



Brentwood Co-op Redevelopment Application

Phase three engagement: revised application evaluation

Stakeholder report back: What we heard report
Summer 2017

Project overview

In December 2016, Co-op, in conjunction with Quarry Bay Developments, proposed a combined development permit and land use redesignation (re-zoning) for the site located at 4122 Brentwood Road N.W. (the existing Co-op site).

After the first detailed review of their submission and rounds of community engagement, Co-op submitted a revised application in July 2017. This revised application proposes four new buildings, along with a relocated gas bar and new Wendy's with a drive-thru. The tallest building heights are proposed to be approximately 31 storeys (116 metres) and 23 storeys (90 metres). A total of 501 residential units are proposed and 15,500 square metres (166,880 square feet) of commercial space including office, grocery store, retail and other commercial uses.

It is the intent of Co-op to develop the site, with these additional uses, including residential units and offices in multiple phases, keeping the current Co-op store and existing businesses open until each of its replacements spaces are built. It is also a requirement of Co-op to keep an adequate level of parking available for customer use during the construction period.

Engagement overview

A comprehensive engagement strategy has been developed to facilitate multiple touch points and ensure inclusivity for all who want to provide input and learn about the Brentwood Co-op Redevelopment project.

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

For this project, we have taken a multi-phased engagement approach. Phase one engagement occurred in April 2017 with an online survey and phase two included two in-person visioning workshops. Both of these phases informed the first detailed review of the application and resulted in the applicant submitting a revised proposal with changes made in response to the City's first set of recommendations.

The purpose of this third phase of engagement is to share the revised application and to gather input on the proposed changes and determine if there are still any outstanding community concerns.

More information about The City's engagement can be found at calgary.ca/brentwoodcoop. Please note that the developer has conducted their own engagement prior to submitting the application and more information can be found at brentwoodcommons.ca

What did we do?

Recognizing that summer is always a busy time, we offered many different activities and tactics throughout the month of August for people to review the application details, ask questions of City staff and provide their feedback. These included:

Community sounding board

A large sounding board was placed in front of the Brentwood Co-op Store from August 9 – 15. This board shared all of the information panels that have been shared online and at the in-person events and asked people to provide their feedback on the sticky notes provided. It also shared details of other engagement opportunities. Over the week we received 86 comments on the sounding board.

Pop-up event

The City project team attended the Triwood Community Farmer's Market on August 15 from 3:00 – 7:00 p.m. At this event we had information panels to share details of the revised plan and City staff on hand to answer questions. The public was also provided with the opportunity to fill out comment forms. At this event we spoke with 140 citizens.

Open house

An in-person open house was held on Thursday, August 24 at Triwood Community Centre from 4:00 – 8:00 pm. At this session, we had project information and City staff on hand to answer questions. Citizens were also given the opportunity to share their comments on the application by completing a feedback form and leaving comments on three different engagement boards. We had 149 people attend this session and received 16 completed feedback forms and 83 comments on the engagement boards.

Online engagement

An online survey was made available from August 9 through August 30 on the project website calgary.ca/brentwoodcoop. Citizens were provided with the information shared at the in-person events and were asked to provide their comments on the application by answering eleven questions. These questions were the same as those provided at the in-person session and are provided in the next section of this report. We had 1,461 visits to the site in the month of August and received 171 completed responses.

Comment forms

We had comment forms available at the Brentwood Co-op Customer Service Desk from August 9 – 30 with a drop box. People without access to a computer would be able to pick-up and drop-off their completed form here. We received 1 completed form.

Overall we had 525 participants through the entire third phase of engagement (in-person and online) and we gathered 1,486 ideas and comments through all methods of feedback.

What did we ask?

In an effort to evaluate whether the changes have adequately addressed community concerns and determine what the outstanding concerns are in the community, we asked the public to provide feedback on the subject areas identified below by answering the following questions;

Pedestrian Connectivity and Safety

Community Idea/ Concern: Citizens told us they desired an improved journey to and through the site.

Applicant's proposed change: The Applicant has created better pedestrian connections across the parking lot, improved the road interface along the park with more pedestrian crossings and removed the driveway on Brentwood Road for pedestrian safety.

1. Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input about pedestrian connectivity and have improved the pedestrian interface?

Development Fit

Community Idea/ Concern: Concern that the new development will not be visually appealing and will be too high for the existing community.

Applicant's proposed change: The Applicant has reduced the height of Building #1 by 10 storeys (40 storeys down to 30 storeys)

2. Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input and is the reduction in storeys sufficient to address community concerns?

Vibrant Gathering Spaces

Community Idea/ Concern: Community feels there is a lack of local, small-scaled businesses and vibrant places to gather.

Applicant's proposed change: The Applicant has relocated the Wendy's and proposed a small café with a patio to better activate the plaza facing Blakiston Park.

3. Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input about gathering places and creates a vibrant place to gather?

Road Alignment

Community Idea/ Concern: The community would like to have a commercial main street that connects through the station area.

Applicant's proposed change: The Applicant has deemed that the commercial main is unviable due to space requirements for the grocery store and conflicts with the existing store footprint. They have proposed a road alignment along Blakiston Park and have improved the pedestrian interface.

4. How do you feel about the proposal to re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park?
5. Do you feel the changes to the plan have improved the interface with Blakiston Park?

Station Area Redevelopment Plan

An amendment to the Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment Plan may be required along with this land use redesignation. Based on the current amended plans, policies including the

maximum height allowed within the site and the orientation and alignment of the commercial main street will need to be amended to accommodate the proposed development.

The maximum height allowed will need to be increased from 90 metres to 120m. The orientation of the commercial main street will have to be re-aligned to be along Blakiston Park rather than through the centre of the site. More information on the Brentwood Area Redevelopment Plan can be found here: <http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/pd/Documents/arp-asp/arp/brentwood-arp.pdf>

6. Do you feel these amendments are acceptable? Please tell us why or why not. \

General Application

7. Do you feel the changes to the plan overall have addressed the community ideas and concerns shared with The City? Tell us why.
8. Do you have any outstanding concerns about the application that you feel have been missed?
9. Do you have any additional questions about the application for the project team? Common questions will be used to help populate our Frequently Asked Questions section on the project webpage.

Public Engagement

10. How satisfied are you with the opportunity to provide feedback?
11. What worked for you about the feedback opportunities provided to you? Is there anything we could do differently to make it better?

How did people hear about engagement?

A comprehensive communications plan was developed to inform the community about all of our engagement opportunities. The tactics included:

- A project specific website (calgary.ca/brentwoodcoop) that shares information and background about the Brentwood Co-op redevelopment application. The website also includes a summary of previous engagement activities and notice about upcoming activities taking place in the community.
- Digital ads ran from July 17-August 28, 2017
 - Impressions:149,839
 - Clicks:610
 - Click through rate: 0.41%
- A twitter campaign was used to create awareness of all engagement activities, which included:
 - 5 tweets from @cityofcalgary twitter account (@cityofcalgary twitter account has 229K followers as of August 2017).
 - 5 tweets from @nextcityyyyc twitter account (@nextcityyyyc has 2664 followers as of August 2017).
- Targeted Facebook campaigns were used to encourage awareness of the open house and online survey. They included:
 - July 19-August 2 Brentwood events awareness
 - Paid reach: 9,253

- Paid impressions: 42, 657
 - Clicks to website: 569
 - Post likes: 60
 - Post comments: 17
 - Post shares: 16
 - August 9-16 Brentwood Co-op online engagement
 - Paid reach: 8,420
 - Paid impressions: 30,658
 - Clicks to website: 330
 - Post likes: 11
 - Post comments: 7
 - Post shares: 3
 - August 17-24 Brentwood Co-op open house promotion
 - Paid reach: 8,110
 - Paid impressions: 35,906
 - Clicks to website: 172
 - Post likes: 24
 - Post comments: 2
 - Post shares: 2
- Six large traffic signs placed throughout the community at high-traffic intersections, to push people to the website and our in-person events
- A postcard mail out was conducted and sent to 12,989 residents in the surrounding community.
- Information was shared with the Brentwood Community Association, which they passed on to members of the community.
- Advertisements in the *Brentwood Bugle*, the community newsletter, were placed in the July and August edition.
- Sending emails to the 216 community members subscribed to our email list, sharing workshop information and encouraging sign-up.
 - 5 email updates were sent between July 13 and August 30, 2017
 - July 13, 2017: List of August events, sent to 175 recipients, 126 opened, 33 clicked
 - July 24, 2017: What We Heard Report from May now online, sent to 178 recipients, 120 opened, 62 clicked
 - August 10, 2017: August events reminder, sent to 204 recipients, 148 opened, 67 clicked
 - August 22, 2017: Pop-up event and online survey reminder, sent to 212 recipients, 116 opened, 27 clicked
 - August 30, 2017: Last day to complete online survey, sent to 216 recipients, 118 opened, 33 clicked
- Approximately 10,000 postcards were handed out at check-out in the Brentwood Co-op store throughout the month of August.
- 50 posters were distributed throughout the community and hung in areas such as community bulletin boards.

- Co-op / Quarry Bay shared information about the workshop on their website brentwoodcommons.ca and to their email distribution lists.
- Councillor Farrell's office distributed information to area residents through their email subscription list and website.
- Future communications for the project will continue as the project progresses via email subscription and website.

How is public input used?

Public input is the vital ingredient in developing a recommendation to Calgary Planning Commission. There are also three other factors that are equally considered:

1. Market viability: to understand what is economically realistic for the area.
2. Professional expertise: to understand best practices and to know what's technically possible.
3. City of Calgary policy: to understand what rules exist or may need to change, and to understand concepts in relation to other City of Calgary policies.

The community input that has been received in phase three of engagement will be used to inform our second detailed team review of the submission as we make recommendations back to the applicant. All phases of engagement will inform the eventual recommendation to Calgary Planning Commission and Council.

What we heard

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

All of the feedback has been reviewed and a summary of input has been compiled to reflect the diversity of opinions that were shared by the community. These opinions were used to create high-level themes for each question. Since many of the comments represented opposite or varying points of view, we are unable to provide an overall characterization of positive, negative or neutral sentiment towards the application in its entirety.

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

- Citizens feel that the proposed building heights are too high and that they should be in alignment with the Station Area Redevelopment Plan and not exceed 90 metres.
- Citizens feel that the commercial main street should be in alignment with the Station Area Redevelopment Plan.
- Citizens would like to see improvements made to pedestrian connectivity and gathering spaces
- Citizens are concerned by the potential impact of additional density on the transportation infrastructure

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](#).

Summary of input

Below is a summary of the main themes that were most prevalent in the comments received for each subject area. 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.

Pedestrian Connectivity	
Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
Citizens feel the proposed changes have improved pedestrian connectivity	<p>Some citizens feel the proposed changes have addressed community input and have improved pedestrian connectivity.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“Pedestrian connectivity is improved however, major concerns with vehicle traffic.”</i></p> <p><i>“Yes, I believe that the new plan places pedestrian connectivity at the forefront. By removing the driveway on Brentwood Road, that encourages more pedestrians to move more freely.”</i></p> <p><i>“The pedestrian interface along the park is improved.”</i></p>
Citizens feel more improvements are needed for pedestrian connectivity	<p>Some citizens like the proposed changes but feel that even more changes are needed for the site to be pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“The changes seem to have made things worse. Building 2 is now in the way to get between the new development and the mall to the east. Adding pedestrian crossings still leaves exposure to vehicle traffic, and amplifies the subordination of pedestrians to vehicles in the design concept. Crossings are better than no crossings, but miss the basic objection and intent of the ARP completely.”</i></p> <p><i>“Pedestrian connectivity is not only an issue of increasing crossings. There is an issue of thoughtfully connecting the development to the existing community and services that does not appear to have been addressed in any real way. I think the important point is that the redevelopment should work with the</i></p>

	<i>current community and infrastructure to encourage and facilitate pedestrian interaction.”</i>
Development Fit	
Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
Citizens feel that the proposed building height is too high	<p>Some citizens feel that 30 storeys is too high for the area and that building heights should not exceed the limit of 90 metres defined in the Area Redevelopment Plan.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“Building #1 needs to be lowered so that it is within the 90 meter limit of the ARP.”</i></p> <p><i>“No I do not feel the reduction in the storeys is sufficient. In keeping with the original ASP the maximum height was 25 stories and I think that this should still apply to this development. I do not support altering the ASP to accommodate the developer's proposal because, based on the appearance of the current height of the buildings in the Brentwood Station area, 30 would be too high to fit into the area.”</i></p> <p><i>“No- the reduction in height to 116 meters is still a violation of the ARP. Even with a maximum height of 90 meters the proposed residential tower is not only inconsistent with the character of the surrounding communities but reflects and poorly conceived approach to densification.”</i></p>
Vibrant Gathering Spaces	
Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
Citizens feel more improvements are needed for gathering spaces in the development	<p>Some citizens like the proposed changes but feel that more changes are needed to address gathering spaces.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“The only place to gather is the park. There is no public gathering place on site. Plus, the road between the development and the park cuts off the development from the community. There is no community appeal to this design.”</i></p> <p><i>“No. lack of soft, vegetative planning - places where you feel less like you are in a sharp, shiny concrete environment and more like you are in a natural environment.”</i></p>

	<i>"No - except for one cafe there is very little change. At University City we were promised a "vibrant place to gather" and what we got is a concrete, soul-less jungle. This development will be the same"</i>
--	---

Road Alignment

Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
-------	---

Citizens are concerned with the road alignment	<p>Some citizens have concerns about the proposed road alignment along the park and feel this should be moved to the location defined in the area redevelopment plan</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>"I think that is a terrible idea. I feel it puts up a barrier between the development and the existing park and the existing community."</i></p> <p><i>Blakiston Park is for quiet relaxation and recreation, presumably -- an oasis in the midst of a busy commercial and residential complex. There is no good reason to put a "main street" along it.</i></p> <p><i>Keep the park pedestrian friendly and the commercial main street where it is. Change the development plan to be a better fit with existing infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree with a commercial main street around Blakiston Park - the park should remain quiet.</i></p>
--	---

Station Area Redevelopment Plan

Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
-------	---

Citizens do not agree with amendments proposed to change the area redevelopment plan	<p>Some citizens would like to see the area redevelopment plan respected and do not want to see changes to the building heights or main street alignment.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>"The height should not exceed 90m. The SARP maximum is 90m. The City and community spent a lot of time and money to develop the SARP. The City should stand by their commitment"</i></p> <p><i>"the building would be too tall and the site will be awkward to walk thru"</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>“These amendments are NOT acceptable....The solution is to maintain the commercial main street through the centre of the site as originally planned. Otherwise, you will have uncontrollable traffic around the site and adjacent to a greenspace/park”</i></p> <p><i>“the existing Brentwood Station Area Plan is has an excellent vision for the community and plenty of room for developers to work within the plan.”</i></p>
--	--

General Application

Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
<p>Citizens are concerned by the increase in traffic congestion</p>	<p>Some citizens feel that there will be a negative impact on traffic and transportation infrastructure with the additional density being proposed by this development</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“Traffic will be congested at all times. At present the traffic through here is terrible. With added apartments by you & RioCan it will only get worse!</i></p> <p><i>“The single entrance into the site is unacceptable as there will be further traffic congestion and add to headache on Brentwood Road. Did not see Brentwood Road issues raised (this may be city hall issue) nor are there additional pedestrian crosswalks on Brentwood Road....”</i></p> <p><i>“The traffic concerns has clearly been ignored in this new proposal as the main roads and the number of parking spots have remained the same. As someone who lives in the area, I can almost certainly guarantee you that traffic problems will increase significantly if this plan were to be approved.”</i></p>
<p>Citizens feel that their input has not been considered.</p>	<p>Some citizens feel that the input provided at the engagement workshop was not listened to and not enough changes have been made.</p> <p>Sample comments</p> <p><i>“Workshop Concepts - note that all of these have a "main street" (100% of workshop members) why aren't you listening”</i></p>

	<p><i>“The design ignores the public input or simply makes excuses - the height - the road - the public realm - the main street concept.”</i></p> <p><i>“Appreciate the opportunity to provide input but only small changes made. Not enough to address my concerns.”</i></p> <p><i>“No. The developers have ignored our two main requests: Completion of the Main Street and lower height for the larger building. The revised plan is a minor cosmetic change that does not address the fact that coop’s proposal does not at all fit what was negotiated with community during the station area redevelopment plan process. I am very disappointed with coop (and with the city) about this.”</i></p>
--	--

What are the next steps?

City staff will conduct a second review of the revised proposal based on technical feasibility, City policies, public input, and landowner rights and provide feedback to the applicant. Feedback gathered through this phase of engagement will be used to inform this second review.

Changes to the proposal will be negotiated based on The City's review of the proposal and feedback from the public.

We will return to the community in the fall / winter to share the final application details the City's recommendation and summary of all engagement. This will be prior to presentation to Calgary Planning Commission and City Council.

When Administration is ready to make their recommendation on the application, all input gathered through all phases of engagement will also be used in reports provided to Calgary Planning Commission and City Council.

To stay up-to-date on next steps for this project, we encourage you to sign-up for project specific communications on The City's project page calgary.ca/brentwoodcoop.

Verbatim input

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

Question 1: Pedestrian connectivity and safety

Community Idea / Concern: Citizens told us they desired an improved journey to and through the site.

Applicant's proposed change: The applicant has created better pedestrian connections across the parking lot, improved the road interface along the park with more pedestrian crossings and removed the driveway on Brentwood Road for pedestrian safety.

Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input about pedestrian connectivity and have improved the pedestrian interface? Why or why not?

OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM

Yes but more "green" incorporated into the plan please

Please add plants/trees along front of Bldg 3 & 4

No - still feel its about a grocery store and a parking lot

Yes

No. It appears to be more access to cars - by adding surface parking and reducing the original planned green space

The changes to the plan are good - as far as they go. Still excessive height & poor traffic management

They have tried but with the tunnels through, it looks unsafe for pedestrians

There is marginal improvement. The current (new) design with a road between the development and Blakiston Park is divisive and not pedestrian friendly, and there is no high street/pedestrian avenue that connects to University City & the rest of the community along Brentwood Blvd.

Present plan routes the Charleswood to Brisbois pathways to the outside. There is no corridor for pedestrians within the development.

No. No direct pedestrian route from University City to Coop

Not really we can't walk down from University City to the LRT without having to walk around a big building; Having no road against the Park would be better than one even if it does look better

No - they haven't. The community input about pedestrian connectivity was based on two things - commercial main street and the road along Blakiston park. Neither of those items have been addressed. Main Street is still gone, and the fact that the perimeter road is now painted brown doesn't change the fact that it's still a road

Somewhat. Several of the concept plans created at the May 25 & 27 visioning workshops had pathways connecting the Brentwood LRT Station with Blakiston Park; there appear to be two such pathways now - please make sure that these are well-lit at night!

No. Brentwood is highly pedestrian orientated. Dalhousie & Oakridge are newer communities designed with better road access to their respective Co-ops. Brentwood does not have the same forethought for traffic planning! Due to age of community; Trying to reverse access/egress via road ways isn't easy - due to Brentwood Rd being access to Crowchild

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

The changes have improved pedestrian connectivity, but have not improved the interface. Sidewalks look narrow, do not have shade cover or really anything to make them appealing. It looks like the atrocious pedestrian interface of the strip mall a block down (Sears, Bed Bath & Beyond, Safeway, etc.)

Permeability of the development from LRT to Blakiston park is improved but largely sequestered to a single path to then coloured pavement. It's not clear if the alternate pattern area is designed to be a shared space (good idea) or lipstick on the loading area that won't encourage a sense of place.

This does not make me want to walk to different locations - especially the restaurant in the west.

<p>Pedestrian connectivity is improved however, major concerns with vehicle traffic. I believe there is requirement for a traffic signal on the Morley Trail entrance/exit as exiting this area across traffic is presently dangerous. The Traffic Impact Analysis needs to be completed before the development is designed properly.</p>
<p>It is a good start, but it is still a project that is dominated by a huge parking lot and not much in the way of green space. What about prior suggestions to link the Co-op store to the North C-train bridge via a covered +15 type bridge?</p>
<p>Changes seem reasonable.</p>
<p>To a degree, and I understand the challenge of keeping the existing services operating during construction, but I still feel there are too many surface spots on the centre. I would still prefer more green space to make it more walkable.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>Without a top down map of the new layout it is difficult to comment. The main concerns voiced at the community engagement was the lack of direct outdoor connectivity with the "Brentwood High Street" that is being developed through the RioCan site. It looks like this street is still being diverted around the back, though it is difficult to tell. It needs to run right through the tall building and store. Also it is not really clear if the direct line of sight alignment between the station and the pass-through on the far side of Brentwood Rd/Blakiston park will actually exist. A map would have been helpful.</p>
<p>it seems to have done so</p>
<p>Unsure.</p>
<p>I can't really tell from the development concept what the road interface along the park is like but I guess it's ok.</p>
<p>No it still doesnt address bike and pedestrian safety. With the increased amount of traffic because of the development access is going to be even more congested.</p>
<p>yes appears to be better laid out</p>
<p>Yes, I believe that the new plan places pedestrian connectivity at the forefront. By removing the driveway on Brentwood Road, that encourages more pedestrians to move more freely.</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Yes it has</p>
<p>Yes, improved.</p>
<p>Yes this will definety improve it. Close access to the train, more services nearby</p>
<p>Yes. This looks a bit better. There must be pedestrian routes through the parking lots, and from University City to the Brentwood Coop redevelopment. The development needs to better face Blakiston Park, but if it is done smartly, it could also improve some of the serious pitfalls of University City by linking it to the new site and the park better by coordinating the vehicle, bike and pedestrian ways.</p>
<p>It is really difficult to see what changes have been made to the plan from the drawing above. A more detailed summary of the changes from Phase 1 to Phase 3 is required I feel to provide informed feedback. I.e. summarize any changes: before and after.</p>
<p>NO it still appears that there is a road along the park. Although they have the road modified for additional accessibility it will still be a main street. I would like to see the road along the park removed relocating the loading docks underground.</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Not completely - I can't tell from the visual (online) whether the pedestrian segments across the main parking lot are just lines on the road or actual concrete structures elevating pedestrians NOR can I visually see how coming from Blakiston Park through the proposed</p>

site would work. Perhaps seeing on the board would help. Right now I can't say it's a great change.
NO this plan is much too crowded for the space.
Sure.
The driveway should remain because this is a car based area with enough traffic at rush hour. More ways for cars to go help speed up time for drivers.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will be improved pedestrian connectivity, but the new pedestrian paths will also create more problems for the long-term residents along Brentwood Road and in the adjacent single-family-house community, i.e. more pedestrian traffic, more crime, more loitering, more littering, etc. It will also chop up the area into little sections. 2. The entire Brentwood Co-op site is already somewhat limited in size, i.e. there are constraints on what can be done with it, built on it, and used on it. Blakiston Park is already quite small, and it will have to serve the needs of a much larger population than exists now. We cannot have a dog park, a plaza, a market, and other amenities without expropriating land from the surrounding neighbourhood -- a definite NO! 3. Calgary, despite the planners' best efforts to make it a "walkable", "pedestrian-friendly" city, is a car city in the main. Why? We have at least six months of poor weather (slippery sidewalks, cold, snow, and inhospitable outdoor conditions) which especially affect older people, seniors, the handicapped, and anyone with balance and mobility issues. Providing car access is vitally important, and is just a fact of life that we have to deal with, i.e providing parking lots for businesses, clinics, churches, gas station, and shopping; parkades for residents in multi-storey towers; crosswalks and overpasses; traffic lights, etc. 4. In the winter, almost no one will want to linger in the plaza, sit at outdoor cafes, or stroll along icy sidewalks. The idea is to: get where you need to go, go in to stay warm, do your errand or task, and get out easily and quickly into your heated car!!!
Yes, it is improved, especially with the additional pedestrian crossings.
No, the pedestrian interface is awful with the road around the development next to the park. There is a chain link fence preventing access except at intersections. This is awful design.
No. All access to the COOP should be from the residential side to the stores (be part of our Brentwood Community rather than creating a quasi mini Downtown area.
Somewhat. Even more green space and less surface parking please. Possibly green with trees and a walkway around the main parking lot.
Overall yes. I'm still concerned about the width of the sidewalk and its very near proximity to the roadway along Brentwood Blvd. Currently there is a narrow sidewalk (not wide enough for two pedestrians to pass confidently side by side), lots of opportunities for pedestrians to be splashed by traffic. Not in the scope of the plan is also the cramped space at corner of Brentwood Blvd. and Brisebois Drive when pedestrians are waiting at traffic light. Redevelopment of the area would be a great time to once and for all move the sidewalk back from the edge of the road, widen it, and add some kind of barrier to protect pedestrians.
Yes. I think that the developer's new amendments have been sufficient enough. I still worry about pedestrians who walk off the LRT ramp and what possible sidewalk changes the developer might make (i.e. street furniture, lighting, and sidewalk) during and after construction.
My concern is traffic and parking! When University City was built there is NOT, and I stress NOT enough parking! Not everyone walks in this area as assumed by the planners and developers! As residents we are already over developed and the city continues to press for more density in our neighbor hood!
Somewhat. However, I don't see easy access from Brisebois (sidewalk along Brentwood or through the park.; same from Blakiston. The park is a pleasant but lengthy way; the road is unpleasant. Buildings seem to block other areas. The covered? raised corridor from the LRT

