicle/pedestrian/transit community.  |
| Concept Two creates two isolated communities. There is no additional retail/commercial sites, i.e. restaurants, coffee shops, etc.  |
| It puts local vehicle and pathway traffic directly on to old banff coach road which is already too busy and too dangerous. The last regional planning study i attended some years ago had old banff coach cut off from the highway and made into a local road. Now it's a major connector from the west city to he highway and also to the new population in the ASP. That is insane. It's a small windy road with absolutely NO shoulder. It should be not connected to the highway or the new neighbourhoods. |
| The city road shown along the 133 St alignment to the south should not be accessing onto Old Banff Coach Rd which is planned to be a cul-de-sac (see AT 2014 Functional Study).   |
| Traffic flows must use Rocky View to enter and exit the ASP areas. That is not appropriate for one jurisdiction to inflict all the harm from infrastructure onto a neighbouring jurisdiction. This would create severe stress on Old Banff Coach Rd re public safety, capacity overloaded, wildlife corridors and character, and local residents. Old Banff Coach Rd must be cul-de-sac per AT Functional Planning Study. Restrict the movement from the RR31 connections to direct traffic to Hwy 1 overpass.  |
| No direct public highway access<br>Emergency highway access only<br>No Community Activity Centre<br>No pedestrian, cyclist, transit or vehicle connectivity between the north and south planning cells<br>Due to limited access, no Regional Recreation Facility in this scenario   |
| connection between north and south can still be provided without the need of any type of connecting intersection (bridge with no turn-offs)   |
| <b>Do you have any other ideas or concerns regarding the ASP that you would like to share with The City?</b>  |
| We do not want access through Valley Ridge, it's already a high use road with lots of speeding. We are concerned about the Environmental Open Space Study Area findings and the potential increase in development area if it's not deemed an environmental reserve. We want the forested area and ravines preserved - that's what we love about our neighbourhood   |
| Developer and City are not listening re transportation issues - OBC Rd should not be part of the plan. You need to solve these issues in an alternative way   |
| Our concern relates to the possible closure of OBCR. Keep it open. The closure will transfer 1500 - 2000 vehicles per day on to SBR and RR31 - 45-70% increase. Share the traffic. Control the concerns on OBCR - traffic calming measures enforcement  |
| In February we also told you that we wanted the natural spaces / nature reserve to be preserved as much as possible. This was not included for us to vote on this time. I feel this has not been given a high enough profile and that the 3 above questions are definitely slanted towards land use 1   |
| There are not many coniferous forests remaining near to Calgary. The City considers this area as a biodiversity region which is key to protecting certain species - particularly those that breed and shelter there like deer and moose. I am concerned that people are not being made aware of this. They may vote differently if they were more informed about impact on this preserve  |

|  |
|--|
| <p>Biggest concern is that concept one will impede traffic flow on the Trans Canada Highway unnecessarily. If the proposed "partial" interchange will not prevent free-flow traffic on the Trans Canada Highway, then it is the superior concept.</p>  |
| <p>Why can a full interchange be part of the project..why go halfway?<br/>There should definitely be a school here.<br/>How doesn't this affect Crestmont and Valleyridge?</p>   |
| <p>Really don't want the green space touched (don't even want a concrete pathway). I feel the entire community really embraces and loves the earthy natural footpaths we've created ourselves within the Environmental Space. Footpaths should be kept to a minimum (or not at all) outside of residential/commercial areas.</p>   |
| <p>I am concerned that the transit commuter time may be extended for Valley Ridge. It is already a long commute to get to Brentwood Station.</p>   |
| <p>No really, appears that there are two options that are 180 degrees different..all services or no services. Who wouldn't want to have a community with services?</p>   |
| <p>A partial interchange with Hwy 1 is a mistake. it must be a full interchange. The growth will be hampered; traffic incidents will occur if not a full interchange.</p>  |
| <p>Please be forward thinking about connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians and maintenance of trees and grass. Cities of the future are GREEN. Don't build sprawl. Don't cut off neighbourhoods from one another with no pathways connecting them.</p>  |
| <p>Please pressure the province to finish Stoney before all this new construction goes in! Really - the ring road will no longer be a ring road by the time it will be finished - it will just be another major road IN the city. Why did they not build it to capacity to start? Costs go up every year making the project more expensive with each passing year! 16th already is a parking lot from Sarcee to Valley Ridge past 3 o'clock - not to mention what the traffic looks like going east.</p>               |
| <p>Safety factors from "temporary road" onto OBC Rd</p>  |
| <p>Would like to see Township Road 250 not connected to this community</p>   |
| <p>I'm interested in the type of schools being proposed and what their catchment area would be. What communities would be busing to those schools, and what would the schooling plan be for the community as it ages (local kids moving to Junior/Senior High and then school-age kids numbers in the community starting to decrease).<br/>Is there a plan to use this ASP to create a second access point for Valley Ridge? Crestmont?</p>  |
| <p>No high density living in this area. Keep it low to medium. Neighbourhoods are closer this way. The sight of taller buildings will not wreck what mother nature has given us. Besides use, you have to think of the aesthetics of the area.<br/>Not enough green areas in this community. Parks!!!!<br/>You are very vague in describing the type of housing that will be built. Single Family Units and Multi Family Units is hugely vague. Wording clearly describing the type of housing should be used.</p>     |
| <p>Wildlife corridor. An enhanced and upgraded pathway system.</p>   |
| <p>Yes. Westview should include a "true" retirement village consisting of 1-3 bedroom townhomes and apartments and an assisted living complex all in one safe complex. The complex should have facilities such as a swimming pool, workshop, and restaurant as well as a clubhouse and maybe a bowling green. Maybe this could start of as the new Olympic village if Calgary proceeds with the 2026 Olympics - a good location close to COP, speed skating and close to Canmore and the mountains.</p>                |
| <p>Walking from West View SW to West View NW</p>   |
| <p>It will be very important to ensure appropriate connectivity for transit, with a bus line serving this area, Valley Ridge and Crestmont and doing a loop to the train station at Tuscany or Crowfoot. That would be a huge improvement.</p>   |
| <p>No.</p>   |
| <p>It puts local vehicle and pathway traffic directly on to old banff coach road which is already too busy and too dangerous. The last regional planning study i attended some years ago had old banff coach cut off from the highway and made into a local road. Now it's a major connector from the west city to he highway and also to the new population in the ASP. That is insane. It's a small windy road with absolutely NO shoulder. It should be not connected to the highway or the new neighbourhoods.</p> |

|  |
|--|
| <p>I would like to see more detail about what is planned in each neighbourhood. There is very little information in these concepts.</p>  |
| <p>Please persue lower dense development, and decide to protect all of the current outlined environmental reserve as possible.</p>   |
| <p>You should improve the balance between benefits and costs between jurisdictions. Rocky View appears to be getting all the negative impacts while the City of Calgary gets the new tax revenue base. The AT Functional Planning Study has not been included.</p>   |
| <p>I don't see clear pathways meeting up with existing trails in Valley Ridge. All along the west ridge and behind the new homes in Valley Point. A plan needs to include the nature pathways in the forest along the river with additional paths connecting to theses trails.<br/>The creek which runs from the south to the river has to be cleaned up as it has a lot of damage and fallen trees from the flood. There also needs to be proper crossings (bridges).</p> |
| <p>We're hoping these are not the only two solid plans. This is a bit pigeon-holed and there should be more debate as to justifying these decisions so that what comes out of it is rationally sound.</p>  |