<p>station is good and I hope there will be some development of shops, etc. beside that corridor. Very little connectivity to the next shopping area where Pier 1, London Drugs, etc. are. That's worse than it was. I still am very unconvinced that the shops in this area will be filled. Certainly the retail in University City hasn't been. It's a dead zone between the buildings on their north side.</p>
<p>No comment.</p>
<p>It depends. Are the pedestrian area welcoming, well-lit, and treed? In the University City development, the pedestrian thoroughfares are poorly lit and feel "sketchy", especially at night.</p> <p>Also, the removal of the driveway on Brentwood road, while it may improve pedestrian accessibility, may be a significant detriment to vehicle traffic coming in and out of the parking lot. This is worth looking into.</p>
<p>I believe that the changes have addressed the community concerns, however they forsake vehicular travel for pedestrian travel. The original design was much more preferable.</p>
<p>The access to transit seems safer without the driveway. It doesn't really improve things for people walking from the Brisebois drive direction.</p>
<p>Definitely NO, the road along the park should be removed. I don't understand why the plan was changed so there is a road and loading dock behind the CO-OP building. I think that all of the loading docks should be built under ground.</p>
<p>I think the plans go against everything that Brentwood and surrounding areas are and have been about and I know, having grown up in Charleswood and having lived in Varsity for the last 21 years. Once again developers, with help from the City, look to increase density - and their bank accounts - in areas where traffic congestion is already an issue. It's not like this idea is the first. The four ugly towers just east of the Brentwood Co-op are already there and the University District in Varsity is already in the works. When is enough enough? Stop ruining thriving neighbourhoods for your own selfish gains! I'll bet none of you live in them. A 40-STOREY APARTMENT BUILDING WITH 500 SUITES IN IT IS NOT WANTED and none of the concessions and window dressing will change that. If you are truly listening to the residents of Brentwood and surrounding areas, this will not be built, nor will one half or a quarter the height.</p>
<p>Yes. Appears to be a more pedestrian-friendly path/route to the path through Blakiston Park. Still would like to see an enclosed pathway, open at least when the co-op is open.</p>
<p>Yes. They provide improved pedestrian access in my opinion.</p>
<p>There must be an elevator for seniors to use to get to the bridge. Not all seniors or wheelchair users can make their way up the long ramps. I wish there had been more angles and drawings provided, showing the path pedestrians would take from communities to the bridge. Are there small shops along the way to the station?</p>
<p>I worry more about the road with cars than pedestrian interfaces. Brentwood Rd, as it is will not support all the vehicular travel that will come about from more condos.</p>
<p>Possibly. It's hard to comprehend so many people in such small space n</p>
<p>Not really. The placement of the stores and parking lot makes a accident even more likely</p>
<p>It is really important to have good connections from Blakiston Dr. and Blakiston Park to and from the LRT & the shopping. The connections are important for both pedestrians and cyclists. Do underestimate the number of cyclists that go to the LRT & Coop from Northmount via Brantford Dr./ Brentwood Blvd/ to Blakiston Dr & the park.</p>
<p>ok</p>
<p>Yes</p>

Yes, I think there has been an improvement, mostly by the removal of the driveway from Brentwood Road being eliminated. Still not a fan of the 3 pathways in/out that a pedestrian has to cross, which could be fixed by the through road.
yes
I like the pedestrian connectivity from Blakiston to the LRT.
I believe the pedestrian interface portion of this plan can be better if the bridge to the C-Train station can connect with the Co-op Supermarket directly. Bridges that connect transit stations with nearby shopping centers are very common in other countries and I believe this should be included for this plan.
This city is not pedestrian friendly. I have lived here for 35 years and feel that it's only getting worse. This project seems over the top and a bit aggressive.
The transportation route that now circles the development on the north side appears to make it difficult for pedestrians to walk from Brentwood district to the LRT station without walking through traffic on this back road. The proposed north road now runs parallel to the park, which is less than optimum exposure for Blackiston park. If the City's goal is to increase use of the Brentwood LRT station, this acts against this process. If the City intends to increase use of Blackiston park, this detracts from this.
The proposed plan makes it impossible to walk down the 'main street' from other stores and restaurants east of this site into the Co-op and other stores. This is counter to the spirit of the original plan for the larger area.
Yes, the new plan shows improved pedestrian connectivity. Nevertheless more is needed. The purpose of densification around LRT stations is to stimulate car-free living. People who bike / walk / use transit should be attracted there. This will happen only if the area near the Brentwood LRT station becomes really VERY walking / biking-friendly. This would be achieved by connecting the LRT station with the bicycle train system in the vicinity. This should include, eg, widening of the existing Crowchild Trail overpass or adding a new one, as the existing overpass is narrow and thus bikes need to be walked there. A good example is the Dalhousie LRT station, which contains both a wide overpass to the LRT station itself, as well as an extra overpass for bicycles not going to/from the LRT station, just transiting the area, which is a node of bike paths. The Crowchild Trail overpass at the Brentwood LRT station should be extended both SW, so that it is possible to bike directly to/from the University area (which is bike-friendly) without needing to use stairs or elevator, and NE into the bike path that runs though Blakiston Park. All this may not be just Coop's responsibility, but it should be Coop's responsibility to partner with the City of Calgary to achieve these improvements.
I really like the latest (July 2017) design. In particular, I like how the design has been reoriented with respect to Blakiston Park, providing better pedestrian accessibility and improved aesthetics. I feel it has addressed my concerns.
No. The increased density is going to erode property values in the immediate area. Living in the shadows is not a desirable neighbourhood, as our area used to be. Just down the road at Northland is a much better location with no residential concerns. They just didn't grease the hands at city hall like the developer did for Brentwood.
Concerned about where pedestrians travelling on c train and wanting to be picked up will gather and where cars that will be picking them up will Park to wait for them
Why will there be a blockage in the pedestrian pathways between the proposed development and the existing towers? This needs to be addressed before any final approval is granted.
Yes

Some pedestrian corridors have improved, but access to the park across a drive through to underground parkade and connectivity to Brentwood / Crowchild road is not safe and encourages more vehicles.
The pedestrian interface along the park is improved.
Yes. Design seems simpler with less road to cross.
High density areas near the LRT should be built with "walkability" and sustainability in mind. People need and want green space and pleasant, not terrifying, walking experiences. The current University City is a good example of what not to do. It is dark, completely paved and very uninviting. The small park associated with the coop development should be a place of rest.
The changes seem to have made things worse. Building 2 is now in the way to get between the new development and the mall to the east. Adding pedestrian crossings still leaves exposure to vehicle traffic, and amplifies the subordination of pedestrians to vehicles in the design concept. Crossings are better than no crossings, but miss the basic objection and intent of the ARP completely.
There is improvement for walking through the main parking area, and removing the parkade entrance from the middle. I would like to see one more designated walkway in the main parking area and one on the opposite side (west) of the road from the main parking area.
The link and plaza connection from Blakiston is improved and is a welcoming entry into the development. The entrance to the TOD main street needs to be maintained/improved for pedestrians to ensure that the COOP site does not become an isolated unit. The entrance to COOP on this side should be prominent and highly visible when looking down the main street.
The information provided on the Calgary website is completely insufficient to fully address the questions and I was not able to visit either open houses. Is there a pedestrian access on the back side of the new Coop facing the existing new development of University City (beside the entrance facing Blakiston park)? How much car traffic is expected on the new roadway facing Blakiston Park? Is there commercial (coffee shops, smaller shop etc) along that new roadway to provide incentive and interest for pedestrians? Are there multiple entries / through ways thru Brentwood Commons to get from Blakiston Park / the neighborhood towards the liquor store / LRT / Coop etc.
Some improvement has been addressed but I do not like the access from the COOP to the parking lot. Seems like it will be congested & unsafe. Is this for cars or pedestrians ? If only for pedestrians it may be okay.
While you may have addressed pedestrian concerns for the people living in the new buildings, you now have made it almost impossible for the original surrounding community that rely on the need to drive to the grocery store and gas station. Making only one access in and out of the area now creates nothing but congestion and frustration as already proven by every community or development of this nature.
I have no concerns with pedestrian connectivity.
No, these changes have not addressed connectivity. The Coop site needs to honour the intent of the commercial main street stretching through the Brentwood TOD. Without this, the importance of the site as a TOD development is significantly reduced in several ways: 1. People living in the south part of the site will need to dodge around Coop's loading dock and garbage bins to get to the train station, rather than walking down a main street with 'complete streets' design cues 2. The visual cues that commercial main street should be a gathering place will disappear if the street ends in a tower

<p>3. The Coop site is using the tower to 'turn its back' on the rest of the development, and trying to isolate pedestrians from the train into its own portion of the site, rather than spreading naturally throughout the site as the ARP intended</p> <p>4. the road around Blakiston park and it's associated safety and interface concerns is still a road, it's just painted brown now. This is not a meaningful change.</p> <p>5. The 'improved connections across parking lot' are just painted crosswalks that should have been there anyway, and are not in the right place to address any of the concerns from the community</p>
<p>It's better but it still doesn't seem like local pedestrian traffic is an afterthought. In other words, it seems like it's designed for the new tenants to have the essentials and good transportation in and out.</p>
<p>The proposal for a "main street" seems to be completely ignored. The current tower locations seems to turn it's back in University City. (Similar to the way the City Administration building turn it back on the Eat Village - didn't we learn something there?)</p>
<p>Yes, better options for pedestrians.</p>
<p>It looks good to me.</p>
<p>It is an improvement. Will there to opportunity to refine it when reality determines that it doesn't quite work as designed?</p>
<p>No. There does not appear to be a direct pedestrian route from the Rio Can side of the mall to the Coop side. Many people walk from one to the other right now. The new development should make the walk easier NOT more difficult.</p>
<p>Seems to have.</p>
<p>No. They will put a road dividing the park and the development, and have limited access and it will be dangerous for the people to cross to the park, also it is dangerous for children playing in the park</p>
<p>The Coop has to be on the side it is or where they want to put the new gas station , and using as a back road what is already there</p>
<p>no There is no road connecting to University City. If you are walking you have to go all the way around the towers to get to the Co-op. Right now there are 3 enterances into the Co-op parking lot, the new plans only have one. I believe this will cause more of a back up than there is now. There should not be a vehical road along the park. It should be for bikes and walking only.</p>
<p>Not really. Although there are some minimal improvements here and there. For instance the road in the back that has become a loop is better but its still pretty bad and cuts off the development from the rest of the community. Also the position of the coop it self still turns its back towards the rest of the commercial area. It is still several towers with a whole lot of parking lots. Also the plan is stil does not look anything like what came out of the community workshop.</p>
<p>No. Pedestrian connectivity is not only an issue of increasing crossings. There is an issue of thoughtfully connecting the development to the existing community and services that does not appear to have been addressed in any real way. I think the important point is that the redevelopment should work with the current community and infrastructure to encourage and facilitate pedestrian interaction. My understanding is that the new four-story tower complex was going to create a space that would attract people to the area and to walk through the development. Unfortunately, this promise was not realized and the result is a sterile and uninviting environment. The creation of another poorly and cheaply developed region will create a zone that will discourage a community from evolving. I sincerely hope that the city</p>

and developers look carefully at how people can be encouraged to participate in the new space and that somebody watches that corners are not cut as the development proceeds.
Yes, because there is a good number of sidewalks maybe make a bike path if possible.
Not concerned about pedestrian connectivity. If I can't drive and park without selling my soul, I won't go. Period.
I have mobility issues.
Yes
yes, this proposal has improved the pedestrian interface very well. I am very happy with how the design connects with Brentwood Road, the main street through University City and the park north of the development. I also like the pedestrian connection from the north community to the LRT station.
I liked the original plan. To answer your question...sure, why not.
Very little in the way of green space (not paint but vegetation and trees) and plaza seating and space within the complex, only stamped concrete, not particularly pedestrian friendly. No high street/main street, as consistently identified by residents through the various workshops and feedback sessions. I guess painting pavement is cheaper than doing something more creative that current and future residents will thank you for.
Yes - it is much better
Why was the pedestrian bridge connection directly into the grocery store/building taken out? How active are the edges at grade? No big glass/brick blank walls. Entrances every 10m. At grade of all buildings to be retail/commercial around the massive parking lot and roads labelled 1b, 3b and south (towards University City) and west (towards LRT) sides of building 2. Appreciate the removal of the driveway right at pedestrian bridge. Break up size of surface parking lot with another building right where the label 4b is (footprint = rectangle with corners at 4 nearest trees board/slide 11).
There are already four apartment towers in the Brentwood Mall area and this proposed development has a negative accumulative effect what was once a lovely, family oriented neighborhood and is quickly disintegrating into a high density, low quality development in the community. You are killing the neighborhood!!! Even though changes might have been "proposed" by the applicant, this height of towers and cumulative density in this neighborhood is not appropriate. In addition, the urban issue with high density housing (parking, traffic, noise, degraded appearance, density, etc.) Quoted from Brentwood ARP "Height zones institute a transition that will ensure compatible building forms with the existing community while facilitating higher densities and height where it is most appropriate." How does a 40, 23 and 10 storey buildings transition to a bungalow or even a 2 storey house?
No, the road(s) affecting residents of original homes are Brentwood Blvd, Brantford Road and 26 Street. We have noticed an increase in vehicular traffic on Brantford Rd and 26 Street NW. The road access at the back of the mall at Brantford Rd and Brentwood Blvd is a high traffic area for motor vehicles. This non-commercial access should be closed to cars and used by bicycle and pedestrian traffic. It is not safe for my daughter and I to bike or walk through this route.
Having attended the session where we had to play the game of placement of all the elements, I do realize it is very difficult to make everything all align for all groups benefit. I think the updated plan looks good.
Is there a way to have one of the buildings for residents without parking offered (like some downtown buildings)? I see the exits as being a problem at peak hours.

bike lanes are a great idea.
Keep and enhance bike-ability
art spaces and green spaces incorporated are great.

good pedestrian crossings to park.

Where's the bike lane?

Need a bike lane and parking locations.

I do not believe the current development plan is pedestrian friendly. Pedestrian connectivity in the east-west direction (as envisioned in the ARP) is disrupted by the orientation of the Co-op store along with buildings 1 and 2. It forces pedestrians from the east (from Main Street) to traverse around Building 2 to continue to the west. Pedestrian safety along Blakiston Park is compromised by moving the east-west vehicular traffic from the Main Street concept to a roadway which runs beside the park and reduces free-flowing pedestrian access to the Park. The current plan also creates an unsafe pedestrian space at the rear of the Co-op (parkade access, loading dock, garbage pick-up) in conjunction with the existing pedestrian unfriendly University City.

1. The Brentwood Road was designed for commercial areas and should be updated for the new capacity for vibrant business and high density residents--additional 501 resident units and 1,113 parking stalls from Co-op alone.

2. Extra lanes should be installed for the Westward and Eastward of the Brentwood road along the new proposed Brentwood Common area, to solve the congestion of traffic currently already shows up from Brisebois Brentwood traffic lights. This is especially congested when the economy was good during rush hour traffic 2 years ago. This is also true after one lane was taken out for bicycle paths.

I don't believe it is just the pedestrian interface. What about the interface with the C Train station. It is one of the most shabby looking stations along the NW line and does not accommodate bicycles as there is no ramp available on the south west side of crowchild. How does a shabby station contribute to a vibrant community.

- I've very concerned about pedestrian safety because of the LRT/bus routes and the heavier traffic that will inundate the area.

- I noticed in the proposed plans there is a walking path near bus stop that cross over to university city. this path requires crossing a road access for delivery trucks. Semi-trucks visibility is not at same level as pedestrians so the chances of injury are high. The area looks likes a very sharp corner for trucks to turn around in to get in and out. I envision it to be a nightmare for truck drivers trying to maneuver tight corners at the same time watching out for pedestrians. Similar to the scenario played out at the home depot on 16th avenue with their loading dock right by the entrance way. i see it as an accident waiting to happen.

- I see there is no loading/unloading zone for dropping people off to use transit buses. if not made available, i can see drivers will intentionally block traffic to let passengers off.

The redevelopment is putting division between the existing development within the Brentwood mall and proposed development. The original plan was proposed with a road down the middle that would allow all residents/visitors to move freely between all buildings from the east to the west with areas for socializing and meeting over coffee around green spaces.

I don't see people walking all the way from the east (London Drugs) to the the coop development while at the same time having to walk all the way around to get to Blakiston Park which will be the only green space in that entire area. Seems very unappealing to me to go there.

<p>I think pedestrian connectivity needs to consider more visual aesthetics. And working with the environment.</p>
<p>Connectivity should include smart placement of appropriate community building things: info boards, public art, and near those who aren't driving often - think going alongside the laundromat.</p>
<p>for the pedestrian safety , developer should consider get and extra lane to make turn to this new development area. Due to the high volume of use n estate population it will create Brisebois Drive lots of traffic. It will even worse in Calgary long winter time.</p>
<p>The City has the opportunity to make this a great pedestrian area, and yet it decides not to do so. How disappointing. Let's look at the whole area along Brentwood Road, and how nice it could be if it had a "main street" type of feel to it, like Vancouver's Robson St, or even 17th Ave in Calgary. Instead, you've decide to put a big building in the middle to block off one side from the other. This is certainly not pedestrian friendly.</p>
<p>I'd also like to see another pedestrian ramp for the c train station. One that has a north / south alignment, without stairs. Make it like Dalhousie station and some of the other newer stations, where it's not so steep.</p>
<p>No, they have not, the COOP cuts off the remainder of the TOD</p>
<p>No. It's not clear that the problem has been addressed. The buildings need to be moved and redesigned to improve flow. Parking should be underground. There should be a main street that connects with the rest of the shopping areas. There should be a walkable shopping and condo area from Brisebois to Charleswood and not a mish-mash of designs by individual developers who build and leave.</p>
<p>The pedestrian connections from Brentwood LRT Station to University City and the rest of Brentwood Mall to the East have improved with respect to the original plan, but the lack of a commercial main street makes it cumbersome to access the Co-op and the redeveloped side from the East of Brentwood Mall.</p>
<p>what will they do with the present access road.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Connectivity and Safety Imagine yourself walking through the entire TOD site, from the existing Coop parking lot to the Safeway side of the site. What comments or concerns do you have? The pedestrian connections from Brentwood LRT Station to University City and the rest of Brentwood Mall to the East have improved with respect to the original plan, but the lack of a commercial main street makes it cumbersome to access the Co-op and the redeveloped side from the East of Brentwood Mall.</p>
<p>Yes, it does look like a less commercial walkway.</p>
<p>No. The journey through the site still requires getting around a massive Coop building (with 2 tall towers) in order to get from the parking lot area to anywhere on the east (Safeway) side of the Brentwood TOD area. We have to look at the site as a whole area, not just the Coop side. Even people living in the 4 University towers cannot walk through the main street area as intended, but rather have to go all around the building to get to the entrance. For people wanting to go from Blakiston Park to the LRT Station, there is one main entrance point that runs in front of the Coop, but otherwise building 3 blocks off most of the park access and pedestrians have to go around this building. Finally, having a road running along Blakiston Park means that anyone coming from the park</p>

into the site has to cross a road that is used by delivery trucks, garbage trucks, as well as 500+ residents who live in the towers.
There appears to be no direct pedestrian connection between the buildings and the bridge from the LRT station. I understand that the pedestrian bridge is not part of the Co-op site redevelopment but the city should certainly consider upgrading it.
There's more to traffic flow than just pedestrians. I understand the focus being walkability, but one of the major problems right now is that pedestrians don't use the pathways that exist.
No. The only place to walk is along the outside of the complex. There is no road or sidewalk on the 'inside area' of the complex. If the road is going around the complex, pedestrians will have to cross a road from the park to enter.
Removed the driveway on Brentwood Road. What does this mean and how would this improve pedestrian movements? This is the major car carrier to and from this development, if the driveway is placed elsewhere where do all the cars access the site. Does this mean an eminent degradation of tranquility for people along Brentwood Boulevard? Anything that disrupts the neighboring communities is a poor plan and myopic in vision and should be stopped immediately.
Yes. Mostly. I know it is too late to change things now but I would like to see less "square lines" and more curved lines so as to slow down traffic, etc.
I think this is better. In the meeting I attended, it seemed more like the concern around improved journey was in terms of shops/retail/something to make people want to move through. This is addressed below.
I think that given the fact that the Coop development is being done by a different company than the University City properties and that they are hoping to keep the existing Coop open during construction which affects where and when they do construction; I think the current plans have a better pedestrian interface. It doesn't feel like it will be any more or any less convenient than the way it currently is.
I don't understand the changes and feel really frustrated that the city has approved a massive huge building to go right up against another building when that tall building could go on the other end of the building site. This will leave me in the building adjacent with years of construction noise, dirt and then a building right beside me taking away my light, my view and ruining the value of my home. I feel like I have NO SAY so ... Put the tall building at the other end of the building site please
Somewhat. Better than the first proposal.
I'm concerned that with only one entrance to the Coop, that intersection will be very congested already. If pedestrians are also crossing there, they will delay cars turning and make it even worse. In order to get from the lights to the 4 towers, pedestrians need to walk on that sidewalk because the coop blocks the street that already exists at University City. It's a dead end street that was supposed to connect through the coop site.
Somewhat.
Yes, addressed.
Yes I think the improvements are great as I commute each day. I just want to ensure they remove the chain link fence from the designs and that any stairs are well lit as you go into the park.
Question 2: Development fit Community Idea / Concern: Concern that the new development will not be visually appealing and will be too high for the existing community. Applicant's proposed change: The applicant has reduced the height of Building #1 by 10 storeys (40 storeys down to 30 storeys).

Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input and is the reduction in storeys sufficient to address community concerns? Why or why not?

OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM

Yes

Yes

The developers have tried to address the height issue but the whole residential development is austere and unappealing - as a potential resident, the height only guess me concern about safety and isolation. Surely something can be done for the aesthetic beyond concrete & glass!

Yes

The apartment buildings are still too tall for the neighbourhood. The University City buildings are an eye sore already. Don't add more

No - stick to the 90m now - the city rule!

I still feel that this will not be visually appealing, it is virtually a nice concrete area with very little green

No! The station area redevelopment plan was recently developed and calls for 90m maximum height. There is no need for a 116m building - 26m too high. Other developments (e.g. at Banff Trail) have kept to the 90m max in SARP. There should be no exceptions for this development. The City developed the SARP with the community and should stand by their word; no relaxation on maximum height

Too high still. The towers @ U City should be the benchmark. Then the new towers will look like they "fit" in. Right now, it's sort of the "sore thumb" approach.

No. Still too high

No. Keep to 90 meters or 23 storeys so less shadowing and better looking

No - this shouldn't be a bargaining process. If they came in with 50 stories, would 40 then be okay? The ARP sets 90m, stick with it.

No; many residents would like the existing Brentwood Station ARP to be respected, but it appears that it won't be

No. Please stick to 90 meters maximum per station area a redevelopment plan. SARP was a 2.5 year engagement process. Why throw away the work done for that. Many minor irritants would be resolved with a commitment to stay within SARP guidelines

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

Yes.

30 storeys exceeds the height of the towers on the adjacent height. They should be no higher than University City towers.

The main reason why is the expected volume of vehicle traffic. The Morley Trail artery will not handle the residential and customer vehicle traffic, or the interaction of the traffic onto this already congested, two lane thoroughfare. Residential traffic can be controlled by the number of units in the tower. Commercial/customer traffic can not.

My answer is no. A 30 storey building is not proportional to or similar in scale to any of adjacent man-made structures (which are typically 1-2 storeys tall and maybe even 3 stories tall) or adjacent natural landscapes. It's too tall, period. Other than the already two tall apartment buildings recently built (which I also think are too tall), there are no buildings above even 8 (?) storeys maybe (the professional centre at Northland mall) on the north side of Crowchild in the Brentwood/Charleswood area. I agree on increased housing density in select areas, such as what is proposed for this land, but the design and building height should be appropriate for the neighborhood they are being constructed near.

NO, NO, NO. It DOES NOT fit into the community at all !!! How many times do Brentwood residents have to say this for it to be heard? Towers of 31 and 23 storeys are still too high for a suburban site. This is not downtown. Plus there is already an abundance of empty office/residential units in the adjacent area (new buildings) so such density has no market. New towers should be no taller than University City (I also wonder why the developments on the south side of the train station have never been required to be so tall ? At 4/5 floors tall they fit into the area very well)
Highrise and high density in the area is unappealing. The current towers already stand out like an eyesore.
Yes. That is a very reasonable concession.
No, these buildings are still really tall. I don't understand why the proponent doesn't show the existing apartments and other uses in the diagrams, so that one can easily see what the area will look like. There should be some thought given to the cumulative look of all of this recent development as well as the proposed development.
No I do not. 30 stories is still too high. There is a "wind tunnel" effect in the current University City and they also create continuous shadows. The current University City buildings are very unattractive. I would prefer to see less coloured metal and glass and more stone, wood that has a connection to our alpine environment and a less sterile look. The tiny cube like balconies are ridiculous looking.
Building 1 is still too tall. For perspective the Orange and Yellow building next door should be shown in the concept to show how dwarfed they will be by the 30 story building. I would much rather see two 20 story buildings with ground level (street-like) space between them than the massive Coop store with a gigantic building erupting from the top of it.
the reduction in stories is appropriate
No, still to high. Does not fit in with a residential neighbourhood and traffic and parking will be a nightmare.
Not at all. A 30 story building is still far too tall and taller than currently permitted in the area. The buildings should be no taller than current 20 story University City developments. The applicant clearly only asked for 40 in hopes that 30 would seem like a good "compromise". It is almost half again as tall as all other buildings in the area, which are already too tall.
University City development is already an eyesore for the community and the reduction in the number of stories doesnt make a difference. These developments have torally ruined what was a beautiful neighborhood and the Community Association has stated their concerns all along - unfortunately the City Of Calgary has an egocentric Mayor and Ward 7 Councillor who never listen to the communities they serve.
I like that the building was reduced 10 storeys but believe it should be no higher than the tallest building in the current development next door.
Yes, although I did not personally mind the original height of 40 stories, the new height will bring much needed density in the area. I approve of the design of the development and I think it quite visually appealing.
The community concerns have not been met. The tall buildings do not fit into the community. A maximum of 8 stories would be acceptable. Low rise buildings are required to fit into the community.
Reduction in stories is sufficient.
No, 30 storey is still way too high considering the night of surrounding developments and the community "bungalow" style. 20 storey should be the maximum level acceptable in such community.
Yes,
Yes. I do not believe there is any need for height concerns with already tall buildings present.

Absolutely NOT! A building of 30 or 31 stories is significantly taller than any building in the area. It will be out of place and the increased density will cause no end of traffic issues.
The absolute maximum height should be NO higher than the new buildings (built in the last 5 years) just to the east of the Co-op in the Brentwood shopping center complex.
Absolutely not! This building, to fit into neighborhood and reduce traffic congestion should not be more than 23 stories in height.
Yes.
Building #1 is still much too high. This is highly inappropriate for the neighborhood. The existing development at Brentwood is very dense, but nothing has approached 30 stories. Where is the demand going to come from for all of this housing? I realize that U of C is a driver of demand. But for this much residential? On top of the already existing dense housing?
Only partially. I believe the new 31 storey is still taller than the University City towers that back on to it and is probably the tallest structure on Crowchild Trail.
NO - want to keep with the original plan of 90 meters max. 30 storeys is too high! The proposed building is too tall for apartments / condos, what if there is a fire? I can't imagine people walking down so many floors and it's just asking for trouble in the event of a fire. 30 storeys will be an eyesore regardless of the material used.
No. It is a significant reduction, but is still an approach that is at odds with the neighbourhood.
Building #1 is still too high. it will block the view from the 'plastic' condos and will place the park and the development site in shadow for a goodly part of the day. All our proposals done at town hall were for less than 31 stories (according to the developers plan - they say 31 not 30)
Still too high
No! The issue isn't Building 1's height, but its location. It's cramped beside the University City buildings, which themselves are cramped around each other. Basically, the whole site needs to be flipped horizontally so the small buildings and the parking lot are beside the University City condos and Building 1 is on the other side of the site. It doesn't look visually appealing, nor is it acceptable to those living in the University City condos, for a 30 storey building to shadow over four smaller buildings. You need to give people the sense of a panorama, with the four highrises on one side and another highrise on the other. This way no building blocks the view of another building, and everybody is happy!
Why is this so hard for the applicant to understand?
Unsure.
The buildings are already quite tall in the area (university city) and adding more tall buildings might not make a difference
No - a high rise building is not wanted in this area. It will be visually unappealing and it will block views of the area. 501 residential units would increase traffic and congestion. This is a horrible plan and very very upsetting.
1. As I mentioned above, the entire Co-op area is not a large chunk of land by any means. When I looked at the proposed models for the three phases of development, I was rather shocked at how congested, dense, chopped-up, and crammed-full the project was! This is not resemble East Harlem in New York!!! 2. Reducing the height of the buildings would be somewhat helpful, i.e. they would cast a shadow on Blakiston Park and other parts of the neighbourhood. But that's not the real issue. The bottom line is: when you try to squeeze as much density, multiple-use facilities, housing, businesses, and supposedly pedestrian-friendly zones into a restricted enclave of space, you

<p>end up with a poor result every time. You end up with frustrated people who have to negotiate heavy traffic, a mass of parking lots, traffic lights, pedestrian crossings, and a large number of residents and customers who will all be trying to get where they need to go!</p> <p>3. Other than the duplexes and apartments along Brentwood Road towards Charleswood Drive, the majority of dwelling in the neighbourhood are single-family homes with yards. People value their privacy, peace and quiet, low crime, and ease of transportation. If this project is eventually built, their property values will decrease, the noise levels will increase, accessibility will lessen, and crime will rise. Yes, it's a NIMBY situation, but you can't blame them from being concerned. There is already a high level of congestion in the area, and people are starting to avoid Brentwood shopping centre because of this. I have noticed that when I go to Brentwood Clinic, for example, there are frequently no parking spaces available. This is definitely a concern for seniors and those with mobility issues!</p>
<p>Yes, this addresses the concerns, and meets the City of Calgary's sustainability approach to urban planning.</p>
<p>No the building is still 86 feet too high. Stay within the plan that was produced as part of the TOD design.</p>
<p>No. trying to block the existing colorful high-rise views would cause the students occupying them get crazy (no sun lite for them. Not incorporating the existing community surroundings in the development will destroy the quiet Brentwood Community. A miniature Downtown complex at this site is unacceptable. Think more like Kensington or 17Ave shopping residential. Building #1 no more than 10 to 12 storeys max. Other buildings 3 to 4 storeys max. The Bank Building is to tall.</p>
<p>I would prefer the height would not exceed that of the University City towers. The traffic corridor is not appropriate for the increased density and we don't need that spilling into the Brentwood community.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is there really a demand for 30 storeys' worth of density, or could this be lowered even more?</p>
<p>Yes. I think 30 is a sufficient story height, considering the condo/apartments that exist just south and east of the site. Brentwood needs more housing and due to its proximity with the University, needs more services and shops than what is being provided. I think this change is welcome.</p>
<p>Yes tall buildings ruin the vibe</p>
<p>Not sure why we need more density! 31 storeys, way too high!</p>
<p>Definitely improved; however it still is very high. The buildings need to have some character particularly at ground level. They look pretty characterless right now. The very high building will encroach on the livability of condos in University City. The west side will now have the view of... buildings!!! I presume some of them could actually see mountains on a clear day before. Wind corridors?</p>
<p>20 storeys should be the maximum. It's a quiet area with bungalows</p>
<p>I still feel 30 storeys is too high for this neighbourhood. We have those ugly, cheap looking colourful buildings that have never turned into what they were told to be (walkable community with a lot of great shops and businesses on the main floor). Given that development has not come to be what was expected, I am very leery of another high tower going up with little street appeal or visual appeal. 30 storeys is still very tall for this neighbourhood and the uniqueness that is here.</p>
<p>30 storeys is still too tall! The issues here will be the same as University City: The shadows cast by the buildings make the area dark and unwelcoming. Unless this is addressed (which I highly doubt that it has been), this development will not be a "vibrant urban village", but another miserable collection of lifeless high rises.</p>

No I do not. I live in Brentwood on Boulton Road. I don't believe any of the buildings should be taller than those at Univercity. I believe that 20 stories should be a maximum height for the area. This is not a place for a huge tower. Our family has always been in favour of increased density, but I do believe that this should be within reason. We have to consider the flow of traffic, which is a concern. Also, the effect on the near by park that is being built behind. I feel it would be unsightly to have a building taller than 20 stories.
The changes more than make up for the community concerns. The buildings should all be roughly the same height as the University Towers located right beside.
It's still too high to soon. The maximum height should not exceed the existing towers in the area which are already an oddity. If we look at increased density in other Canadian cities, eg, metro Vancouver, you don't see skyscrapers like this in bungalow or so-called single family home neighbourhoods. Tall building don't make for a vibrant area: witness the core of downtown Calgary in the corridor where these buildings exist. The businesses occupying the current area towers don't add to the street life because they aren't connected to the exterior in any way (except the daycare) and were vacant for a long time. A high tower will further obscure views from Nose Hill Park and of Nose Hill Park from the west, a quality of life issue for area residents and commuters alike.
NO – I heard that the site already has an approval for 90 meters (which is still too high in my opinion) and that the City would have to change the station area plan to allow the developers to build higher. I don't believe there is ANY community support for it to be 30 stories. The developers need to go back to the drawing board and put in a plan that has a max height of 90 meters.
I do not feel that the height reduction is enough for the higher tower. The highest tower is still too high especially considering the community already has four towers nearby along Brentwood Rd. I understand the city has a need for this type of housing but the lower the better for keeping the feel that the units are part of the community and not an eyesore, as well as a cause for congestion.
See above.
It's still a tall building, but should fit better at 30 storeys. Not my biggest concern.
Yes, this is an adequate reduction.
No. The tall tower is still an eye sore at 31 stories. It sticks up way too high. The design is putting the buildings on the wrong side; they are closing off the park and putting the "back" of the project toward the park. Closing off the community. I really don't like the design.
No. There are over 25,000 condo units for sale in Calgary. Why do we need more? I hate those really ugly condos that were built for students and now there will be more? Just No. And 31 stories? Oh hell, no.
No. There are already enough high rise buildings. I would like to see more family friendly development.
I don't even live in the area although I do work close by and I believe that even 10 stories higher than the current University City will be an eyesore. I honestly don't think that the community
NO. 30 stories? Are you kidding? This will very quickly become a project or "a ghetto" much like in Toronto.
I feel the changes are an improvement. We need good transit oriented development.
The height of 31 storeys is out of line with our community...as per the development of the 20 storeys etc already there....keep the number below 20 storeys for all buildings. This is out of line for residence close by the "Park" as the existing buildings have done.
Yes
I had no problem with the height of the previous plan.

No. The building is huge and out of context with the entire NW, including the University and AHS campuses. Its massing is extreme. It's monolithic.
How will the visual/aesthetic concern be addressed? Are there plans to landscape the area?
No. Building 1 is still taller than 90m (this height restriction of 90m is clearly stated in the ARP developed earlier).
BTW, I feel that consistently using 'storeys' when engaging community stakeholders is misleading and disingenuous; can we please stick to meaningful units like meters when referencing height?
No, I think that 30 storeys is still too high, and would see 20 as the absolute maximum. The apartments already developed in the area have created more traffic and parking problems, as well as visually standing out and looking out of place. 30 storeys would be even more out of place and add too many people to a condensed area that was not intended to hold high density housing.
I do not feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input nor do the reduction in storeys can be considered sufficient to address community concerns. The whole purpose of this plan is to redevelop the Co-op and the surrounding area. I do not understand how creating more residential buildings can justify the purpose of redeveloping Co-op. Therefore, I find it hard to understand why Co-op would even suggest building more residential buildings as part of its redevelopment plan. When the University City condos were built nearby, it created a lot of social problems that the city have failed to address before giving permission for the builder to built the condos. I live in the area and I can tell you over the past 2 years, looting and stealing have become very common in the area, as well as traffic congestion. I simply do not believe the new development should include anymore residential buildings or any buildings that are taller than 10 storeys.
It still feels too aggressive30 storeys will still cause considerable congestion. This is a community of single family dwellings with limited access to roads. This building is not close enough to LRT station, which therefore cause traffic concerns. I think the city needs to scare way back on this project, reducing it from a 40 storey to 30 is definitely not enough. It will take over that part of the community....what will be done to accomadate the excess traffic concerns?
The original ARP for this space allowed for a height of only 90 meters, and this should be upheld, based on the rigorous process this went through in order to be adopted. The developer is still proposing a building higher than this, at 116 meters. This should be adjusted to 24 stories from 30, considering this borders on a residential community and is not the downtown core (where all other 30 storey buildings are, with the exception of the one recently approved at another LRT station (Banff Trail?). It does not enhance the neighbourhood surrounding the station.
Is there a market for 500 additional residential units here, particularly considering the approval of the high rise at Motel Village? What studies, if any, have been done to ensure that the market won't be flooded with too many rental units?
I don't think it should be taller than University City if you want it to fit with the existing community AND even then - will that shade Blackistone park and rob it of sun?
Insufficient. The number of storeys is still too high.
I think the reduction to 30 storeys is great and significantly alleviates my main concern about this development. I'm still concerned about the impact on traffic, particularly on Brentwood Road and Crowchild Trail, by adding this many additional residences. Brentwood Road can already come to a standstill, particularly westbound, during busy afternoons, and accessing Crowchild Trail can already be difficult.

NO. Shadows are for low lifes. I need to move.
Still concerned with building heights don't believe that a reduction of 10 storeys is sufficient. With the vacancy rate in Calgary being where it is wondering if there is a real need for this development. Doesn't seem that it fits into the area and it will create more traffic in a now quiet neighbor hood. Don't know why this area has been considered for rezoning period!
No. The height and size of the development are still too large and will continue to add to the rush hour congestion traffic congestion along Brentwood Road. The commercial street along the park destroys park ambience .
The height of Tower1 needs to be reduced to 15 stories because otherwise its apartments will overlook all of Brentwood's houses. If Councilor Farrell can object to the tower that overlooks her home, we should be able to have the same right.
Yes, the reduction in storeys makes a big difference.
The building height of 31 floors is still too tall for the community. A maximum of 25 storeys with accommodation for 2 and 3 bedroom units would be much better fit for this community. Families and seniors would live in these units long term instead of the short term university and young professionals as seen in the colours buildings.
Building #1 needs to be lowered so that it is within the 90 meter limit of the ARP.
With regard to this issue, I think the response to the community input was minimal.
Reduction in storeys is acceptable. Overall design is appealing and brings these lands and buildings up to current aesthetic standards.
Height, not stories, is the consideration. The area plan, developed with the existing neighborhoods in mind, specifies a maximum of 90 meters. That is still very different than the existing neighborhood but should be the absolute maximum. Any added height casts more shadow, creates more of an instant ghetto (like University City), adds density, traffic, with no addition in green space and little consideration of added traffic.
Big deal. My impression is that the original height was "bait"...deliberate excess so that reducing the height can be passed off paying attention to community concerns when it was the actual intent all along. The failure to comply with the 90 metres restriction of the ARP indicates contempt for the balance of interests expressed therein, and that contempt remains with the new proposal of 115.5 metres. It's like telling someone you're going to break both their arms, then saying "We deserve to be considered good guys because we're only now going to break only one."
No I do not feel the reduction in the storeys is sufficient. In keeping with the original ASP the maximum height was 25 stories and I think that this should still apply to this development. I do not support altering the ASP to accommodate the developer's proposal because, based on the appearance of the current height of the buildings in the Brentwood Station area, 30 would be too high to fit into the area. In addition, the tallest buildings are adjacent to the park and I think that this will not make the park as attractive as it could be without the tall buildings.
Yes, the new building height is in line with the University City site and being away from the park this is the best location to place the density.
The reduced height is still above the TOD approved building height and should be further lowered to not exceed the height of the current existing University City.
Has been addressed somewhat but is still too high. Building will not to be visually appealing. This is an established area of Calgary -- 55 years Old- why make it look like downtown.S
You have now reduce only building 1 from 40 stories to 30 the second bldg still 23 stories and no other mention of the other two bldgs and total residential units dropping from 540 to 501. I still do not feel this is enough for this residential community and believe the ugly University City development is proof these high rises do not belong.

<p>It still feels too high and am still worried about what it will look like. The four new residential buildings already in the area are a complete eyesore and do not add anything positive to the community.</p>
<p>No, this change has not addressed the community concerns. The height limits in the ARP are already the result of a long and thoughtful community engagement process to determine what is appropriate for the existing community, and bargain on acceptable heights. A developer should not be allowed to exceed them. The fact that they aren't breaking the rules by 'as much' does not address the community concerns that were already addressed by setting the height limit in the ARP. Do we want to set the precedent that this is somehow a bargaining process? If the developer had started at 50 stories, would that somehow make 40 okay because it's lower than their first proposal? No, it wouldn't. Make them respect the ARP.</p>
<p>I'm not against more density. My concern is quality. University City has addressed the need of low income housing for students. These have to be high-end units with the majority being marketed at families (who will make use of local schools etc.)</p>
<p>31 story building is still way too high. Should be no more than 20 stories.</p>
<p>In keeping with the surrounding areas and buildings, the structure should not be higher than 20 storeys.</p>
<p>Would prefer to have max 25 storeys.</p>
<p>Sorry I don't feel this enough of a height reduction. There is a very tall building there already {University City Building} therefore this building would be adding tenant volume density level that the traffic flow cannot manage. It's the access roads that cannot handle the cars exiting the Co-op or that north side. Apartments should have been built to the south of the LRT in this area. It is too much density. There are lots of small restaurants- health/spa business at University City already.</p>
<p>No- the reduction in height to 116 meters is still a violation of the ARP. Even with a maximum height of 90 meters the proposed residential tower is not only inconsistent with the character of the surrounding communities but reflects a poorly conceived approach to densification. It should have been evident to planners that University City towers have not had a positive impact, nor has their use been consistent with the intention to create living space for families. Too many of the units are being used as hotel rooms. The absence of green space has undermined the commitment to a pedestrian friendly environment, and these problems are being perpetuated with the proposed Coop development. Planners need to look at successful cities with vibrant lower rise residential and commercial mixed use, whether in Canada (try Montreal) or in Europe. It is possible to create communities in a largely inner city environment. High rise is not the way to accomplish that. Witness the disaster of St James Town in Toronto or the high rise redevelopment of Cabbage Town in Toronto.</p>
<p>Yes, this is actually a good buffer between the community and Crowchild Tr.</p>
<p>This will still significantly change the visual appearance of the area. However it seems this is part of the end goal for the ARP irrespective of the existing community.</p>
<p>I am glad that the height has been reduced from 40 to 30 storeys. However, at 30 storeys (116 metres), the height is still GREATER THAN City of Calgary laws permit. The City maximum is 90 metres. Why would Quarry Bay even consider going beyond that? I certainly hope that the City will stick to the 90 metre limit.</p>
<p>Not at all. Many in the community are still concerned about the height. Only reducing it by 10 stories is an insult.</p>
<p>The reduction in storeys is not addressed well. University City buildings are 18 and 13 storeys high, so to put just next to the LRT a humongous building is disproportionate and it only says this developer wants to make a lot of money, and not thinking about the great impact of having more cars coming in and out the parking lots, and also to address the parking issue for Co-op shoppers or the other services offered. It is a very small space for such an ambitious</p>

project.

The University City buildings will be completed shadowed by those first two buildings they want to build, specially the biggest one where they want to put the Co-op

The traffic will be impossible, it is not true the people only use LRT, the people have also a car there, sometimes more than one car.

I am also very concerned about the continuous traffic on the road they want to put along the park passing in front of the green and yellow building of University City. It will be impossible to bear the noise and emissions produced by all the trucks continuously coming in and out the Co-op for loading and unloading merchandise, not to mention all the garbage the Co-op will generate with meat, produce, etc, that will create a foul smelling atmosphere there, and specially for the Green and Yellow building and the back to their own new buildings as well. The people have the right to live peacefully, that is why a suburb is chosen, and the City of Calgary cannot approve every ambitious project without putting themselves in the shoes of the people that have to live there every day. The Condos will not be rented at a fair value, the Condos will go way down in this already difficult market, and the students that are the ones that will rent those Condos will opt for another place due to the smell, the noise, the traffic, that won't allow anyone in Summer time to enjoy the balconies and having the windows open. Also the buildings will be very close, there is no reason to increase the density there and creating more shadow to the buildings that today enjoy an exceptional open view to the NW and the mountains and the sun in the afternoon and the sunset. It will be all gone adding noise , traffic, trucks coming and going the whole day, garbage trucks every day and the smell in the area.

The Coop has to be closed during this ambitious project and rebuilt exactly where it is, and putting the high building on the other corner, and leave the gast station and Wendys right where they are now.

Even though the tallest tower has been reduced to 116 meters, it still does not follow the plan that many people and houndreds of hours were spent so that there were rules to follow. In the plan it says that 90 meters is the tallest, why can't you follow the rules.

Absolutely NOT. We are aware of the TOD height limitations and purchased a home 600m away with the expectation that these (recent) restrictions would not simply be thrown away by their second application (the first being University City.) The City might as well repeal the TOD work and simply do everything ad hoc.

Secondly, the developer suggests that they are height limited on Brentwood Rd. due to a CHP. This false. I personally have considerable experience with CHP's (professionally) while it would be 'nice' to have an unrestricted, small diameter flue of limited length (i.e. the perfectly ideal installation,) I have never seen this as a reason for limiting the height of a building. Usually the architects want to push the buildings higher and leave the CHP designers to mitigate the effects. There are dozens of work-arounds (better dispersion, larger diameter flue, lower emissions choices) that will allow Ambient Air Quality Objectives to be met (mostly NOx.) I think the developer is being disingenuous by blaming the CHP as a technical reason for a height restriction of the south building.

No, although the building volumes changed the configuration has not, and its kind of awkward. It is bad for accessibility for anyone who lives in the area. It is highway commercials with a few towers on top of it.

No. Sadly, I think the reduction to 30 storeys was a token gesture. This is a MASSIVE tower within the current context of the community and is not well-suited to this area. I do not see how such a large tower is being integrated into any community context. Just building a large structure to house people is not sufficient. There must be an environment around the development to make it an attractive and vibrant place to live. My concern is that the development, without a more appropriate and supportive surrounding, will only ever become

a large number of short term rental units and not encourage the growth of a community. Why is such a large scale necessary or required? Create a high quality living space and don't go for the obvious large number of apartments.
The reduction in height is still not enough. The area development plan suggests 15-25 storeys for that zone. I think the height should not exceed the tallest of the University City towers.
yes
It is still insufficient. Height needs to come down to a maximum of what has already been built at the site, to reduce population density and resulting traffic issues in the nearby communities. Charleswood Drive is already so busy that it often takes many minutes before you can enter, especially during busy arrival/departure times from the Uni. Adding all of those units will make an already poor situation even worse. You don't honestly expect all of those people to walk everywhere, do you? If you do, you are so naive that you are a danger as a planner.
Yes. The existing buildings immediately to the east are about that high.
Yes, I like the look of the development and think the applicant has done a good job integrating into the community. I also think it is important for a development like this to drive what we want our community to look like in 10-20 years and not reflect current state
It has become a concrete ghetto bereft of character. Those living high-rise condos of 500 sq ft are not contributing to community. Yes, they buy groceries, fast food and some goods from the in building vendors but they dump trash and butts all over the street. They reside here. They don't "live" here.
Yes...a 30 storey building is a good compromise.
The station area redevelopment plan developed height restrictions that seem sensible and were well thought out, taking into account the goals of the TOD. The 90 meters is more than sufficient to meet requirements for the TOD. What has changed that would require a 31 storey building? Nothing. There is no need.
yes - i think if we go shorter we will wonder in 10 years why we hadnt done more for a spot so close to an LRT
Building 2 highrise should be moved north closer to pedestrian bridge, provide a bit more space between University City and new highrise (unit privacy, etc less canyon effect) to better space and retain all property values. The community wants property values maintained, not for buildings to be more susceptible to slums. No specifics on seniors-oriented housing. No specifics on affordable housing-ideally sprinkled throughout development, not just in one building.
Again, this is just a misdirect from the real issues, which is the over-development of the site. The vibrant gathering places seem aimed at the young adult segment and are already provided by the bars and restaurants in the area. The more mature settled families in the area will not be drawn to the so called vibrant place to gather represented in this development. There are 4 towers immediately east of this proposed development with many empty commercial spaces waiting to be occupied. Let them vibrate.
It is good it has been decreased. There is 501 residential units and a lot of commercial units. With only 148 surface parking stalls I would like to add that all residents and all employees of the Coop and other businesses need to park in the underground parking lot. Will there be someone watching for people who are parked there all day? C-train users? visitors of the residential units? Residential units with 2 cars? Currently how many cars park on the surface parking from the Coop store alone? I see this could be a potential problem. The University City Condos have parking problems right now. It would be advisable for someone to get the information from the company managing those 4 buildings. Thank you for putting a light on

<p>the turn into the parking lot. It is brutal to make a left hand turn anytime after 4pm. Please also grade the entrance as it is a big bump right now and that is a problem.</p>
<p>No, this is still too high. The pictures I saw did not include the buildings already located south of the Brentwood Coop. The two sites should work together.</p>
<p>No - 30 storeys is still ridiculously high for the area. Though, high density living is fantastic.</p>
<p>No.</p> <p>Has orientation of the building and consequent to shade and location of shade through the seasons been studied.</p> <p>20 stories max. Definitely don't go higher than other one in area. Let's cap it.</p> <p>Consider orientation</p>
<p>I do not believe the planned height of 30 stories is appropriate as it exceeds the ARP designated height of 90m. I have not heard why the height has to exceed 90m, or how greater than 90m is an improvement to the ARP.</p>
<p>No. The height is still too high. It should be no higher than the coloured condos already built. This will blend in better with what is there and not be an eyesore. This is a community of largely bungalows and three storey apartment buildings until the coloured condos were built. In the 2009 document attached to in this engage.calgary site, it said on page 63 that the highest buildings will be in zone D with a maximum number of storeys being 25. 30 storeys exceed this.</p>
<p>What is not available in the proposal is consideration of the impact that University City already has on the community. I believe there should be a look back on this provided as part of the proposal. Did it meet all of the city's and community objectives?. In environmental studies, we look at the air shed or water shed to assess what additional contributions can be accommodated within the environment. It seems remarkable that we don't do this with city planning. All the data is merely attributed to this proposal, not what currently exists and the compounding impact. In additions, when concerns are raised about traffic flows, we are told that this will be looked at further. As we see from West Hills and Crowfoot, the design of traffic flow is frustrating at best. How do you accommodate so many additional vehicles in what is already a busy road.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30 storeys is still way too high for the community and will cause a significant amount of shading not to mention doesn't integrate well with the community in terms of esthetics. what you are proposing is too dense for the amount of area. - has the city/applicant considered the wind tunneling/snow/water build up effects from the tallness of the buildings? - has the city/applicant considered access for emergency vehicles for the residential community? fire to the high rises can prove to be deadly given the density of residence being proposed.
<p>The ARP has specific bylaws with respect to the height of building in the new proposed coop area. I do not see these bylaws being followed by the developer. I feel all buildings are still too high. I realize that increasing density is the concern but feel that the design does not work well for the site.</p>
<p>Reduction is insufficient, unless it becomes way more up to the times and innovative.</p> <p>Office buildings on north end so heating and electrical bills are more efficient for evening dwellers (the residences in the south).</p>

Plan should include shared community building spaces for things like:

Shared washer dryer facilities instead of each apartment having their own.

Gym space that helps to generate electricity for the building (Come on Calgary... step up your game - be a global leader)

Atrium or community garden space for reading/ chilling.

Compact residential design - so dining/eating social spaces shared, and generous percentage of space for pampering (bathroom area), and enough for sleeping. Innovative storage built ins.

It's not just size that matters... Let's get Calgary on board for 2017 most intelligent high density living design.

Is there a way to manage apartment compost locally, instead of shipping to dump? This would be amazing if it could nourish the surrounding green spaces.

not too high to match existing community

No. 30 storeys is still too high for this area.

No, both building 1 and 2 are well above the height restrictions allowed by bylaw (as negotiated in good faith by the city, their consultants and many neighborhood through the ARP.

30 storeys is still too high. This should be closer to University City's tallest building, which is 20ish stories. The height of the building increases shadows cast into Brentwood, reduces privacy for those residents and blocks the views of those living on the hill north of the development.

Not at all. The maximum allowable height is 90 meters. Period. That is a maximum, not a suggestion. This height was determined after years of work on the ARP and it should not be changed.

The applicant initially proposed 146 meters, a full 61 % OVER the maximum! A 40-storey tower would have been as high as the residential tower next to the Stampede Grounds, totally inappropriate in Brentwood.

The revised height of 116 meters is still 29% over the maximum. It's hard to even imagine how Coop thinks this is acceptable to residents.

If developers pay no attention to the legally-binding rules that are in place, and yet allowed to proceed with their application anyhow, residents become distrustful and angry about the entire process.

The buildings still seem much too large for such a small site.

I think 30 storeys is still too high. The University City building's are visible from all over the city and are an eyesore. I believe 20 storeys would be better. This is not downtown, and it's not attractive.

No. Reduction is not enough - should be no more than 20 stories. Will block the sun, specifically in the park. And would be an eyesore.

This is not contextual. Even at the new 31 stories it is significantly taller than anything in the immediate area, including U of C. This needs to be revised and shortened to less than 25 stories to fit into the context or the community. 31 stories is an eyesore and shows a lack of consideration for anyone living in the area. If it must be so monstrous please ensure that all

conforms to the TOD concept once pitched. This whole thing seems like a plan without a vision. Chaos will ensure if 31 stories is permitted.
I feel the reduction of building #1 to 30 storeys still doesn't address community concerns. The height of the building doesn't conform to the ARP. 30 storeys at 10 foot/story will overwhelm the landscape. As well, the density of the 3 residential buildings is too great for the limited take-away capacity of the traffic light intersection to Brentwood Rd. as well as the adjacent access of the two larger buildings to Brentwood Rd. Also. with further development of the adjacent RioCan property, Brentwood Rd. will become a nightmare for traffic for access to Crowchild and Charleswood Drive.
Not enough. Still too high. You could knock another layer off that layer cake.
Not at all. Brentwood is one of the last beautiful home oriented communities in the city. University city has already done a lot of damage to this sense of community and cramming another 500 residents into the same area is a terrible idea.
I don't think this properly addresses their concerns. Yes, 30 stories is better than 40. But the concern everyone was raising was that there is nothing else of that magnitude around. When people said that a 40 story building is going to stick out "like a sore thumb", going to 30 stories doesn't really help with that. Next door you have other buildings that are 20 stories high. Why not stick to 20 - 25 stories so at least things are more similar and visually appealing on the whole?
The problem with all of this is that Co-Op does its own thing, Rio Can does its own thing, and the community is left to deal with all of this. As the City, I suggest that you maybe sit down with both developers/land owners and make a unified plan for what buildings will look like in a broader sense. Going from 40 to 30 stories doesn't really address the concerns that were raised in either of the meetings that we had. The bottom line is that people are concerned about the visual impact of all of this development, and a 30 story vs. 40 story building isn't answering these concerns.
I think the height might still be too high but I am not concerned about them being visually appealing. The current design may be a little out of place given some of the surrounding properties but chances are that in the next 5-10 years some of those properties may need to do renovations or upgrade so their appearance may change anyway.
It is cold and even though they have gone down 10 storeys, it is huge and unwelcoming to those who might want to walk around and shop in the area.
NO NO NO
Appreciate the token gesture however the buildings are still too high and will in my (and many others opinions) not blend in very well with the existing look and feel of the area. They just don't look welcoming for people to just come and enjoy the space. Almost too industrial looking, Make it more warm and visually welcoming with buildings that have character and diversity. Like other older areas of the city such as Kensington Rd. (Sunnyside) or Marda Loop or even Inglewood.
90 meters is the maximum. No higher. No changes to the ARP. No reason to go any higher and it shouldn't have even been suggested. 40 storeys was ridiculous and 30 is not much better. Way too high!
No, in my opinion not. Is the Applicant not supposed to follow the regulations as formulated in the Brentwood SARP? What is the Applicant's reason not to follow those rules?
Yes. 25% reduction is a lot. 30 stories will still be very high, but is manageable for the area.
The height should conform to the ARP, as there was considerable effort and review undertaken to develop the plan.

<p>However, if that cannot be accommodated I see no issue as there are already high rises in the area.</p>
<p>As long as the height of the building is not above what is permitted by area regulations, I am happy with the height of the building.</p>
<p>No, Building #1 is still too high. The maximum allowable height of 90 metres must be respected. The Yellow and Orange Buildings of University City and Building #2 in University Commons are already tall enough for a low-building community such as Brentwood.</p>
<p>The developer has partially addressed the concerns - it would be better if Building #1 is reduced by 15 storeys (to 25) and Building #2 is reduced by 5 storeys (to 18)</p>
<p>the height of the residential building is still too high. the fire department cannot reach to that height in case of fire. you are asking people to risk their lives just for profit. the area was restricted to r1 when most of us purchased in the area. we were restricted to the size of basement windows so we could not build basement suites. what does that say for the rights of present owners.</p>
<p>I was told at the Triwood mtg. last week that there would be no shadow cast on residential areas in Brentwood. I have started to research this, and think that this is incorrect. I will continue my work and report back. You may also want to ask for clarification. (personal information removed)</p>
<p>No, the height should be further reduced.</p>
<p>Height of Buildings: The current maximum height allowed under the Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment Plan is 90 meters. The current amended plans show a height of 116 meters, still 26 meters (85 feet) above the maximum. Should the Station ARP be amended to allow for the increased building height? No, the maximum allowable height on Station ARP should be kept at 90 metres. The Yellow and Orange Buildings of University City and Building #2 in University Commons are already tall enough for a low-building community such as Brentwood. Building Alignment The position of the proposed Coop means that there cannot be a main street connecting across the full TOD site. Pedestrians approaching from the east side (from in between the existing 4 towers) would walk up to the back side of the Coop and would have to go around the building instead of continuing on the road as envisioned in the ARP. Given the site constraints, is this acceptable to you? Access to the Co-op becomes indeed cumbersome for the residents of University City and from the East side of Brentwood Mall. The site constraints are not as rigid: a possible alternative is suggested in our answer point 2. Development Fit Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input and is the reduction in storeys sufficient to address community concerns? Why or why not?</p>

Only partially:

- The improvements made on the Blackiston Park side and the features of the commercial main street alongside the Park are unclear, because no three-dimensional rendering with an appropriate view angle has been provided;
- The height of Building #1 is still excessive, and should be reduced to the current maximum allowable height of 90 metres (see answer to point 1);
- The pedestrian connections are improved with respect to the original plan, but residents at the east of the site will have to walk around the Co-op building even to access the Co-op.

Question 3: Vibrant gathering spaces

Community Idea / Concern: Community feels there is a lack of local, small-scaled businesses and vibrant places to gather.

Applicant's proposed change: The applicant has relocated the Wendy's and proposed a small cafe with a patio to better activate the plaza facing Blackiston Park.

Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input about gathering places and creates a vibrant place to gather? Why or why not?

OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM

Yes

It would be great to have second-floor café balconies overlooking the park as a way to encourage community

Yes

No! Hiding a plaza back in a corner will not encourage people to sit and enjoy the green space; which is too small

I'm not overly concerned about gathering places. Local small business is usually good for everybody

Perhaps there could be a community centre right in the building for community functions

The only place to gather is the park. There is no public gathering place on site. Plus, the road between the development and the park cuts off the development from the community. There is no community appeal to this design

I am not sure how realistic this goal would be as is. For example, I see empty school yards in the evenings, on N/Es. People do not gather. This if you build it, they will come philosophy is an expensive exercise. What if they don't come? Well this area be a graveyard of empty rented space because no one can make a living.

Worried that the new patio will never be used as it will always be in the shadow

I do think the plaza is slightly better, but without the commercial main street it is still isolated from the rest of the ARP area. This helps a corner of the site but doesn't address the main issue

No sufficiently. The café appears to be situated at one end of the site, and while fine in itself, should not be the only place to gather. Additional gathering spaces within the development, such as the community room at the existing Brentwood Co-op, should be an integral part of the plan

No. lack of soft, vegetative planning - places where you feel less like you are in a sharp, shiny concrete environment and more like you are in a natural environment. Seating, tables and lighting are essential

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

An improvement but not addressed especially on the southern and eastern sides.
The applicant has provided no information on who the tenants of their commercial units will be. As with the University City units, it will take many years before tenants are attracted to this site, and there is no business plan on who they will be.
No - except for one cafe there is very little change. At University City we were promised a "vibrant place to gather" and what we got is a concrete, soul-less jungle. This development will be the same. Anywhere that has huge, overbearing towers does not promote a feeling of intimacy
A small cafe does not compensate for the high density tower. Larger parks and accessible retail (with parking) would be much more desirable.
It will come down to proper street level design. Downtown execution bad, Kensington execution much better. Make it great like 4 st, 10th ave or Kensington but in an urban setting
Who will be responsible for the proposed cafe? I seem to remember that the apartment towers were supposed to be 'vibrant, social gathering places' and they now consist of dark unappealing places, very cold to walk through, specially in winter, with few social opportunities.
I do not agree. Same as comments above regarding unappealing buildings, shadows and wind. Businesses with cheap looking full window logos are not appealing. One cafe with a patio does not make a whole complex appealing and welcoming. Gardens, green spaces, natural looking buildings and attractive creative signs do.
Blakiston Park doesn't need park-side cafes, what is needed is a walkable active frontage linking the c-train station to the currently failing brentwood high street so that we end up with a walkable, busy, shopping street connecting the train station to the rest of the community. This was really clear in the station area redevelopment plan and mobility study but not present in coop's proposal.
it appears to do so
No, still not enough small scaled businesses. Should have a car wash as well.
The applicant has made minimal effort to address these concerns. A single cafe does not make a vibrant meeting place (and Wendy's doesn't count). Small-scale business feedback has not been addressed. Considering the amount of residential units, I would expect at least one restaurant + patio in this space, even if it was on the +15 level
No it does not address the need for gathering places in Brentwood. Like the Northland development, all small local businesses are being run out of the area. Now there are only big box stores and restaurants, no indoor shopping centres and high rises putting more pressure on already congested roads like Brentwood Road and Northland Drive. There are no unique cafes or local business. Wendy's, Harvey's and Starbucks don't make unique local meeting places
Yes, how will the drive through at Wendy's be handled?
The proposed café and patio is a great idea! However, to encourage more people to gather here, more boutiques should be located in this area to encourage more foot traffic. Additional businesses (e.g., restaurants) should also be considered to encourage more people to meet here. Moving the Wendy's drive through is an excellent idea.
The community input has not been met. Tall buildings do not promote gathering places and a vibrant atmosphere. Look at the existing 5 towers. Empty concrete areas that create a dark bottom of the canyon feel. We do not need more of this. Only low rise buildings create vibrant places.
Changes have addressed community input.

Not sure....
Yes.
This would bring new buildings to an outdated location making it much more vibrant.
This is improved and needs to continue to be a priority.
See my comments in the first question. I really can't see any significant changes, except a partial lowering of the building heights. At the session, I attended there were some nice examples of streetscapes that looked inviting and imaginative. I really don't see any of this in the proposal. Basically it is just buildings surrounding parking lots. I don't see much here that would encourage any gathering. There really hasn't been much imagination at all put into this proposal.
Small gathering places won't work if they are up against a main street and if between two buildings would be too shady for people to enjoy(3C). I would like to see the Wendy's drive thru remain in some form.
Yes.
There is still a lot of concrete - and little space between buildings for green space. One little cafe doesn't quite fit with the proposals from the town hall meetings - nor does there appear to be space left to have patio space. The developers 'appear' to be relying on little Blakiston park to provide all the green space.
No: gather where? there's no space in this crowded site!!
Yes, this does the job.
Unless it is a big brand name like a Starbucks, the cafe will become run down and go out of business as it will not attract enough people 2+ years down the road, as with so many building projects we see from the 70s 80s 90s and even early 2000s that had cafe things or "public vibrant gathering places" built into new building complexes only to be closed down and replaced with an insurance office or a McDonald's 10 years down the road. We see it all the time, an insurance office in the bottom of a building, occupying a place that was once a 1980s community kitting room that just wasn't realist and got shut down.
<p>1. I disagree. We have a Starbucks, a juice bar, and a Ginger Beef in Brentwood Mall. There is also a Starbucks in Safeway and a cafe in the existing Co-op Store. We have Kilkenny's pub adjacent to the medical clinic, an Opa! cafe, and a Jameson's pub onsite. Further over, we have a Harvey's, and of course, a Wendy's. There is a new Vietnamese restaurant as well. There are benches and tables within the mall, too, where people can meet, sit, and chat. On some winter days, the mall itself becomes quite a vibrant place to gather (for local residents, shoppers, people needing flu shots, restaurant-goers, university students, and errand-doers)!!!</p> <p>2. For large groups, major meetings, and events, we already have two community associations in the area: Brentwood Sportsplex, and the Triwood Community Hall with J.T.'s pub, and the Arena. There is a seasonal Farmer's Market in the Triwood parking lot, run by the Lions Club! There are three churches that come to mind: Brentview Baptist, Foothills Alliance, and Hope Lutheran. There is Nose Hill library in Brentwood, too. If we really need another seasonal market, there is one in Northland Mall on Saturdays in the parking lot!</p> <p>3. The University of Calgary is just across Crowchild Trail, and it has many vibrant spaces to gather: student lounges, open areas, vast study halls, the Nickel Art Gallery, the Taylor Digital Library, the theatre complex, a food court, MacEwan Hall, and many other indoor and outdoor areas open to the public.</p> <p>4. It should be noted that many of the small-scaled local businesses in Brentwood Mall have failed to thrive, i.e. within Brentwood Mall, we have lost -- among others: Mark's, the knitting store, the jewellery store, the Edelweiss Kaffee Stube, the tailor's, the drycleaner's, etc., etc. Part of the space is used for an annual flu clinic which operates from October through March.</p>

<p>5. Brentwood LRT provides quick access to a plethora of other amenities and spaces for people to gather.</p> <p>6. We have many local parks, i.e. Canmore Park (with its tennis court, toboggan hill, picnic areas, and splash park); Confederation Park (with its open fields, bike paths, picnic areas, golf course, cross-country skiing paths, and toboggan hills); the parks which connect Senator Patrick Burns school yard with Triwood Community Hall (containing two baseball diamonds and a soccer field); small neighbourhood parks interspersed every few blocks; Brentwood's community gardens; multiple playgrounds adjacent to the many schools in the area; the school yards themselves; AND, a bit further afield, we have massive Nose Hill Park, too!</p> <p>7. Blakiston Park can't be "all things to all people"! It's already limited in size. Having said that, a small cafe with a patio might be a nice touch if it faces the park. Space for children to run around in, and a playground are top priorities, in my opinion. There are already off-leash dog runs for people to use elsewhere.</p>
<p>Yes, this addresses the concern.</p>
<p>A Wendy's is not a small scaled business, in fact it's not even a draw for anyone on foot or cycle. Beyond that there is no public realm of any sort in this plan. The developer should not be able to use the park instead of providing some public space. There is no green space on this plan, they have replaced everything with different color concrete.</p>
<p>Not enough, bring all the buildings down to the community level will give any space a homey common feel. Attracting Brentwood people to flock to the site. Especially if the sunlight gets to the small businesses. The colorful high rise towers block all the light from shining through the stores at their bases. Use this as an example what not to do. Think community.</p>
<p>Even more green spaces to gather with trees, grass, tables and walkways.</p>
<p>The spaces are appropriate, but they will remain empty or minimally used unless there is a plan for events. Gathering only happens when people feel safe and when there is good reason. E.g. weekly farmers' market, concerts/ events scheduled in the park or the plaza. Also the spaces need to be used in all seasons, i.e. planning for events other than in summer. Could other city departments be involved in planning events? E.g. Parks and Rec?</p>
<p>This change is good. I am excited about this project in its amenities, goods, and services that it will provide to the community. I want to have more pedestrian retail along the north side (near the park) as well as near the LRT station to serve the people getting off (e.g. university students, commuters, residents).</p>
<p>Yes local cafes are vibrant spots</p>
<p>Where are we actually able to gather except in the park.? MAYBE you have a square there??? on the southeast edge of the development. Theatre space? Seniors housing? Gallery space? Event space?</p> <p>We will have added approximately 2-3000 people (my very rough estimate) along the park or just east of it. And we're hoping the rest of the community will be able to use the space as well. We are expecting the park to do too much for too many, I believe.</p>
<p>More patio. Public benches.</p>
<p>Again, see my comments above - the colourful buildings were supposed to provide this and never delivered. How is this development going to be different? I am looking forward to a new and improved Co-op, but honestly, without a guarantee of who is moving into the building and confirmed businesses who are signed up to be there, I am not excited for it to go in.</p>
<p>The local business in University City are sad at best. Does the developer actually have a plan to create gathering spaces, or are they just paying lip service to the concept of it here? Will there be adequate green space and lighting in these "vibrant places"?</p>
<p>This would be a great idea, to allow residents to go the cafe by the park! My only concern is where they will put the Wendy's?</p>

I see a parking lot and residence but not a gathering place, but the park could fill that role.
I would like the Wendy's restaurant and drive thru to remain in some fashion. Not sure small gathering will work in current proposal. Sunlight could be an issue.
See above.
Good start. Would be nice to see other small restaurants and cafe's on the ground floor facing the park, however this may take time to develop.
Yes, they have added a good gathering place. The small cafe is a good idea.
Wendy's does not feel like a small scaled business. Where are the mom and pops shop opportunities?
Right. So the gathering places will be used by those who buy condos. Great. A place for the students to smoke, smoke up and get drunk.
No. Still not enough green space, outdoor space, space that doesn't require commercial consumption.
It has not. Merely relocating Wendy's does and adding a cafe (which for all we know could be a chain) doesn't address the lack of small-scaled business. There should have been a walking path or a playground.
The area has plenty of fast food and patios. Coffee shops & small business shopping would be better.
ok
Yes
It does look like a significant improvement. As University City has demonstrated though, making places for tenants is a lot different than occupying them.
Café is excellent but more is needed in the area. I suggest an ice cream store, more coffee shops and other gathering places. This community lacks significantly in vibrant places to gather. With its proximity to the University the space is ripe to develop these types of things
I do not feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input. Anyone who lives in this area knows that almost nobody would come here for grocery or regular shopping anymore. Whether you add small-scaled businesses or shuffle the order of the stores, it will not resolve the fact that both Northland Village Mall and Market Mall are more appealing options for consumers and customers. To me, this whole development plan should have been done to Northland Village Mall instead.
This does not at all take on the image of a gathering spot. It looks more like an invasion and overwhelms the feeling of quiet community.
Families need coffee shops and sit-down restaurants in the area, in addition to fast food outlets. There are very few restaurants in the area that residents from Collingwood, Charleswood, Brentwood, Varsity, and University Heights can enjoy. Several small cafe-style restaurants have been built at University City, but there is a shortage of parking, so they are not suitable for winter patronage.
wow. a whole cafe and a fast food joint. How is the connection to Kilkenny's.
Fine.
Yes, I like the idea of a cafe facing Blakiston Park. I think this will provide a vibrant gathering space for the community.
No. You will need to drive to get in and out of this congested mess. That does not promote a vibrant community. Quite the opposite.
There is not a "community" feel to this development. Wonder if there will be enough financial attraction and parks will be useful only if children play in them.
Adding a fast food restaurant and a small cafe is hardly addressing small-scaled businesses (although it is plural) and will not be vibrant places to gather.

Yes. I'm not sure how viable the café idea is but it would be nice.
Further green space or play area development above the Coop grocery store to encourage families and seniors from adjacent apartment units to meet , play and develop a community garden.
The small plaza facing the park is definitely an improvement, but the second Plaza adjacent to Brentwood Road is in a bad spot. Please move it away from the road and away from the LRT ramp. Do not get rid of it.
If there is actually a coffee shop in the NW corner of building #3 along with a plaza (facing the park) this appeals to me.
In the end, I have little reason to believe that this development will be better than University City and University City is definitely not a vibrant place.
Addition of cafe is essential. Not sure why it is limited to a "small" cafe. Would prefer eliminating the Wendy's to make room for a larger cafe/restaurant. Our area is very short of good cafes/restaurants.
Again look at University City. The promised village atmosphere has not taken hold. It is dark, cold, unappealing and inhuman in scale. There are no plants, trees, sunlight. Why would anyone want to go there? Vibrant is not a word I would associate with a group of high density high rise buildings with little or no green space.
Definitely not. Nothing in the new design creates a sense of local, complementary businesses placed close enough that clients will encounter one another even if they are patronizing different establishments (like an urban village). Wendy's and the proposed cafe are as far apart as one could make them, and pedestrian traffic to it has to deal with vehicles using the drive through. The potentially pleasant area along Blakiston Park is populated with town houses instead of public facilities, and the cafe with patio at the NE corner will have to a "destination" rather than spontaneous drop in that would make it "vibrant". The patio at the SE corner is absurd...who wants to sit on a patio facing Brentwood Road?
Using the existing recent high-rise development at Brentwood Station, I would say that the frontage of the current buildings has been a failure in creating attractive people places. The area is a concrete/asphalt wasteland with little or no landscaping and large covered windows with signs for what is offered inside. Hideous is the word I would use. The most attractive is the gym frontage that at least you can see inside the windows and it invites you in to try it out.
If this is setting the example of what we can expect from the new development I would say that there is no vibrancy in the proposed development. Perhaps a clearer layout of landscaping, benches, small areas with flowers and fountains would create a warmer feeling. A few coffee shops with attractive frontage and not blacked out windows would certainly help.
In summary, if the city does not require the developer to put money and thought into attractive landscaping and small green areas for sitting outside, we will be stuck with more of the same asphalt and concrete and nothing more for the community.
I can not comment on this question since a full map of the proposed new development is not available.
Satisfied with this proposal.
no comment as your revised plan does not show exactly what has changes and how things look before and after the changes
A drive through fast food establishment is never exciting, least of all in my neighbourhood.
More than one 'small cafe' is desirable. One small cafe and relocating an already existing

and undesirable fast food behemoth isn't enough to make up for all those new residential units. And other uninteresting commercial tenants. A choice of restaurants, cafes, etc. would add utility to the community at large.
This is another aspect that would be improved if the plans were forced to keep commercial main street intact, because it would give a better pedestrian connection with small-scale businesses throughout the site. Coop will have a very difficult time achieving this objective while turning their back on the rest of the site because they don't have many shops themselves. Additionally, using the road along Blakiston as a utility entrance means it will never be a pleasant gathering place
Wendy's? Sounds like the plan is to have people continue to jump in their cars to drive to Kensington....
Doesn't seem to be anything like this on the south or Sunnyside of the development.
Good response to community input so far.
I like the proposed small café with patio overlooking Blakiston Park. Will make sure to frequent it myself.
Actually the Brentwood LRT Station is not that safe in the evening. The lights are off in the CO-OP parking lot and the city street lights are dim & to few. so not sure if Wendys new location would improve this.
Yes this is an improvement.
It's a start, ideally there would be multiple businesses on the ground level in order to create a pedestrian scale development adjacent to the neighbourhood.
It is an improvement to the gathering places / vibrant places from the original proposal.
My answer partly deals with the next category as well. How can you have a pleasant patio experience by the park if there is a road running along the top edge of the park???? Eliminate the road along the top of Blakiston Park.
No. The vibrant place to gather theme never materialized at the new towers. I don't see how it will develop with this project either. Tall buildings do not contribute to a sense of vibrancy.
It will have very few shops, it is not a place for gathering at all. Nobody gathers in the Coop. The people are going to Jameson's and Kilkeny pubs, and not to a tiny coffee shop. Wendy's is a choice for few people, so it is not to be considered a gathering area that appeals the majority. That café with all the traffic in front of it will be a nightmare to be seated in, with all the gas emissions , garbage trucks, big trucks going back and forth to the Coop. Please think about this, it will be a nightmare.
Moving Wendy's was a good move.
That us not enough. The development still turns It's back towards the rest of the community and commercial area.
The community has expressed an honest and thoughtful request to create a vibrant and accessible place to gather. The response from the developer seems, unfortunately, rather ignorant. Move the location of the Wendy's and added a small cafe is hardly an appropriate response. This is NOT a sufficient response and really reflects a lack of imagination and sadly very little interest in developing an area within the community that will serve the region for years to come. Would it be possible to think a little bit more creatively here? What attracts people to gather? Outdoor theatre spaces? Sports fields for kids and families? Space for community farmers' market? Skating rink and water park? There is tremendous opportunity to BUILD some interesting spaces and the best that can be offered is a small cafe? I really fear for this development when this is the response that was offered

I think the plan still has too much emphasis on surface parking. I don't like the gas station being at the centre of the development. Wouldn't it be nice if there were a bit of green space with benches and tables right near the front of the store.
I like the idea of the small cafe with a patio but I do not like the idea of moving the Wendy's.
Much too little a proposed change. A new Wendy's and a "small cafe" are totally inadequate. Space needs to be provided for restaurants and cafes with outdoor seating, and perhaps some interesting one-off retail shops, including a florist, a gift shop/decorating outlet (non-chain), etc. Eclectic should be the byword.
Partially, more than a single patio would be required.
yes, I like the development and how the plaza, mainstreet, park and walking way are all integrated
A vibrant place to gather??? for whom? For what?
Yes...quite frankly government always tries to get in the way. Let business decide (entrepreneurial spirit) always comes on top. Stop taxing so much as a city to let these places survive!
Wendy's restaurant (high fat, high sugar) does not meet my expectation of a vibrant gathering space. It would be nice to have high quality place in the wasteland of restaurants in the northwest (a problem for many years when looking to dine out), that has an adult target demographic. I prefer that national chains do not take over the space, whether coffee shops, cafes or bistros and restaurants. We have enough ramen places as well. I ask myself, why would I go to that location and arrange a meeting with friends, for coffee or lunch,dinner. The answer is, I wouldn't. Does not appear to have any restaurant or coffee shop patio space for summer. Where are the other critical services that residents use, vet clinic, dry cleaners, farmers market space in summer.....
Yes. This is a challenging site and private land. Co-op has done a good job of listening to the community and trying to give us what we want while balancing their needs
No specifics on active edges. We need pedestrian traffic not more vehicle traffic/parking. No specifics on getting a variety of retail/commercial footprints, sizes, and desirability/high rent-like locations. We need diversity, variety with respect to rents. Appreciate the Wendy's relocation. Concern about viability by giving in too much to anti-development forces in community for development fit. Make the CO-OP grocery store 4 storeys and add much more commercial office (I know market's terrible for that subsector now) to make the development busy at all times. This development is too residential and won't be busy in the middle of the weekday. Let's make CO-OP and food service busy at lunch time, coffee time, etc with enough employment at this site. Maybe the best solution is to give CO-OP flexibility by designing the site's foundations, parkade, etc so that future phases (say in 10-15 years after all these phases are done) can add more employment and residential. At same time with a bit more spacing (move highrise building labelled 2b right to pedestrian bridge) the developer could go 60 storeys high; if 10 storeys is ~40units/60 people, then that's 180 more customers for CO-OP and other retail/commercial. Building height is much less important than the at-grade interface (active edges, doors, pedestrian-oriented architectural details (vertical & horizontal articulation, signage, etc) The city could also require this development and RioCan's to fund an endowment for programming at Blakiston Park for events (e.g. movie nights, Shakespeare by the Bow-like, Stampede events, Xmas events, Easter events, Halloween events-i.e. things that draw people and benefit the businesses too. The renders on board 13/slide 13 just show glass curtain wall and brick facades. No doors.

No storefront. This looks like the back of the building facing inward away from the community towards it's massive parking lot. Do better.
More gathering needed in mall area not just the park
Less big-block stores, and more opportunity for local businesses preferred.
Consider- what makes Inglewood voted best community in city. We need more character.
incentive for local unique businesses.
Please provide incentive for locally owned.
Would love to availability of an organic whole foods store in the neighborhood.
Also... perhaps have the public artwork be interactive.
Making Wendy's the ground floor of a multi-floor building is an improvement over a standalone one. Moving it and the drive thru away from the Park is an improvement. However, a small café in the shadows or next to a bus stop does not constitute a vibrant place to gather. The vibrant space is supposed to be the Park and the pedestrian space fronting the park (which has been sacrificed by proposing a road along the park).
I has lived her for 33yrs and am one of the older people who are not "wanted" any longer in Brentwood, it seems. The bank I went too for years has been knocked down. I must drive to the Dalhousie station as the bus and train add a at least 90 minites to a previously walkable destination. I go to the Brentwood co-op for groceries. But if the parking onsite is limited then I will no longer shop there as I cannot carry the groceries I buy easily. So I am unclear how or if I will use any gathering places, because it seems only young people are being encouraged to live here.
I am unclear the definition of vibrant. It is noted that the Dalhousie Coop height is originally proposed at 31 stories. Why is Brentwood starting at 40 stories and then negotiated down. This seems rather insincere. We'll go high knowing that we will have to reduce. Is this a game that is played? Again I look at University City and wonder how this makes the neighbourhood a more vibrant place. It reminds me more of the high wall canyons we see in downtowns.
- I'm concerned about the littering/loitering that will happen in Blakiston Park from take out from the small scaled businesses. Will it be sufficiently lit at night to prevent drug activity in the park/patio area? you can build a gathering space, but will it provide the desired outcome
I do not feel that the applicant has properly addressed the vibrant gathering spaces. You have a road going around the park which will be used by residents, delivery trucks etc. One small cafe by the park is not enough. With the shadowing of the towers I would not find the patio vibrant when I am sitting in shadows. A main street with a plaza and several variety shops will draw more people for a vibrant space. I already don't like the space where the university city towers are and it is a concrete jungle in there with no appeal.
See above for more holistic approach.
Community areas need to have function as well.
Incorporate food forests and non-mowing/ herbicide/pesticide free, xeriscaped land development, with early to late pollinators. Adds aesthetic, community ownership, and peaceful place to gather.

no
No. How does moving Wendy's and adding a café make it a vibrant gathering space? It needs to have benches and areas where people can actually want to gather. That would be a vibrant gathering space. I don't want to gather at Wendy's - do you?
There is still a major lack of small business.
No, the concern is it's a bunch of tall buildings around a parking lot with no interface to the park or the rest of the shopping in the area and no gathering space. There's no guarantee the cafe will prosper and succeed if it's not part of the co-op building, does not face the park anyway. Look to the plaza at Northmount across from the library for a place where people gather and enjoy ice cream and coffee.
It is impossible to judge from the scarce visual information that has been provided. More details and, in particular, a three-dimensional rendering from an appropriate visual angle are needed to make an evaluation.
A small café with patio does not create a vibrant gathering place - it is unclear on the plans whether restaurants and small business will be encouraged to inhabit the area.
Yes, I like the café/patio addition
No. Relocating the Wendy's was a start. The small café with a patio is alongside a road that will be used by delivery trucks, garbage trucks, and anybody wanting to enter into the lobbies of the towers. Food stores generate a lot of traffic and daily deliveries. 500+ residents also generate traffic. This patio will likely be the seating area for a small café (i.e. a private space), rather than a public gathering space available to all. It will be in shade most of the time so not very appealing other than on extremely hot summer days. The rest of the year, not so much. The little patio in front of the Coop is right next to all the traffic on Brentwood Road as well as right next to the ramp from the LRT Station. Who is going to want to sit there?!
No opinion.
It might help, but a few more park bench areas and that kind of thing would do the trick nicely. Blackiston Park used to be a place people would go to play with their kids or friends. It would be good to preserve that in some manner, especially given that there will be tall imposing buildings surrounding the green spaces.
Partly. It would be nice to have a cafe or patio on the park. But if the road is going in there, it takes away from this idea. We could use a Starbucks or another coffee shop with outdoor patio space.
Not at all. I feel that this plan is being rammed down the collective community throats. I am all for a sustainable redevelopment, but these revisions seem trivial and disconnected from the public will. It seems that any notion of TOD and improved pedestrian focus has been lost. This whole project seems rife with big box mentality and totally car focused drawing in people from all areas of the city for maximum profit that will be "in and out" after collecting their wants". No small attractive local business like coffee shops, bistros and boutiques.
The gathering places on the Blackiston Park side of the low-rise residential appear to still be inadequate, as retail doesn't create a vibrant meeting place - multiple restaurants and cafes would be a better choice.
Better, but still way too much ground covered by pavement for the parking lot.
Yes, a small cafe would do a lot to preserve some of the small knit community feel, but again, I don't understand how any of the existing businesses or any of the new ones to start up will

be able to handle another 500 residents? There's already always a line up at starbucks, the kilkeny is always packed. This will only make everything worse for those of us who have grown up in brentwood, and feel safe knowing we are welcomed into our community establishments.

This is going in the right direction, to be sure. But again, the real problem people were raising is that when we talk about TOD, it isn't just higher density population, it is also something to draw people in, i.e.to make this a social hub as well as a place to live. So yes, a cafe and patio are going to help with that. But there have to be gathering places, places for people to meet and stop and talk and gather together. A cafe and patio alone aren't going to do this. Basically, the issue we as residents have with University City is that there is nothing there - the only reason to be there is if you live there or if you are walking through. I think proper TOD requires some thought into how to bring people together, not just to walk through...Look at places like Kensington, which are a nice mix of commercial and residential, or Inglewood or even Bridgeland. These are examples of where it is been done successfully. What Co-Op is proposing (adding a cafe and patio) doesn't properly do this. It is certainly a step in the right direction, but I think what the community wants is a proper plan of how this development will lead to a better gathering place and make people want to come and visit and stay.

Yes. I a excited about the possibility of a small cafe and more unique shops in the community.

the small scale business are still not present

NO NO NO

Proposed "a small cafe" - one cafe...thats really going get the masses flocking to the area. How many small pubs or restaurants does sunnyside have in a 2 block radius? Surely there can be more creativity here.

Then again, we know how the City of Calgary (or at least current council) treats small businesses. They wouldn't be able to afford the taxes...is that why there is no appetite for smaller non-chain or franchise opportunities here?

There is no central plaza or gathering place. The little spot near the park is going to be in shade most of the time. Who wants to sit on a plaza in the shad of a high-rise?

The proposed change seems rather poor to me.

Yes. Brentwood will benefit dramatically from gentrification. The community is getting younger and in desperate need of trendier, community gather spots.

I like the addition of the cafe with the patio. I think another look should be taken at the interface between the development and the park to ensure that there isn't too much loading dock space and 'dead' faces of the building.

Question 4: Road Alignment

Community Idea / Concern: The community would like to have a commercial main street that connects through the station area.

Applicant's proposed change: The applicant has deemed that the commercial main street is unviable due to space requirements for the grocery store and conflicts with the existing store footprint. They have proposed a road alignment along Blakiston Park and have improved the pedestrian interface.

How do you feel about the proposal to re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park?

OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM

More green (bushes, grass, open space, benches) less emphasis on traffic

Please add more green if possible. Keeping this area more aesthetically pleasing is important to me
Seems like it's coming in the back door - as is counter intuitive to the orientation of the train - for collection?
Good
The commercial road aligned with Blakiston will be busy and not encourage families to use the park
Ok (I think)
I think there will be too much traffic for the existing plan
Sick to my stomach; I think this proposal divides the community. The road separates the residential buildings from the park. Also the development is separated from University City. There is no integration of the development into the community which is a main principle of the SARP
The shortest distance between 2 points is a straight line. The proposed system is the long way around. The walking culture is not evident yet in Calgary, as I see people drive with shopping centres to be closer (car) to their preferred shopping.
Bad idea.
No terrible idea. Not one of the visionary exercises show a road only a sidewalk. People want to walk from London Drugs to Wendys or other stores and shouldn't have to go around a store in the middle
I don't think it's appropriate. Calgary's planning language in the MDP and this ARP talks about build-out and community growth over decades, and I don't think it's appropriate to overrule this because of the short-term concern of keeping a store open during construction
Uncertain - I'm dubious about having more traffic adjacent to the park
Are you (Co-op) with encouragement from Quarry Bay trying to do too much for maximum financial gain at the expense of quality of life for residents at the location and in the surrounding community? Are you Co-op in the grocery business or financial/development business?
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
If it's truly a street and not a barrier of cars, great. I don't see enough to convince me that's the case.
Big mistake! How is it safe to direct truck/delivery/customer traffic adjacent to this greenspace after all the effort to align the pedestrian traffic through it has already been done & constructed?
A road along the edge of Blakiston Park? You want a vibrant people place to gather, but then there is a road that you have to cross. That does not make one bit of sense.
I suspect that this would not be readily accessible, nor would there be parking available.
Understand challenges to execute
Do not understand this section
I disagree. The commercial main street is the key to the whole redevelopment concept. The current two block main street is currently failing to thrive because the rest of it still hasn't been build. It's continuation through the coop site ca be phased and the current store footprint is going to be demolished anyway, meaning their second point is moot. The full coop store could be built on the current site of the Wendy's and the current gas bar. It could also be a two story store (with the deli, produce, checkout on the first floor and the freezer, dairy and dry goods on the second floor. If they are insistent on blocking the commercial street, then there should be front and back entrances aligned with the street that encourage foot traffic to

walk through the store to get to the station. Better yet would be to build the street as per the original ARP.
without advertising could be commercial disaster. On the other hand, could provide excellent restaurant space with park view. Don't really understand why there has to be a street between the park and the people
Not a good idea.
That is THE WORST. Space along the park should be pedestrian only, for the safety and enjoyment of the park.
Really. The people who live there are already going to suffer from massive high rises in front of them and their quiet street will now become a major traffic area. Give your head a shake. The park will become useless because of a major roadway in front of it. Getting in and out of Brentwood Mall is already painful - this will only make it worse
Will work as long as park not cut off.
Great idea.
Yes
I don't use this park, and am indifferent about the changes.
I am comfortable with this. The park is rarely used. This might increase usage and visibility to it.
Don't like it at all - there needs to be a commercial main street through the area like the current Brentwood road. If there isn't easy vehicle access, my family and I will NOT be shopping at Brentwood at all (we live in the northern part of Charleswood).
Current traffic from 4:00 to 6:00 pm is total congestion, how will this improve with several hundred more units?
Yes.
I think that is a terrible idea. I feel it puts up a barrier between the development and the existing park and the existing community. Basically what it means the people facing the development will get to see and hear most of the traffic through the site. The development alone is going to be a major change for the community, and not necessarily for the better, but why should they also bear the brunt of the traffic impact?
NO - That is such a bad idea! Every proposal put forth by the community shows no vehicle access against the park! We can live with a well thought out road fronting the buildings but not against the park.
The traffic requirements should be held within the proposed redevelopment and not be pushed out into the neighbouring streets.
Not quite agree that the developers proposal improves pedestrian interface. Having only one entrance/exit to this entire site is CRAZY!!! The traffic on Brentwood Road NOW is unacceptable as it is the only access to Crowchild North (west?) from Charleswood drive. Just imagine what it will be like with the increased population. Sorry people still drive cars - and most of the condos will be sub-let. The traffic mess is already catastrophic!!!
Sorry for the residents of Blakiston Road
It's a good idea.
Improve driving interface
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Absolutely NOT! Blakiston Park is for quiet relaxation and recreation, presumably -- an oasis in the midst of a busy commercial and residential complex. There is no good reason to put a "main street" along it. If I read the map correctly, this would be along Brentwood Road - - and the local residents would definitely be strongly opposed to it! 2. There are already enough businesses in the fairly compact area! There is no need for a "commercial main street"!

I think this is a better solution.
They haven't improved the pedestrian interface and the design completely isolates the other buildings to the south in the TOD because as you look down the main road to the north, the road will look like it ends in the tall tower. This is ugly.
No, not necessary, people in a community can walk threw (create walk ways to the low rise development, if it is to maintain a community spirit. If people have cars they can access the Coop complex from the existing roads. Traffic lights, crosswalks roads do not a friendly community make.
I am disappointed the commercial main street be right next to the park. That area should have been restricted to pedestrian use.
Pedestrian interface has NOT been addressed as the plan focuses on mostly the car in regards to the Blakistan Park interface. The road interface along Blakistan Park should be less car oriented and more pedestrian focused. Possibly green spaces with benches, trees and landscaping. Cars will ignore the differing textures and drive where they wish and use the space for parking. PLEASE provide pedestrian friendly/oriented/green (plants, trees, grass, walkways) interface with Blakistan Park
Fine, as long as pedestrians are safe crossing the street and going through the park.
I understand the changes done. I am disappointed by the commercial Main Street proposal being rejected, however I understand if the space is not viable.
The main street concept was key! We still have a big parking lot with nothing in it and difficult pedestrian navigation! I am also wondering about buying groceries and trying to get them down to my car in a parkade! Could the city run a small grocery shuttle (or maybe the Co-op could) that would allow one to do a larger purchase without bringing a car? (I do walk and carry when I only have a couple bags and a dog).
Definitely need better access in/out. We don't go to that Co-op (despite being the closest store to our house) during rush hour as we can't stand fighting the traffic.
A street running aligned with Blakiston park looks to me like it will be a perfect place for crime/homeless people (a problem we already have in Blakiston). If the development is well lit and well taken care of, then maybe this will not be a problem?
Very reasonable. The applicant is correct in stating that a commercial main street would be nonviable, but probably also not visually appealing.
I don't understand the question. The concept rendering shows the main road in use as usual. It makes sense to continue to use this existing road.
I'm disappointed they couldn't continue the road from the University City area, it would make a lot of sense to do so.
See above.
Should make the Park and the commercial main street feel more pedestrian-friendly and therefore an area you are likely to linger in. Agree that there isn't space for a commercial main street.
It works much better.
It's hard to say for me, as I don't fully understand the street based on the drawings provided.
I cannot see the residents of Blakiston Rd being happy about the construction, excess traffic noise and cars. There goes the neighbourhood and the house prices.
No. Keep the park pedestrian friendly and the commercial main street where it is. Change the development plan to be a better fit with existing infrastructure.
Does address community concerns.
Pedestrian & cyclist access are key. We don't need car access via this area. What about cyclist access crossing Crowchild Trail?

Leave our park alone.....it is small enough & more traffic is not necessary.
It's good.
From the revised site plan, the road along Blakiston Park goes no where. Again, a dead zone has been built along the back of the Coop that will not be occupied by tenants. When all your focus groups and your own plans have a road that the applicant refuses to add, then maybe it's not us that has to give in, but the applicant. For instance, why can't the Coop be along Brentwood road? The applicant is proposing buildings of all sizes on all sides of the lot, but the grocery store needs to be in a specific spot? It sounds like the Co-op is a convenient excuse to not have to spend a bunch of their real estate on roadway.
Yes
Having the commercial main street along Blakiston makes the interconnect with University City very awkward. I don't like it (sorry!).
I do not believe the proposal to re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park resolves the community's concern. On Co-op's website, they claim that the "majority" of consumers in this area would travel by "LRT" instead of driving and yet they refuse to built a commercial main street that connects through the station area, thus making it inconvenient for people to access the area. I live in this area and I can tell you I would never shop there because the road alignment is a complete mess.
Please see above. It detracts from the plan.
Can't they have a parkade for the grocery store? IF the main street is BROAD and there is a wide pedestrian walk, then maybe wish we could see pictures while filling out this questionnaire.
Disagree with a commercial main street around Blakiston Park - the park should remain quiet.
I approve. I think the altered paving pattern and increased pedestrian crossings are a big improvement.
Not at all. Take out the bike lanes (that few use as it is UNSAFE) and make BRENTWOOD ROAD A PROPER FOUR LANE ROAD TO HANDLE THE TRAFFIC. IT'S ALREADY TOO BUSYT!
Believe this is necessary and that development company should perhaps consider taking away some of its proposed residential areas to make this viable.
Don't like it. Spend \$ on a park then destroy the ambience with a commercial street immediately adjacent.
I didn't believe in the main street idea. This proposed change is an improvement.
Commercial Main Street paralleling Blakiston Park would discourage use due to increased traffic through this area.
I am not opposed to the road alignment along Blakiston Park, but I think that the traffic circle at the North end of University city should be left in place, so that only pedestrian traffic can continue along the main street and cross over to the road along the margin of Blakiston Park. This blockage would minimize the traffic that would proceed around the margin of the park.
Better solution than adding a commercial main street connector.
Having the main road between buildings and the park makes the park less appealing for people and especially for children. Point McKay has low rise buildings with lots of green space and children can simply go outdoors and meet their friends in common green space. That is vibrant and appealing.
This is absurd. How on earth can one consider a row of town houses a commercial main street? Why on earth would one even consider putting a vehicle main street along the border of a park, thereby contaminating the intent of the park? Is the commercial parking lot in the "courtyard" the back side of the development, or will it be the factual main street? Re the conflict with the existing store...the development is going to take several years of construction

<p>upset, require variable parking locations to build the underground parkade etc. And they're worried about interference? And how is a Blakiston Park road going to interface with the existing store?</p>
<p>I think this is a move in the right direction. The next step is to make it attractive (see my comments above). If it simply consists of blacked out windows, no greenery, and just parking along the sidewalk it will be a failure.</p>
<p>The alignment along the park is not ideal as it isolates the street from the commercial area. Vehicles will still be able to use the street but it is a poor design for pedestrian and bicycle users. The additional distance required to get to the end of the development and lack of sight lines will eliminate the feel of a continuous main street.</p>
<p>The commercial main street (across the entire length of the new Brentwood mall) was the MAJOR selling point of the original ARP and can not be eliminated. The footprints of the future Coop location needs to be adjusted to that original plan. The short-term need of the developer (i.e. to keep the old Coop open while the new one is being constructed) is not as important as the long-term viability and livability of Brentwood ARP as well as current Brentwood Citizens.</p> <p>The proposed commercial main street along Blakiston Park would only be viable if it is actually a commercial street with multiple shops for different interests. The current plan only includes a "small coffee show with patio". That small amount of commercial is not sufficient to call any "roadway" a "commercial roadway". The remainder of the "main street" is likely window / patio fronts from tenants and provide no interest to pedestrians.</p>
<p>Do not like this. Traffic coming along the park would hinder activities in the park. The park should be a slow , safe , congenial area for the community.</p>
<p>Making only one access in and out of the area now creates nothing but congestion and frustration as already proven by every community or development of this nature. Can you not build something that works for the actual surrounding community that require vehicles to retrieve groceries, it is nice to think in the future vehicles will be obsolete but slightly unrealistic and impossible with the urban sprawl of Calgary.</p>
<p>The feeder road running parallel to Crowchild Trail and in front of the existing site is a nightmare since they put in the bike lanes. It is now so backed up at certain times of the day (especially in winter) that, instead of taking it, I drive back to 24th Ave. to access Crowchild and then backtrack up Crowchild, an addition of a few kilometres every time I need to head north on Crowchild. I know I am not the only one in the neighbourhood doing that. This obviously more than undoes the green benefit of the bike lane there. Basically, any change should be an improvement. But only if we get lanes back for the feeder road.</p>
<p>The entire Brentwood TOD project lives or dies based on the commercial main street. Without this, the importance of the site as a TOD development is significantly reduced in several ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People living in the south part of the site will need to dodge around Coop's loading dock and garbage bins to get to the train station, rather than walking down a main street with 'complete streets' design cues 2. The visual cues that commercial main street should be a gathering place will disappear if the street ends in a tower 3. The Coop site is using the tower to 'turn its back' on the rest of the development, and trying to isolate pedestrians from the train into its own portion of the site, rather than spreading naturally throughout the site as the ARP intended 4. the road around Blakiston park and it's associated safety and interface concerns is still a road, it's just painted brown now. This is not a meaningful change. 5. The 'improved connections across parking lot' are just painted crosswalks that should have

been there anyway, and are not in the right place to address any of the concerns from the community

6. A commercial main street continuing through University City will improve the interface with the podiums of those buildings, which have been struggling to become the gathering place as they were intended. If this is blocked off and pedestrians no longer have any reason to walk between the University City towers, businesses in there will struggle to survive.

Again. I'll plan on maintaining two cars, even after the kids have grown up and move out. Sounds like the right people are going to make money. This is transit-oriented development at its worst.

Despite complete renewal to blackiston park, proposal seems to turn it's back on this asset.

See comments regarding traffic congestion below.

see below comments.

Yes this is an improvement but it begs the larger question of the overall inadequate transportation planning for the entire section from London drugs to coop. there is far too much Crowchild destined traffic channeled onto Brentwood Blvd from 32nd ave.

We need to get away from the current big box mentality in Calgary and anything that moves us away from the conventional approach is a good start.

Again, it is an improvement however if the loading bays were below road grade then this would provide more sound buffer between road and park.

Please see above. Placing a road along the top of Blakiston Park is asking for accidents and reduces potential enjoyment of the park. The Park at the west end is already very narrow. Having vehicles along the top of the park will make the park noisy. It also puts park goers at the risk of fumes and car accidents.

It doesn't provide what was asked for. Commercial main street and park do not go together

The traffic will be impossible, it is not true the people only use LRT, the people have also a car there, sometimes more than one car.

I am also very concerned about the continuous traffic on the road they want to put along the park passing in front of the green and yellow building of University City. It will be impossible to bear the noise and emissions produced by all the trucks continuously coming in and out the Co-op for loading and unloading merchandise, not to mention all the garbage the Co-op will generate with meat, produce, etc, that will create a foul smelling atmosphere there, and specially for the Green and Yellow building and the back to their own new buildings as well. The people have the right to live peacefully, that is why a suburb is chosen, and the City of Calgary cannot approve every ambitious project without putting themselves in the shoes of the people that have to live there every day. The Condos will not be rented at a fair value, the Condos will go way down in this already difficult market, and the students that are the ones that will rent those Condos will opt for another place due to the smell, the noise, the traffic, that won't allow anyone in Summer time to enjoy the balconies and having the windows open. Also the buildings will be very close, there is no reason to increase the density there and creating more shadow to the buildings that today enjoy an exceptional open view to the NW and the mountains and the sun in the afternoon and the sunset. It will be all gone adding noise , traffic, trucks coming and going the whole day, garbage trucks every day and the smell in the area.

The Coop has to be closed during this ambitious project and rebuilt exactly where it is, and putting the high building on the other corner, and leave the gast station and Wendys right where they are now.

That café with all the traffic in front of it will be a nightmare to be seated in, with all the gas emissions , garbage trucks, big trucks going back and forth to the Coop. Please think about this, it will be a nightmare.

As I said above.
There should not be a vehical road along the park. It should be for bikes and walking only.
The existing development was virtually walled off from Blakiston and the Co-Op seemed to ignore the existence of the local community park. Now they suddenly propose an immense tower overshadowing the local park and the green space seems to benefit the sale-ability of their units, but the developer still does not want to provide the community with easy access their development. So if there is only downside in this for the locals, why allow it?
The configuration is still more a less the same. No meaning full improvements have been made. The lack of will to do so shows a lack of creativity.
I believe the developer has not understood the intent of the community request to create a vibrant commercial area rather than another set of apartments and stores with separated parking lots essentially isolated from existing commercial development in the area. Unviable? I think this reflects unimaginative. Given the scale of the proposed development, there are many possibilities. I don't see that the developer is expressing much creativity in this regard.
If Brentwood Rd. remains the main thoroughfare to reach Crowchild Trail, then I think an alternate route through the development is needed that would encourage more community residents to access the Coop and the small business in the development.
no.
Nope. Listen to the community, or shut the whole thing down. You DO NOT know better than us, or have to live with the result. I will stop shopping at Co-op immediately in response to their response.
I like it. Combining the park and small commercial is a good idea.
yes, i think its ok for the "mainstreet" to jog north to accommodate. I like how the mainstreet has greenspace to the north
Good compromise. It addresses the concern the best they can.
I think Quarry Bay needs to go back to the drawing board on this one, as it was a consistent concern for residents at workshops etc. The problem is not so much the commercial zone as the road, and any parking (other than bicycles and pedestrians) that would front the park, taking away a quiet, car free place to have lunch or coffee, read, relax and just enjoy the park space.
I like it. After hearing their reasoning it makes sense. By forcing a main road in the middle I think we'd be creating more less desirable retail and housing space and that doesn't help anyone. I know my neighbour worked on the area plan and says we need to follow it, but if it doesn't make sense for the landowner, that's a problem too. It sounds like what they proposed is better for everyone
Appreciate combining the loading docks. Changing the pavement isn't really the right part of the pedestrian interface. Only benefit there is if it's permeable paving to save CO-OP money on stormwater drainage (and community potentially construction impacts if less utility upgrades are required). It all depends on how active the at-grade buildings are, doors every 10 metres, no walls of glass/bricks/etc. Do not just face all buildings inwards towards the central massive parking lot. Sidewalks need to be minimum 3-4m wide (i.e. space for businesses to put racks of clothes, produce, etc outside, patios, and still have 2m for pedestrians. Doesn't have to be concrete, can use cheaper? material like permeable paving stones. Extra wide sidewalks on west side (facing LRT) of building labelled 4c too (same reasons). Like the car parking on the Blakiston Park side. Lots of bike parking racks everywhere - encourage people to use other modes than just driving. Do not just put in minimum per city bylaws. Think like downtown along Stephen Ave downtown, rows of them along sidewalks. It be great to get the at-grade interface that active,

<p>go after it (see comments re viability and not enough mixed use density above). Renders are not active enough (glass curtain wall/brick facade, no doors, no places to go in and out of); the fake render people won't be their in real life since it's a place to pass through, not a place to people watch, linger, or a destination (i.e. doorways).</p>
<p>Again, this is just a misdirect from the real issues, which is the over-development of the site. All of these proposals are no win solutions for the quality of the neighborhood with the problems previously cited (parking, traffic, noise, degraded appearance, density, etc.).</p>
<p>We were hoping to gather and use Brentwood Blvd for the kids and elderly in the area. Many of these residents walk to and from using this street, but we have no other gathering sites but Blackiston Park</p>
<p>looks fine.</p>
<p>I don't think this is appropriate. The commercial area should face the station, not the park.</p>
<p>unsure.</p>
<p>unsure</p>
<p>Re-aligning the commercial street along the Park is the worst part of the plan. It is a big slap in the face to the community and to the City, and is an insult to all those who contributed so much time and energy to preparing the Brentwood Station ARP. It would be a disappointment to, after renovating and upgrading the Park for the community benefit, to have it cut off from the commercial space by a road. It appears that this road will be used for a great deal of traffic including, loading and unloading, deliveries, parkade access, and local traffic to/from the east (potential for many residents with time).</p>
<p>Sounds like it will increase safety concerns for children who might use the park.</p>
<p>I am concerned with the proposed traffic flow through this area. It is already unsustainable. There are insufficient seats on the C Train during rush hour and so people at Brentwood will not get on the trains in the morning meaning they will use their cars. This is the opposite of what you are trying to achieve.</p>
<p>The road currently along coop is already very busy and often difficult to get of the parking lot. it seems to me there is still only one way in and out proposed by the applicant. again I see it problematic especially in the area where delivery trucks come in because its next to the underground parking entrance (at least that is what I remember from the plans I saw at the open house).</p>
<p>Am not in favor of this change. It will be hard to go to the park and especially if you are now crossing commercial road with children. Real safety issue.</p>
<p>See above.</p>
<p>No mowing, but tonnes of 'green-space'</p>
<p>Go low maintenance beautiful, designed to complement our climate.</p>
<p>This hardly addresses the community idea/concern of a commercial main street. Once again, the applicant has their own self interests in mind, and not the interests of the community. Let's not let them get away with this. Having a commercial main street is vital to the success of this Transit Oriented Development.</p>
<p>I feel that this development ignores the main street concept and should be rejected.</p>
<p>Expecting businesses to thrive on the backside of a building just because they face the park is poor planning. They won't thrive. A major redesign is needed here. Push for underground parking and create a space that's pedestrian friendly.</p>
<p>I think from the park you still will be looking at the back of the buildings, an alley feeling, as this is where the loading docks are</p>

<p>This is the worst aspect of the entire proposal. The central concept in the ARP was to create a vibrant, active space with a main street running from Charleswood Drive right through to the western edge of the TOD site. Placing the main street along Blakiston Park means there is no central street and instead the layout of the proposed Coop building chops the entire TOD site into two: the Coop site and the rest of the site.</p> <p>We already have 4 towers with empty buildings in the bottom. There is a dead-end road there that was supposed to continue through the Coop site. Now it will continue and circle Blakiston Park. Not appropriate.</p> <p>There is only one entrance into the Coop planned. If there is an accident on that busy intersection, all traffic will be re-routed alongside a park instead of through the middle of the site.</p>
<p>It should help to make the park seem like more than just an upgraded vacant lot.</p>
<p>Blakiston Park can't take the traffic flow that will be created. The main street should stay on Brentwood Road.</p>
<p>No. The road along Blakiston Park is a bad idea. For one, it is aligned very close to the park, especially along the 'outdoor fitness equipment area'. Fumes and exhaust from the vehicles would be a health hazard and extremely unpleasant.</p>
<p>The commercial Main Street should be connected to the street that already exhibits behind University City. It would run down the middle of the complex. This would give easier access to vehicles and pedestrians.</p>
<p>If the community will is to have a Commercial Main Street in the centre of the complex that does not increase flow through the neighborhood, then it should be the prerogative of the developer to make all attempts to fulfil that will without question. This seems as though the city is backing a developer that has little interest in the community will.</p>
<p>Without a commercial main street, Brentwood Rd. access will be poorly served.</p>
<p>Fine. A commercial main street doesn't belong in that kind of development anyway -- it's too small. in this case, I agree with the applicant.</p>
<p>I think it is very sad to propose any new roads along or through parks. It ruins the atmosphere for anyone trying to enjoy the park and could create a dangerous situation for children playing.</p>
<p>I am not sure what this part means. I looked at the map/architectural drawing above and it isn't clear what these changes are. Maybe more details need to be provided?</p>
<p>When I was in the engagement meetings, the issue raised regarding the main street was that of traffic, i.e. with all of these new buildings (Co-Op, Rio Can, etc) there will be a bigger traffic density. That, coupled with everyone leaving UofC and trying to get west on Crowchild, means a lot of traffic during rush hours. People are concerned that there is basically nothing that can be done to alleviate this increased traffic. Is that the case? In the FAQ they talk about a traffic assessment study. Should this be done and disseminated to the community prior to final acceptance of these plans?</p>
<p>Given the applicant's reasons in the proposal change, I don't think there is more that could be changed. It is still not ideal but I think they are doing what they can to address the issue.</p>
<p>It could be more pedestrian friendly</p>
<p>NO</p>
<p>That area should be pedestrian/cycle friendly - not vehicular.</p>
<p>It should not be along the park! People should be able to come and go from the park, not have to cross a street. A commercial street along a park makes little sense. If I go to the park it is to relax and enjoy the trees and grass, not to hear traffic behind me.</p>

It doesn't look very inviting .The solution offered is mediocre?
Seems ok, though unsure about the details.
I do not feel that this is an issue. I think that as long as there is connection to University City the development is fine. However, consideration should be made to ensure pedestrians crossing in and out of the park are safe. It should be clearly labeled as a playground area to keep speeds down as much as possible.
I don't mind the street being along Blakiston Park. The other alternative, if the street runs through the middle of the space, is that the back of buildings will face the park? That sounds worse than having a street there, with buildings back a bit off the park, as long as there are means put in place along the road to try to ensure cars are not speeding along the park.
The applicants have made no attempt to move or re-orient the Co-op instead. If they keep the main entrance of the Co-op oriented towards North-West, then of course they have no choice. Another option would be to re-orient the main entrance of the Co-op to North-East, which would make the long side of the Co-op parallel to Brentwood Road. This is now possible since the additional vehicle access point from Brentwood Road has been removed. No, the Station ARP should not be amended to re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park, because it would isolate the East part of the mall from the redeveloped part.
I'm really uncertain about the street re-alignment as it is hard to imagine - will the street be facing blank walls on one side and the park on the other? If the street needs to run beside the park, then the small businesses, dining, etc should be facing the street and park as well with the large blank walls facing towards each other in the middle. The placement of the Co-op will have great impact on those decisions. The street doesn't go anywhere - so what's the point of it? If it doesn't create a thoroughfare either to the businesses or back to Brentwood Road - why is it there?
it doesn't meet the needs of those living west and north of the proposed store site. access to the bus lanes along the access road .
Question 5. Road Alignment
Do you feel the changes to the plan have improved the interface with Blakiston Park? Why or why not?
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
It still looks like a big shopping market and some places to live - not very creative
Good but - please focus on pedestrians also (and green)
Yes
No. Traffic.
Yes
No, because they do not fit with community values. SARP - "It will be a people place with quality connections... Attractive public spaces and a wide variety of uses..." I do not see quality connections to the community or attractive public spaces. This development will not be a place to make the community proud.
No. You are asking people to take too many steps. We can't see around corners, so spontaneous drop in pedestrian traffic would not materialize
No. The commercial main street suits the way we use this mall better
No see above [No terrible idea. Not one of the visionary exercises show a road only a sidewalk. People want to walk from London Drugs to Wendys or other stores and shouldn't have to go around a store in the middle]

I also don't think this is acceptable because it (the amendment to eliminate main street and redirect along Blakiston) allows the Coop site to turn its back on the rest of Brentwood station, isolate themselves, block pedestrian routes between the LRT and the rest of the site, and ignores the work and public engagement that was done to establish the ARP. Transit-orientated development has to mean more than a single density number, and for the City to fulfill its community visions the whole site needs to work coherently, not in parts.
If you put fewer buildings on the awkward shaped site, would a "high street" be feasible? Please respond
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
On the northwest side yes. On the northern and northeastern sides no.
No, why would you purposefully put traffic adjacent to a newly developed greenspace? It will greatly take away from the attraction of this new park.
There should be NO roads adjoining Blakiston Park - in addition to comments above, isolated road/laneways only encourage criminal activity and we have enough of that already.
The park area is behind the current store location and not easily seen from the main road.
In a small way, nut still not overly connected.
No, not particularly. See above comment re proposed cafe,
Not at all for the same reasons listed above
Having a street along Blakiston park is not the answer here. The park should have a wide entrance aligned with the c-train stairs, the rest of the park edge could be a sidewalk with patio entrances for townhouses similar to what has been done for the "blue" phase of the university city development.
don't see any real "improvement", its just different
No.
JFC NO. Absolutely do not put a road OR parking alongside the park! What an eyesore to a park that's just been renovated. This isn't fish creek. It's a small park, especially in the area behind that building. Run a road along side it and you might as well not even HAVE a park.
Absolutely not. These changes will make it more inaccessible to children and seniors.
yes
Interface with Blakiston Park improved. Removed the backs of all of the stores and created a commercial main street along the park. Great idea.
Yes, allows the park to be accessed easily.
Definitely improved. We don't want only the backs of buildings to face the park.
See my comments in the previous box. I cannot see in any way that this has improved the interface. Not sure how putting the main road through the development adjacent to the park could be in any way thought of as an improvement.
No they have just added traffic calming measures, the cars will still be there and use it as a main street.
Increased traffic near a park that is so small will make the park significantly less attractive for users. I worry about its loss for neighbourhood children.
Having the ring road, and buildings around the perimeter cuts off access to the park..having to skirt around buildings - and now there will be additional cards driving around the back of the buildings - OUCH. Not my idea of a positive change for the park, or residents in or around the park.
What is Blakiston Park going to be like in the end?? It's taken too long to do.
Yes.
Yes

<p>1. Blakiston Park will be used by the local residents of the condos, apartments, and towers in the area. There is no point in encouraging the public to also use Blakiston Park which is rather small as it is. Let's keep it as pristine and quiet as possible, given the constraints I've listed above.</p> <p>2. People should feel safe and tranquil walking to Blakiston Park with their strollers, babies, and older kids. They don't want to have to worry about even more car traffic and congestion which would increase safety concerns and emotional stress.</p>
<p>If the road alignment is vehicular: No, because it may block off pedestrian access to the Park, and Park users may be agitated by road noise.</p> <p>If the road alignment is pedestrian: Yes, because residents may be more likely to make use of the Park.</p>
No, in fact it got worse because they added a chain link fence.
Making the park more accessible (add lights and paths, so the park looks safe at night) would be best.
Somewhat. Please see the box above for further detail.
Anything would be an improvement over the existing situation.
I think that the improved interface will ensure residents of Brentwood have easy access to the site. Please ensure that there is no fencing or obstacles from the Park to the site. Also please ensure the road has ample lighting for night time shopping.
Yes. I do like the idea of a restaurant with plaza space on one end and a coffee shop on the other. Can we do anything to make the gas station/convenience store/Wendy's more enticing? That whole area is ugly!!!!
?
Yes, the added tree line allows for visitors to interact with the park if they want, and allows park goers the option to access the property or enjoy the park in peace without looking into a parking lot.
From the perspective of someone approaching from Brisebois Drive, I don't see a significant difference. We will still have to cut through a portion of the greenspace and cross a parking lot to get to the grocery. We don't stop at the park typically so interface doesn't make much of a difference. Did planners take into account these "goat trails" between the corner of the park and the grocery site, which are reflective of actual use, when revamping the park or with a view to the Co-op changes?
NO – There should be no vehicle access against the park! Looks like a BAD IDEA....I find it hard to believe that there is ANY community support for this proposal. NO - cars will still be there and use it as a main street.
See above.
Has the potential to make the park and the development feel integrated, rather than separate spaces. Time will tell whether this actually happens.
Yes, I do.
The pathway is good, as there was no ramp and I've been asking for one for years, however, I feel the overall design is backing on to the park, not opening up to it. I would prefer to see the tall buildings along the road that is near the train station.
see above
No. The park has been a sanctuary. Development around the park detracts from this
I highly doubt that the interface with Blakiston Park will make much of a difference. The main issue would be with the increase in vehicle traffic to the area would be to widen the road along Brentwood Rd. The staff and students at the UofC utilize Brentwood Rd to access Crowchild Trail. During the summer that isn't much of an issue but Sept-April it can be very

frustrating going through that area to go home. There are already long waits to get through the area let alone get in and out of the Coop parking lot. Waiting on Brentwood Rd. I have seen numerous near misses with vehicles coming in and out of University City, Coop and the pedestrians that insist on walking across the road instead of using the bridge and people that are so impatient to go that they use the bike lane and nearly hit people.
No, it makes the park less accessible.
I hope so. What about getting through the park to the LRT? Both cyclist & pedestrian?
No. They are taking more & more of the existing park...High density buildings such as this are taking control over are parks...The TOD is out of control around this development.
Yes
Any buffer area will improve the interface from the previous version, so yes.
Yes
I do not feel the changes to the plan have improved the interface with Blakiston Park. If Co-op claims that the "majority" of consumers in this area would be travelling by "LRT" instead of driving, I do not see how refusing to built a commercial main street that connects through the station area would be an improvement for this plan.
No. Decreased access for pedestrians.
It's too tall.
Yes, definitely. I appreciate that loading doors have been consolidated or eliminated to minimize the visual impact on the park. The current co-op is a particularly bad offender: the view from the park is very unsightly. The new design is much better.
No. Blakiston Park is not and should not be considered part of this development just to satisfy YOUR needs.
Wonder if the Park will really be used but if it is has traffic been addressed? Most parks aren't located near main roads.
No. From what I can see. The plans there is only one entrance to the area from park very near loading dock.
Yes
No. Does not improve the interface with Blakiston Park due to increased traffic through / in between the buildings, visibility will be decreased .
Yes - moving the business deliveries, ramps, etc. away from the park edge is an improvement.
Yes. Traffic flow seems relatively simple.
Making the boundary with Blakiston Park a road that serves more than service vehicles is definitely not an acceptable interface. The vehicle connection to University City and east should remain blocked. And, again, losing the potential for public enjoyment of suitable commercial businesses facing the park is loss of a huge opportunity. It appears the actual motive is profit...providing single occupant town houses with a premium view and command of expensive rent or sale price.
The interface must be attractive (see my two above comments). Right now I cannot tell from the information boards what this interface would look like and how it would transition into the park area, other than there is some space provided for this transition. If all there is facing the park is the back of buildings, then creating a space back there, looking at the back wall of a building does not do much for attractiveness.
Fundamental information has not been provided and would need to be in order to answer his question appropriately.

If the traffic calming measures are strong enough to keep only local traffic on the Blakiston road, the road will function as an offset for the buildings and will provide a buffer to the park that could be an asset with proper landscaping.
If the new plans improve the interface with Blakiston Park mainly depends on the number of cars expected on the road, interest to pedestrian, traffic calming measures, greenery etc.
No it has not. Money is being spent right now on this Park to make it attractive , useful & safe for all ages in the community. Commercial businesses , etc, will hinder these improvements.
seems to be somewhat reasonable
The changes have done nothing meaningful to improve the interface with Blakiston Park. All they have done is tweaked a median and painted the road brown. This doesn't improve pedestrian safety (or the fact that it would still be jaywalking to walk to the Coop site at any point outside the designated park access at the corner). Additionally, this road is still designated for access for semi-trailers, loading docks, garbage bins; so it will never be a good pedestrian gathering place because it will feel like (and is) the backside of the site.
No. Not in the least. All of us who preached that density would help to improve vibrancy etc. are eating crow now.
No
The area cannot accommodate this much additional traffic; it doesn't matter which interface is chosen.
Concerned over safety of pedestrian interface from Blakiston Park. Will need to be well lit. Consider having a "call security" pole (like at most universities for their pathways and like one by the Bow River pathways East Village).
It has improved the interface but still could go further. Has there been any attempt to look at similar examples of commercial redevelopment next to a park? I realize the developer wants to minimize its cost but can the city planners explore other options?
Not at all. Please see above.
Less so. Buildings are too tall for overlooking the park.
For all the reasons I gave above, please look at how NOT peaceful this place will be after they construct in that very small lot all what they want to construct. Lots of people living there, lots of garbage from buildings and Coop, lots of traffic, darkening of the adjacent buildings, narrow roads adjacent to Blakiston Park.
Please study well the project by standing exactly where they want to build each building and look at all the buildings, park, homes that will be affected.
No. It would be safer without motorized vehicles.
No, few people, especially seniors, pedestrian-shop for groceries, they need to get the groceries home. I have never seen a frail senior carrying 20lb of flour in one hand and a sack of cat food in the other. Similarly, the family-sized quantities that younger residents shop for are too bulky to carry far. The access proposed is to allow their residents to easily access the community, not to allow the community ready access to the Co-op.
Not really it merely is a slightly better looking service road
No. The proposed project still reflects a vision to have a self-contained shopping and apartment complex with no relation to the existing community or the recent development to the south. Sadly, we are on the verge, I believe, of creating another development that is a disconnected silo and has no architectural or functional connection with the surrounding region.
no.

No. See above.
yes, I like how blakiston park is now integrated with with the mainstreet and how this realignment almost increases the usable space of the lot and integrates it into the design
Sure. Not perfect but they are good.
Chain link fence is unsightly. The changes have not improved the interface, as the traffic will completely destroy the intent of a commercial street that is less congested with vehicles, trucks, and the emissions at the interface with the park. I think the road also impacts park users who are within hearing, seeing and smelling distance of cars and trucks (many diesel burning and therefore smell).
Yes. like the cobblestone idea and having homes face the park - would make everyone safer
Mimimally. They need to do better.
Appreciate the attempt at a linear plaza kind of concept, but the buildings (in the renders at least) still make the development look like it's turned inward away from the community towards its parking lot.
The sidewalk width and on-street parking looks promising. Buildings at grade being active are key. People need reasons to be/stay on this street, not just traverse it to the LRT and other side of the buildings.
Why spend the extra money on wider sidewalks and different paving if no one's going to be there?
What about the back (north) of the gas station convenience store? Make this building 4 storeys high with office space above the at grade store with access from the park/north and west side. Add on-street parking to Brentwood Rd (better pedestrian environment with parked cars between sidewalk and road). CO-OP is not using this part of their land enough-maximize use of your available land. Activate the north and west edges with an entrance and reason for people to at least pass through the space. Right now it looks like a future homeless camp/like some architect said "what do we do with these sides of the building; it's 5pm on a Friday, fuck it." Brentwood Rd is busy, this could be valuable streetfront/office that's a lost opportunity- think of the amount of traffic passing by this point on the road.
None of this has been clearly shown on a map to know what changes are planned.
Yes, it is difficult to get everything in.
unsure
unsure
The changes to the plan are not an improvement over the concept of a commercial main street and pedestrian park access as envisioned in the ARP. Adding a small café in a shadowed space and putting different coloured stone on a road do not alter the fact that the development as it stands turns its back onto the park, and onto the remainder of the commercial space to the east (Brentwood Village Mall). Having a road follow the perimeter of the Park takes away from the potential vibrancy as intended for pedestrians and cyclists.
i see traffic congestion a problem at that interface with Blakiston Park. again have you considered drop off points that won't block traffic?
No because I still see a real disconnect to the park from the entire Brentwood area.
Not if it's just a big grassy area. Consider planting edible bushes, and having compost areas.
No. A road with high traffic is not safe for the area residents, especially seniors and children.
They made the concrete prettier, lip service at best.
No. There's still a huge building between the park and the parking/shopping area. How can that possibly mean an improved interface?
Road Alignment

<p>The ARP stresses the need for a commercial main street that connects through the station area. In community workshops, all groups also indicated a commercial main street was desirable (as shown on the City of Calgary heat map as part of the What We Heard Report).</p> <p>The applicants have moved the road alignment to be along Blakiston Park, indicating site constraints make this the only feasible option. This would re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park instead of through the site.</p> <p>Should the Station ARP be amended to re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park?</p> <p>The applicants have made no attempt to move or re-orient the Co-op instead. If they keep the main entrance of the Coop oriented towards North-West, then of course they have no choice. Another option would be to re-orient the main entrance of the Co-op to North-East, which would make the long side of the Co-op parallel to Brentwood Road. This is now possible since the additional vehicle access point from Brentwood Road has been removed. No, the Station ARP should not be amended to re-align the commercial main street along Blakiston Park, because it would isolate the East part of the mall from the redeveloped part.</p>
<p>From the plan and three-dimensional rendering presented, we cannot judge, also because the three-dimensional rendering is from the side opposite to Blakiston Park. There is the need for more information and an appropriate three-dimensional view.</p>
<p>It really depends on whether the park will face blank walls across the street or if businesses/restaurants will be available and face the street. The park may be less appealing for children and dogs if it is unfenced and bordered by a street.</p>
<p>The walk from the station seems nicer</p>
<p>There was also supposed to be a lot of interface with the park, especially since the park is undergoing a multi-million dollar renovation right now. Instead there is a road that users will have to run across, making it both inconvenient and dangerous. Get rid of that road. In all the workshops, all groups said no to a road in that location along the park. NOBODY placed a road there, only the developers.</p> <p>Building 3 is a very long building that blocks off access to and from the site unless you walk all the way around it.</p>
<p>Hard to tell, but yes.</p>
<p>No, not at all. For all the reasons I have listed above.</p> <p>Mainly - the height of the complex - the road along the park</p> <p>Plus Brentwood Road is already extremely busy, and at rush hour, the traffic is backed up almost to Charleswood Dr. Now that we are adding a substantial number of new residences, the traffic will even be worse. Brentwood Blvd should be widened, with a dedicated left turning lane to enter this new complex.</p>
<p>I don't feel there is enough information to say at this time.</p>
<p>There is still a poor connection to Blakiston Park with the main commercial road bisecting that connection.</p>

Any greenery that separates a commercial area from a residential area is a good thing; however I really don't feel that most users are going to come into this development by way of Blakiston Park anyway.
See above.
I am concede that it will make the interface with Blakiston Park a little too busy with traffic.
they could do more to improve and connect with the park.
NO
Not really. Still not very warm or inviting.
No, the park is a prime piece of land and a road will disrupt users, bring noise, etc. There will be people running across the road from the park. There are only a few places to get across because the buildings block access.
These changes look meagre. The park design is promising to be vibrant and inviting and you would like to see that reflected in the buildings that face the park! That does not happen in the plans as they are now.
Yes, overall it seems to be more desirable to fit into the space.
I think they are okay but could still use some review of the interface with the park. There is still a lot of the back of Coop facing the park. However the addition of the cafe with the patio is great!
Question 6: Station Area Redevelopment Plan
An amendment to the Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment Plan may be required along with this land use redesignation. Based on the current amended plans, policies including the maximum height allowed within the site and the orientation and alignment of the commercial main street will need to be amended to accommodate the proposed development.
The maximum height allowed will need to be increased from 90 metres to 120 metres. The orientation of the commercial main street will have to be re-aligned to be along Blakiston Park rather than through the centre of the site. More information on the Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment Plan can be found here.
Do you feel these amendments are acceptable? Please tell us why or why not.
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
Yes
As stated, higher buildings only spell safety concerns and alienation to me - main street away from shopping; train makes no sense
Yes
No. Traffic to access the businesses will increase. Parking for the # businesses will have to be increased. Walkability is diminished
The Brentwood station ARP should keep the map. Hieght at 90m - street realignment looks o.k. but will always be in shadow - joy in winter
No. The height should not exceed 90m. The SARP maximum is 90m. The City and community spent a lot of time and money to develop the SARP. The City should stand by their commitment.
No. 120m is too tall. Doesn't "fit" the neighbourhood. The realignment isolates Coop from Blackiston and vice versa.
No. Don't agree w/ Brentwood Community Association ideas.
No the building would be too tall and the site will be awkward to walk thru

No, these amendments are not acceptable. Why is the planning community engagement, and long term vision for the entire area at the whim of the developer of a single lot?
Definitely against increasing the maximum allowable height! The redevelopment plan should conform to the City's plan, not the other way around
Emphatic No! As described in #1, please stick to you original guidelines - they are sound and still apply to the current development
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
Yes
These amendments are NOT acceptable. See above. The solution is to maintain the commercial main street through the centre of the site as originally planned. Otherwise, you will have uncontrollable traffic around the site and adjacent to a greenspace/park. There is already a potential traffic issue at Brentwood Blvd. and Brantford Drive NW.
I am against accommodating even taller structures (potentially 120m). Even 90m is too tall. A permissible building height of 38m is my preferred maximum height. The proposed building heights will render the Blakiston park undesirable. Maybe during the summer when the sun is at its highest point, will the park will be under full sunlight parts of the day and a place to be (and maybe not even then due to the lack of landscaping plant materials that will survive or flourish there), but during the spring, fall and winter this park will be a dark and cold place as it will be cast a shadow from the 100 + meter tall building: not a welcoming space it is now.
No comment on the orientation change.
NO - see comments above
Making the station area higher also increases the industrial nature of the project.
Yes
Yes
No, the existing Brentwood Station Area Plan is has an excellent vision for the community and plenty of room for developers to work within the plan. I do not understand why coop is insisting on proposing both increased height and removal of the main street. Many, many local volunteers worked for a long time to convince our NIMBY neighbours that the area redevelopment plan was a good idea. Now the developers are asking for more from us. I want to see the site redeveloped as per the original area redevelopment plan, rather than in a way designed to maximize real-estate profits for coop's developer partner at the expense of the walk-ability and connectivity of what is supposed to be our local commercial hub.
see above. Don't really see why the street has to be between the park and the people
No. Buildings WAY too tall. Putting a road along Blakiston Park is the worst idea ever and applicant should feel bad for even thinking about it.
I sincerely feel that these amendments are unacceptable. This area of Brentwood is being totally devastated by this concept. It literally turns the community into a transportation hub and the sense of community is gone
yes
Yes, by increasing the height you are encouraging more people to stay in the area! With an increase in density, there will be stronger demands for more services which will pop up in the area and encourage more pedestrians to visit the area.
No. The development as proposed does not meet the desires of the community. If the commercial main street (or any other component) cannot be met, then the project is a loser. It's better to have no project than a bad project.
More than acceptable.

No this is no acceptable. The maximum height should remain at 90m to be compliant with the station redevelopment plan. Surrounding park and house will be affected by such height increase and Brentwood is composed mainly of low lying developments.
Yes.
Nope - it will make it more difficult for people with mobility issues to access the C-train.
No height should remain at 90m!
Yes.
Not at all. These ARPs are developed after a lot of work and input by both City staff and the involved communities. There were probably very good reasons why 90 metres was set as the maximum height. If a developer wants to incorporate a new project they should develop the proposal within the ARPs. Otherwise why bother developing guidelines? The Coop knew what the guidelines were when they started out on this project, so they should have done their homework to make the project fit and to make a proposal that makes sense financially within the guidelines. As mentioned putting the main road adjacent to the park just does not make sense and I feel really adds a barrier.
No the original SARP was well thought out and 90 meters although too high in my mind is a height that I can live with. Residential towers create a worry for me in the event of fires etc. The people who will eventually live there may have to use the stairs, be reasonable 30 floors is too high.
No. I feel that these amendments are a way of pushing responsibility for the development onto the city. The cascade effect caused by the plan's desire to add density to the neighbourhood is creating the problem. Why not develop in a way that integrates with the community?
No, the #1 building is too high - does nothing to enhance the site and takes away from the park and inhibits the view of the current residents of the 'plastic' condos. Allowing trucks, and loading and parking along Blakiston Park will become a nightmare - as will the access to and from the site.
The existing buildings are high enough. NO increase in height!!!!
Yes, I'm fine with them.
Yes, putting this main street at the park and out of the way of drivers passing through is better.
1. NO -- for the reasons given above. They (the planners and developers) might as well forget about the concept and purpose of Blakiston Park if they are proposing a re-orientation of the commercial main street along it. If they are absolutely intent on putting the commercial main street along Blakiston Park, it would be better to wipe the park out entirely, pave it over with concrete, and forget about "green spaces, relaxation, tranquility, and peace of mind".
Yes, they are acceptable.
No, they are not acceptable, there was a lot of time and money that went into the plan and this developer is simply ignoring the concepts.
No. if referring to the New commercial main street that will connect the Brentwood Mall development with the Coop development is fine and should be coordinated (planners in Calgary only look at one pile at a time, then ask for input and only get a magnified local one. If everyone saw the whole picture then there would be not so many amendments, This street issue is therefore a none issue, since it is not designed for heavy traffic just part of the whole complex design. Widen existing roads if increased traffic is required and decrease height to keep the community cozy.
I do not feel the amendments are acceptable. They should not be allowed.
If the concern in regards to a more pedestrian friendly (green, trees, walkways) interface between the complex and Blakistan Park is addressed and green spaces with trees, benches

and grass are the focus rather than car oriented textured pavement, than the amendments will be considered acceptable.
I don't feel the height amendment is acceptable. The building is still too tall. University City has been an example of large buildings imposed on the neighbourhood. My observations of that development are: -How do inhabitants of University City engage with the rest of the neighbourhood? Do they feel themselves inhabitants of Brentwood? Was there ever a plan to encourage this? -Little of interest has yet appeared on University City retail levels (lots of 'for lease' signs even years later). -The space between those buildings is a dark wind tunnel which pedestrians avoid. -Traffic and parking in the area are chaotic. Brentwood has been touted as a community where new ideas can be tried. Let's learn from previous errors.
I think these amendments are acceptable. I want to see a commercial Main Street more than anything for the Brentwood area.
Not happy about how high Leave height restrictions in place
Still having trouble with that one and really wondering if all of this is needed as other areas of the community (along Northland; Northland Shopping Centre; the Varsity development, etc.) are also being developed. It is honestly hard to tell the overall plan from that one "final" site plan. It would also be very helpful to see a full site plan including the University City and Brentwood "Mall" (ha!) area. We would have a much better concept at that point.
Policies should be followed and no additional height should be allowed.
I'd hate to see traffic get too busy along Blakiston Park. Isn't this redevelopment meant to bring life back to that park? To make it also more of a busy street removes that appeal.
NO! The maximum height should remain at 90 metres! It is clear that the community wishes for this. Please actually listen here. If there is one thing that should still change in this plan it is that the maximum height stays at 90m!
I do not feel that increasing the height of the buildings will be of benefit to the area.
Yes these amendments are 100% acceptable. Calgary desperately needs more housing near C-Train stations and especially near the University of Calgary. This development will help Calgary grow into a more vibrant and sustainable city.
It's not clear whether the station or access to it is being changed or not. The height amendments are not acceptable. The name "Brentwood Station Area" is a bit ambiguous. The station and park are the City's but isn't most of the development site a commercial property? The station and access to it don't seem to be changing in the plan.
NO, I DO NOT FIND THE AMENDMENTS ACCEPTABLE. The original SARP was max 90 meters high for a tower (which I think is still too high). I don't believe there is any community support for a 30-story. TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE
See above.
The orientation of the commercial main street - yes. Much better than previous plan. No opinion on the height issue.
Yes, they are acceptable.
No. The main building is way too high. It is ugly to look at. It does not blend well with the current University City towers. It's too high. Please cap them to the height of University City towers.

No. I have been shopping at Brentwood Coop since it opened. I know that there is a bigger one down Crowchild, but it would not be convenient to me. As it is, students need more food stores and fewer "designer shops" (nails, massage, etc) and I can't see why anyone in their right mind would want more parking. Move the entire concept to University City and leave us alone.
No. Too much money, construction, time, inconvenience caused by this project.
No, height of 120 metres will block the sun, create unsafe areas and encourage "projects".
I think realigning the main street to the park, will help prevent Blakiston Park from being the isolated wasteland that it is now.
Yes
Maximum height, yes, that is acceptable. Commercial main street orientation is not acceptable. The whole point of the commercial main street is to connect the multiple districts within the brentwood mall area to unify the area and help control traffic. If University City can follow the ARP, why can't Coop?
Yes
No. Money and effort was spent to create the ARP, and the general layout presented in the ARP (and the more recent workshops) looks really great! I think we should stick to the ARP.
Increasing the maximum height for buildings will create more traffic congestion, block of sunlight for the surrounding areas, lower the value of the surrounding houses and condos, as well as, create a much more crowded environment that will lead to more social problems such as looting and theft in the area just like what University City Condos have brought over the past 2 years. With that taken into consideration, I do not see why these amendments are acceptable.
No. Please see reasoning above. There is no reason to jump to this high height of building outside the downtown core. It detracts from the residential communities around the redevelopment area.
NO. It's too tall.
I strongly support this plan, particularly the emphasis on walking and biking. The area will be a hub for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Good connectivity to bike path in surrounding areas is essential.
Yes, these amendments are acceptable. I think the orientation of the main commercial street along Blakiston Parks improves connectivity with the neighbourhood and with pedestrians.
Idiots.
It appears that the principles of the ARP are being abandoned to facilitate redevelopment. Surface parking, gas station and development form are not consistent with ARP. Was the ARP wrong? What is the justification for compromise when the ARP is relatively new?
Density should be earned through good design not granted because we don't like what is there today.
No I'm not in favour of increasing the maximin height. Believe it will increase traffic, shade other homes, allow for future buildings to be built in area, changes this quiet feeling community and will be an eye sore.
Continue to feel that if developer would consider reducing some residential space then main road could be on site instead of making it happen somewhere else. Still question whether this is the best time for this kind of development in Calgary.
No. The purpose of the original city plans for areas such as this was to ensure that the proposed development didn't overwhelm the community. 90 meters is high enough (even that is too high). Two towers needing the increase. We also have the 4 newer devopments

<p>already constructed east of project plus two more to be constructed in near future adjacent to those 4. These comments do not even consider the proposed changes to the Brentwood mall near Charles wood drive.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>It is absolutely NOT Acceptable to increase the maximum height allowed from 90 metres to 120 metres.</p>
<p>Yes. Some increase in height is necessary to achieve sufficient population density to support local cafes, restaurants, and retail outlets and services.</p>
<p>No. The maximum height, alignments, etc. were developed to mitigate many of the concerns that have been raised by the community. There is no 'need' to increase the height except perhaps greed. How many owners will live in the tower? How many units will become Air BnB as in existing towers in University City? How many apartment/condo owners want a hotel room across the hall from them or next door? How many units will be purchased by real estate speculators? These are not the goals of a sustainable, walkable, vibrant, human scaled city.</p>
<p>The proposed development is a totally different concept from the "urban village" that is the primary intent of the ARP. It isn't just a few amendments to problem details, it is nothing short of contemptuous. As a citizen of Brentwood, and the city as a whole, I expect the City planning authorities to develop integrated plans, and STICK TO THEM. The opportunity to challenge the concept was during the development of the ARP, not when use of a particular parcel of land affected is designed to meet the desires of a private developer whose primary motive is their profit. Abandon the ARP and you implicitly admit the zoning process is corrupt.</p>
<p>I do not support amending the ASP to allow more height. This was discussed further in one of the above comments.</p>
<p>Moving the orientation of the commercial main street along Blakiston Park is probably acceptable if they can show it will still be functional and attractive.</p>
<p>Compromising on the main street is unacceptable as this is a foundation for the ARP. This sets a precedent that the core values of the ARP can be eliminated for the short term profit of a developer.</p>
<p>The additional height is being used to offset lower height buildings along the park face thus reduced shadowing and improved aesthetics. As this is a tool that is being used to improve the site I feel that this is an acceptable amendment.</p>
<p>The PDF link for the Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment Plan does not work, hence I can not agree with any point of the amended plan. I do not agree with the increase in height as it would overpower the entire redeveloped Brentwood mall complex, As noted in the point above, I do not agree with re-courting the commercial main street which (in the proposed way) leads to an elimination of the main street for the entire length of Brentwood Commons.</p>
<p>Money is being spent right now to improve Blakiston Park. This will be a step backwards & improvements will be demolished. This means the tax money spent on the Park today will be for nothing. Seems like a waste of tax money!!</p>
<p>No I feel the max height should not be increased to 120 meters and should stay at 90 meters, we do not need downtown like buildings in our residential community</p>
<p>These amendments are not acceptable. The original ARP was already the result of a detailed planning exercise and public consultation. To allow a single developer to amend the ARP,</p>

especially with a site that is turned in on itself and turns its back to the rest of the ARP area, makes a mockery of the entire process. This site also ignores the valuable interface with Blakiston park, and makes the money spent to rejuvenate the park look like a waste. The commercial main street and its associated pedestrian connectivity through the site encouraged access to the C-train and provided spaces for local shop interfaces that would be severely diminished if this proposal were allowed to go ahead. The height is totally out of step with the rest of the community and the rest of the ARP area, and the layout that isolates Coop's site from the rest of the ARP goes completely against the City's planning policies. TOD has to mean more than a single density number, and the ARP process has to mean more than a set of words that any developer can change on a whim.

Absolutely not. I was actually hoping for taller building and more density; however, the way this project is shaping up we are better off living with the status quo and waiting for a project with vision and developers with resources. I have done a complete 180 and have resolved to lend all of my experience and efforts to ensure that this project gets a complete reboot.

Buildings are way too high

As indicated above there is no justification for a relaxation of the height restriction beyond 90 meters and even that is far in excess of what is acceptable.

No, this opens the flood gates to dramatically changing the look and feel of the community. The developer is only concerned with the execution of the project, they are in and out and not long term residence of the community.

Not at all.

I will simply be repeating myself!!!! The City should NOT change its height limit past the current 90 metres. The City should NOT allow a road along the top of Blakiston Park. Quarry Bay KNEW the City rules before they decided to be involved with the project. If they didn't like the height restrictions, then they should NOT have taken on the project! Quarry Bay knew that the Coop side of Blakiston Park was very narrow and could not safely handle vehicle traffic. If they didn't like that, then they should NOT have taken on the project. I hope that the City will be FIRM on its policies!!! Don't let developers push you (and citizens) around!!!

The heights are too much. Low rise buildings provide a much more pleasing street scape and atmosphere.

The amendments are not acceptable at all, it will be a mistake from the City to accept the project like this.

The traffic will be impossible, it is not true the people only use LRT, the people have also a car there, sometimes more than one car.

I am also very concerned about the continuous traffic on the road they want to put along the park passing in front of the green and yellow building of University City. It will be impossible to bear the noise and emissions produced by all the trucks continuously coming in and out the Co-op for loading and unloading merchandise, not to mention all the garbage the Co-op will generate with meat, produce, etc, that will create a foul smelling atmosphere there, and specially for the Green and Yellow building and the back to their own new buildings as well. The people have the right to live peacefully, that is why a suburb is chosen, and the City of Calgary cannot approve every ambitious project without putting themselves in the shoes of the people that have to live there every day. The Condos will not be rented at a fair value, the Condos will go way down in this already difficult market, and the students that are the ones that will rent those Condos will opt for another place due to the smell, the noise, the traffic, that won't allow anyone in Summer time to enjoy the balconies and having the windows open. Also the buildings will be very close, there is no reason to increase the density there and creating more shadow to the buildings that today enjoy an exceptional open view to the NW and the mountains and the sun in the afternoon and the sunset. It will be all gone adding

<p>noise , traffic, trucks coming and going the whole day, garbage trucks every day and the smell in the area.</p> <p>The Coop has to be closed during this ambitious project and rebuilt exactly where it is, and putting the high building on the other corner, and leave the gast station and Wendys right where they are now.</p> <p>That café with all the traffic in front of it will be a nightmare to be seated in, with all the gas emissions , garbage trucks, big trucks going back and forth to the Coop. Please think about this, it will be a nightmare.</p>
<p>I answered this question above. There was reasons why 90 meters were agreed upon when the plan was created, why do you think this should be changed?</p>
<p>See comments in Development Fit. There is no point is having any ARP's at all in this City if they are simply there to stop developers who do not have deep enough pockets to fund a land use redesignation. There was considerable consultation and compromise that went into the existing ARP and land use, and it should not be abandoned to meet the commercial fancy of one developer. I too made a financial decision when I bought a house in the community, expecting the ARP to remain in place.</p>
<p>No, considering Brentwood station is supposed to be turned in to a transit oriented development the proposed co-op development will eliminate that. It will i sure the area will continue to be mostly catering to car traffic. Also the added height won't increase density it wil just make up for the potential density that could be created in the parking lot, service roads and gas station.</p>
<p>No. There are maximum height allowances that have been put in place for very good reasons. Ninety metres will still allow for a very functional building and an opportunity for developers to make money from their development efforts. The ever-increasing to build higher does not seem to also require that developers build better or smarter.</p>
<p>It is not acceptable to change the Area Redevelopment Plan. Why would citizens get involved in that type of planning if their input is then ignored the minute a developer comes along with a different idea.</p>
<p>no I think you should move the maximum height from 90 - 110</p>
<p>Maximum height increase is not open for discussion. 90 meters is already too much.</p>
<p>yes, all these changes all for a better use of the site and help achieve the goals and overall vision for the location</p>
<p>Not important to me so lets go with yes...they are acceptable???</p>
<p>I have been consistent in responding to feedback, that 90 metres is sufficient now and for the distant foreseeable future at this location. The Station ARP was a multi year, thoughtful process, involving large numbers of residents, and holds today as it did in 2009. If Co-op is no longer in the grocery business, but the development and financialization business, let them close up shop (creating a food desert in Brentwood), and be honest about what is really important to them. Amazon is only a click away.</p>
<p>Yes, as per my prior answers. The plan should be a guideline, not a rule.</p>
<p>Yes.</p> <p>Concerned about viability; rather have more density and more mixed use (i.e. employment since this looks to residential-oriented). Is this enough and the at-grade treatment enough to get:</p> <p>"... an "Urban Village"; a major hub in northwest Calgary where people can live, shop, dine, work, be entertained and meet their daily needs. ... Attractive public spaces and a wide variety of uses will contribute to a vibrant and safe community. ..." It's not there yet with the orientation towards a site-centred parking lot and all renders that show sterile, suburban large big-box style "storefront" instead of active edges.</p>

NO and isn't it convenient that all the laws in place can so easily be amended when it suits the city and developer!
Yes.
The is no good reason to change from the previous plans. If these plans are not acceptable to the developer, maybe we should wait.
It really depends on the quality and variety and uniqueness of the small business fronts on the commercial Main Street.
unsure
No, I do not find the amendments acceptable. The Brentwood Station ARP was prepared as a guide for development of the area. Much consultation was conducted to arrive at the ARP which included items such as height, density, and street orientation. I believe the ARP is a good template for current and future development. I have not seen or heard any explanation to suggest Building 1 needs to be higher than 90m, or how the proposed 120m is superior to the 90m. Also, I do not believe the proposed re-routing of the Main Street is superior to the ARP design. As proposed, the development would turn its back onto the future development to the east and create the western end of the Main Street running east/west from Charleswood Drive as in the ARP. It also turns its back to the community Park and puts a road between the site and the Park. This poses a major accessibility and safety issue.
The maximum height allowed will need to be increased from 90 metres to 120 metres. This doesn't appear to be referring to the height of the buildings so I am having difficulty finding what this is referring to in the development plan.
No I don't. This is a community not downtown Calgary with office buildings. Nothing should be that high and disrupt the residential houses nearby enjoyment of open sky. The commercial main street along Blakiston Park doesn't seem to make sense. A park has playgrounds and kids that potentially can wander off onto commercial main street. A fence doesn't necessarily prevent this. Look at parents who think their kids are safe in their own backyards only to have curious kids find a way out. A nightmare for parents.
I believe that there should be no increase to the required 90 metres. I
I'm not sure.
Looking at the existing condos recently built in the area, which are known as "university city", the area is not more vibrant yet, and, as a resident of the community, all I've noticed is more traffic congestion. There is not more reason for me to go to this area for shopping, restaurants, meeting people, etc. The City should be planning urban areas which are attractive and interesting and inviting. Instead, all we are getting here is a bunch of high density condos that make developers rich but leave the community worse off. We need infrastructure components in this development which will attract people from all over the city. Let's do something to make this special, instead of just a bunch of condos like what they did in West Village. Let's make this special - put something unique here which will differentiate the space from anything else in the city.
An amendment should be rejected by the city. It was their experts and process which determined the Station Area Redevelopment Plan.
No. This is not acceptable. The Station Area ReDevelopment Plan is a good document meant to ensure a vibrant and consistent redevelopment of the area. We should not allow a major overhaul to please one developer.
The amendment to the alignment of the commercial main street should be considered only as a last resource. The applicants have made no attempt to move or re-orient the Co-op instead. If they keep the main entrance of the Co-op oriented towards North-West, then of course they have no choice. Another option would be to re-orient the main entrance of the Co-op to North-

<p>East, which would make the long side of the Co-op parallel to Brentwood Road. This is now possible since the additional vehicle access point from Brentwood Road has been removed. The amendment to the maximum allowed height is absolutely not acceptable: the maximum height must stay at 90 metres, and Building #1 must consequently be reduced to the same height of Building #2. The Yellow and Orange Towers of University City are already tall enough for Brentwood, which is otherwise a low-building community.</p>
<p>I don't believe the maximum height needs to be increased to 120 metres - the tallest building should be 25 storeys (not sure what that means in metres). I am uncertain about the commercial main street as it depends on where the Co-op will be and what the park will be exposed to.</p>
<p>changing height restrictions leads to lack of sunshine to important areas and makes for bigger wind tunnels as experienced in downtown areas.</p>
<p>Main building height is still excessive. No answers have been provided to improve traffic, currently a bottleneck, along Brentwood Road. Only answer given at the consultations is that the traffic study has not yet been done yet. Wouldn't this be important before making decisions?</p>
<p>No. The ARP required years of work and many, many area residents. The ARP was created exactly so that once there was a development planned, there would be clear and consistent rules in place. Sort of like a will: you prepare the document now so that there won't be a lot of confusion later. Coop knew the rules and should stick to them. There is no justification for the increased height and it's hard to imagine that anyone from Coop thought that residents wouldn't mind a 40-storey tower or even a 31-storey tower. We mind. That is why we worked towards a ARP that set the upper limits. The main street realignment will severely limit the future success of the entire TOD site. It will be 2 halves, not a vibrant whole. Blakiston Park will feature a road next to it. There won't be a main street for pedestrians to linger along. NO changes to the ARP should be allowed. If the City wants to be taken seriously, this plan should never have been allowed to proceed as far as it did.</p>
<p>The maximum height increase is not acceptable, only because it will increase the magnitude of the whole development, which will in turn increase the amount of traffic congestion caused by the development. Brentwood Road is a low-capacity thoroughfare, confined by Crowchild Trail on one side and the new developments on the other, with little potential for capacity improvement, and with inadequate connections at both ends. It is already over-taxed. The development proposal seems to ignore this issue completely. I found a passing reference to improving road access "if necessary". Really? How?</p>
<p>No, the buildings are too high already.</p>
<p>No - this is much too high.</p>
<p>Not at all. This is totally vague and seems like a smokescreen to the community. Please explain why anyone requires 31 stories in this neighborhood. The current 90 is more than sufficient.</p>
<p>As discussed before, 120 metres will overwhelm the landscape and lead to too much density and are not acceptable, along with the orientation of the commercial main street.</p>
<p>I still don't like the idea of one of the buildings having to be over 20 stories tall. I don't understand the housing demand for this cluster of buildings.</p>

No, limiting traffic to only a few streets and making other streets "mixed use" will further increase congestion for traffic and limit parking. Downtown has become even more painful since bike lanes went in and parking became reduced. Why do it again?
To me, this is not really acceptable for the reasons given above. With a 90 m restriction that is still 27 stories, i.e. still the tallest building in the area. You can see my comment above regarding height of the building, but in case these all get parsed up, the crux of the argument is that a 30 story building is still much larger than anything else around. We as residents are concerned about the visual optics of these developments, and how each one is being done completely independent of one another (Rio Can vs. Co-Op). The result is a bunch of buildings that look all dis-similar in terms of feel, size, etc. I think that there needs to be some sort of unified plan of that this area is going to look like. So giving approval to build higher without this unified plan is going to potentially just push this problem to the future, which isn't a good idea.
I do not but I can understand why they would be necessary. I don't understand why these two items were not stressed more in the development process (or at least that is how it appears). I'm not sure how the developers were able to get so far along in the process that their design wouldn't align with the Station Area Redevelopment Plan.
It should be farther away and NOT so big. Why is this necessary? We do not live downtown!!
NO
NO! Leave the park alone! There is already more concrete in the park's current re-development then there should be. Probably 50% less actual greenspace then there was originally. Leave the tallest building at 90m (still to tall IMO). Cap the others at 10 or maybe 12 stories at the most.
No. Both the height of 90 meters and the main street road are the 2 most important aspects of the ARP. The developer knew those rules when he started working on the plans but chose to ignore them. He can now say that he's been working on the plans for years when really, he's never proposed anything that was within the rules. If anything, by coming in with a 40 storey tower, he's just made residents upset at the coop for allowing such a plan in the first place. Why did coop ever think that was a good idea?
The Brentwood SARP has been carefully formulated to enhance our Brentwood community. Is it too challenging for this Developer to follow the rules? I sincerely hope the City will back up our community and our ideas.
Yes.
I think the height should conform to the ARP as mentioned previously, there was considerable effort undertaken to build that plan and I think that agreeing to an amendment shows the residents that they don't care about their input to the original plan.
I don't understand why the max height needs to be increased, if applicant has reduced the height of building #1 as noted earlier in this form.
Question 7: Do you feel the changes to the plan overall have addressed the community ideas and concerns shared with The City? Tell us why.
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
Yes
The planning team has made strong moves toward addressing community concerns. To good effect. Thank you for the changes that have been implemented
It has addressed them but not made the development anymore attractive from a residential point of view
Yes

No. City and Coop are not addressing the problem! Traffic will be congested at all times. At present the traffic through here is terrible. With added apartments by you & RioCan it will only get worse!
A I said - the chances are positive as far as they go - keep at it! We don't need another U City mess!
I think more needs to be done to accommodate the community's ideas & concerns
No. The building will still be too high and not fit with the existing community. The walkability/likeability/streetscape and connecting to the community is not improved. The new development plan will still have a negative impact on traffic. Also there is no commercial main street that connects through the whole station area (University City, the park & the C-train Station)
The overall plan meets the City's need (revenue) and the developers needs (investment). As an almost 40 yr resident of Brentwood, doesn't meet all my needs. I will continue to see value for my money, and will drive if necessary to get it. As a senior, I don't do a lot of retail
No. See # 6 [No. Don't agree w/ Brentwood Community Association ideas]
No we need the commercial main street
The changes have not been addressed in a meaningful way. Updates amount to little more than prettier urban design, and do not address the fundamental problems in layout
Very hard to see with the top-down conceptual view. A 3D model (to scale) showing pathways, roadways, relative building heights would convey much more
Regretably, they have not. Too much development on the site. Height is a major concern at this location - Northland wld have been great for higher buildings. I understand they will have low-rise residential units. Reducing a few parking spots (1175 to 1113) and lowering density (540 to 501) doesn't qualify as substantive changes
COMMUNITY SOUNDING BOARD
I am happy to see the improvement in making this development more pedestrian friendly - I like the new location of the underground parking and the addition of the patio's restaurant
Community's request for "main street" through the proposed store was ignored. Could have tried a 2 storey store if footprint was the problem
The revised plan is better. Much more pedestrian friendly. Still too bad that our "main street" towards RioCan lands not added.
Improved. Don't see walkway access that leads from Brisebois into Centre. Did we lose ground/ green space? Blakiston Park isn't big. Please make sure that retail is small enough to be feasible for little local businesses. Events here please! (personal information)
At the workshop, all groups did <u>not</u> want a road along Blakiston Park. The workshop concept plan shows a road in the middle of the site so that Blakiston Park does <u>not</u> have a road that pedestrians have to cross. The Developer has gone <u>against</u> the Area Redevelopment Plan place a road along the park. There is no place to walk along the park now with cars and trucks.
Sweet! Keep people Employed! --- Agreed!
Its Awesome! Those of us who live facing this and walk to the biz's here daily. Love this!
I thought Co-op would have made a better deal. I may have to go shop at Safeway or Sobeys
Proposed heights are entirely inconsistent with community. Planners need to look lowrise - europe.
I am supportive of this development and am excited to have more business to access close to home. Calgary is finally catchin up with transit oriented development. New Plan addresses many of the concerns.
This is a road not a pedestrian space (arrow pointing to road on Blakiston Park)

Changing the colour of pavement does not improve pedestrian access. (arrow to road on Blakiston Park)
Re: Workshop Concepts - note that all of these have a "main street" (100% of workshop members) why aren't you listening
This should not get changes to the ARP as they are asking
The design ignores the public input or simply makes excuses - the height - the road - the public realm - the main street concept.
Revisions are an improvement but still 3 floors too high, no main street is unfortunate. Removing the road on the park side would be an improvement.
Too tall! 90 Meters Max!
Wendy's drive thru?
Please no road against park!
calgary is not a small town! Small building sprawl has to end!
This is great!
Still concerns about 31 storey building that's too high NAH!
So build it on the south side of crowchild ... Not in my backyard
More highrise buildings 1. Cause higher crime due to added population 2. more congested road. 3. Higher noise
Reduce to 31 stories to 25 No taller that high rises to the East of Coop Gas Bar
We need a development that includes café, that draw people to this area
Prposed towers are too tall too much density for infrstructure in the area.
Poor idea to have access on Blakiston Drive
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
Much improved but still very auto centric for something that is supposed to be more transit oriented.
The present information is not shown fully in the picture. Also, there is no detail on the map. This needs to be completed before any viable feedback can be provided. Especially with the recent, substantive changes to the application being made.
No. The permitted building height has not been addressed. it should be reduced.
No - see comments above
Definitely not!!! This is a beautiful neighbourhood and it is being downgraded by a bunch of towers. City planners should consider neighbourhoods like Garrison Woods and the way they successfully created a charming community. Brentwood towers look out of place and retail and parking opportunities have been a disaster.
Better, but still too much parking on surface. and not enough green within the design.
Not at all. Still an unattractive sounding development .
No. The developers have ignored our two main requests: Completion of the Main Street and lower height for the larger building. The revised plan is a minor cosmetic change that does not address the fact that coop's proposal does not at all fit what was negotiated with community during the station area redevelopment plan process. I am very disappointed with coop (and with the city) about this.
you have addressed some but in doing so will likely have created others
Applicant appears to be paying lipservice, most concerns have barely been addressed. The buildings are way, WAY too tall. Putting a road along Blakiston Park is the actual opposite of making the park more accessible and community friendly. WTF.

The Brentwood Community Association and residents has continuously provided feedback to the City about redevelopment at the Brentwood and Northland malls. Minimal amendments have been made and none that reflect the true concerns of the community - the loss of the community. It is so shameful that our City Council cares not a whit for its residents.
yes
I believe that the concerns have been voiced clearly to the City and the new plan adequately addresses these concerns.
No. They have tweaked a bad concept rather than revised the project to be compatible with the communities ideas.
Changes have addressed the ideas and concerns.
Some concerns were addressed but certainly not all concerns. The building height and population density still remains an issue to me.
Changes have been made that are reasonable and will maintain the initial intent of the redevelopment. It will add polish to the Brentwood community that is quite lackluster and aged at the moment.
No - the changes proposed are very minor and the community has expressed significant concerns about the height of the new buildings, traffic (both pedestrian and vehicular) and density. The city seems to be paying lip service to the concerns expressed without making any sort of significant change to the plans.
No still too tall and not addressing added congestion. Adding a small cafe does not make this a friendly site!
Yes.
I believe most of this has been covered above. I really don't see much if anything that really incorporates what I felt were the community's feelings from the meeting I attended.
I am really disappointed, and surprised, at what I feel is a real lack of imagination in this plan. The Coop has a clean slate to come up with a great design and this is what they come up with? As mentioned, this proposal doesn't come anywhere to matching some of the really nicely thought out projects that were shown at the meeting I attended.
The overall max height is over the SARP recommendation and there should be no road against Blackiston Park.
No. Overall, these amendments are merely a scaling back of an aggressive approach to development. I cannot help but wonder if the original proposal was made so that this fall back could be reached. By scaring the community with the first proposal, it makes this one seem better, but it is not a good fit for our community.
I think they tried - and failed in many ways. The height of #1 is unacceptable for reasons stated earlier. The road along Blackiston Park is unacceptable for reasons stated above. The single entrance into the site is unacceptable as there will be further traffic congestion and add to headache on Brentwood Road. Did not see Brentwood Road issues raised (this may be city hall issue) nor are there additional pedestrian crosswalks on Brentwood Road....
No, not nearly enough. Councillors and developers need to get together and not necessarily in a mutually beneficial way!!
For the most part, but the applicant seems adamant in suffocating the University City condos and the whole site with it. Five tall buildings cramped together with shorter commercial spaces around them does not a fruitful site make!
Yes, but to an extent they over represent the views of a small (but vocal) minority who has the time to fill out these surveys, while the silent majority is busy working and more concerned with if there will be an express way built through this thing to and get out on the road and drive to work faster

1. Not really. As I mentioned, the entire area is already congested enough, dense enough, and mixed up enough. Adding more towers, businesses, roads, traffic lights, crosswalks, a plaza, and a hodgepodge of unnecessary and redundant "stuff" will only serve to annoy the local residents (both future and existing), frustrate car drivers, slow down the smooth flow of access and egress, and cause a lot of people to avoid the area altogether! I hate to think of the increased noise levels and the chopped-up aspect of this plan!
Overall, yes, because the changes seem to have taken our considerations in mind.
No, I think they were minor and calculated for later bargaining. The developer knew there would be a negative response for a higher building, so proposed even higher so they can claim they have reduced height. This should not be bargaining by the city, they should maintain the maximum height as agreed with communities in the area redevelopment plan.
No, any complex that has some high rises should have them as far away from the new cozy community (common to all) as possible as with the Brentwood Mall redevelopment. There are already way to many high rise for this whole development. Once the colorful high rise where built that filled that space and, to prevent it from looking like a miniature Downtown, High Rise upon High Rise upon High Rise upon High Rise... where is the open space, green space, Community space.
To a degree. Please note the above box.
It is encouraging to know that the amended plan incorporates concerns from the community.
Yes. I am content.
Parkade entrance on north side is better. Bike lanes on Brentwood Road presently are not utilized and cyclists still use the sidewalks. Grrr. Since that will be the main access road into the shopping area (mainstreet lost). What can be done here. Blakiston will have only have the north side of the road housed. Could the bike lanes be put there?
There should not be high towers in the area.
No, development is still too tall and not enough clarity as to what business are going in to make this community more vibrant and keeping the community here vs. having to travel elsewhere for food, coffee, social places. I also don't want any more traffic in the area than there already is without a thorough plan for traffic management. Right now, it is a nightmare during rush hour.
Not yet. It has been made very clear that the community does not want a 120m building. Until this is changed, the plan will not have addressed the community's needs.
No, the buildings are still too high.
Yes, everything was acted upon to a reasonable extent.
The height of the building is still a concern.
NO, I don't believe the plan has addressed any of the community ideas and concerns. The build height is clearly higher than recommended SARP on 90 meters. There shouldn't be a road and loading docks on behind build CO-OP and against Blackiston Park.
See above.
Generally, yes, however the developer cannot also 'build' the businesses that will occupy the 'main street', and this will be a significant aspect of the success of the development.
Yes, the developer has addressed the concerns and ideas in a meaningful way.
No. The tower is still way too tall, and we all complained about that.
Nice try. Window dressing.
The city has merely rearranged the same number of chairs to give the appearance of "we heard you". COC is famous for this, create open houses, on-lines surveys but at the end of the day, COC has already made up its mind and will cater to the wants of big business.

As a Charleswood resident, this project seems to have a lot of potential.
Yes
yes especially the reduced height of building 1
To some extent yes. I know there was a lot of worry about the height, which has been modified, but I still believe the commercial main street in the ARP is a fantastic idea, and this modification does very little to correct that.
Generally. We do need more development of the area to support community gathering. It would be lovely to see a larger coop similar to market square downtown.
No; the height of building 1, and the alignment of the commercial main street still go against the ARP and community feedback...
The overall issues the community had with this plan has always been traffic concerns and potential social problems such as looting and theft brought by an increased of residential units. The traffic concerns has clearly been ignored in this new proposal as the main roads and the number of parking spots have remained the same. As someone who lives in the area, I can almost certainly guarantee you that traffic problems will increase significantly if this plan were to be approved.
The second concern I read from the previous feedback by the community was that the residential buildings are too tall. I understand that the developer has lowered "one" of the buildings by 10 storeys. But as the previous question have pointed out, the fact that the city has to make an amendment to increase the maximum height of the building in the area from 90 metres to 120 metres in order to accommodate this plan goes to show you the building height needs to be further reduced.
The city is looking at building up, which is perhaps what is to come, However infrastructure as it stands is not in place with the amount of change that this project will introduce into the quiet atmosphere of the area.
it's too tall and will block the sun for those to the north. Traffic.
The City should be commended on connecting the Coop project with the redevelopment of the LRT station area / improving walking/biking in the area. This is a significant improvement over simply permitting to construct the Brentwood Towers a few years ago, but not improving the walkability/bikability in the surrounding area.
Yes, the changes to the plan are substantial and demonstrate that the City has taken the input of residents seriously.
Because you are destroying what was once a desirable neighborhood. Crime increases in dark areas, which ours will be.
No
No I do not feel that the changes to the plan have address the community ideas or concerns for the reason sited above. That is there are still issues on the building height, main road concerns, and I still not convinced this will be a "community" feeling development.
No
The height and interconnectivity issues need to be further addressed.
Yes. Adequate balancing of the developer's needs with those of the community.
I still have concerns about the height of the proposed apartment building heights. They are TOO tall and NOT required in this community. Maximum of 25 storeys is acceptable.
There needs to be some attention paid to how long the construction for this project will be going on. I have heard that the Coop redevelopment could take up to 10 years to complete. This is not acceptable. I do not want my community ripped apart for such an extended period of time.

Yes. Reasons already given in above responses.
I think crumbs have been offered.
I attended the "board game" meeting awhile back. My understanding of the results was that most of the players wanted a main street through the site, and idea which has been totally abandoned. The meeting had no presentation of the particular features and motivation for the design offered there, no Q & A session. It put citizens in the position of having to tell the City and the developer what is wrong without important relevant rationale statements, and instead of making the developer defend the design instead of serve as the authority with power to accept or reject unorganized input. How is this even close to being a responsible approach?
It has certainly improved, but I do not see enough information regarding the transition landscaping, storefront designs, walkway design, garden layouts, entrance ways to buildings, or outside seating areas. Having spent the last several years walking through the earlier phase of development at Brentwood Station, and being very disappointed at what came out of that development, I would have to see a lot more detail before saying my concerns have been addressed.
MY thoughts are stated in the above questions.
No I still believe the height of the bldgs area still too high and should stay at the 90 meter max height Removing the gas station entrance/exits are a mistake and will increase frustration with accessibility and congestion.
I am leery of any development and most of the recent stuff I've been seeing in this part of the city have not been particularly practical and don't add much to the community. Mostly just seems to favour maximizing the return on investment for the developer at the expense of charm and usability.
No, the changes have not addressed the community ideas: 1. All of the groups in the brainstorming session were in favour of commercial main street continuing straight through the site, and Coop has not changed this part of their plan 2. The concern with height being higher than the ARP allows is not addressed if the slightly lower height is still higher than the ARP allows 3. The changes are very small and only address landscape architectural concerns, not the much larger planning issues that the City and community have shared
No.
Appreciate the opportunity to provide input but only small changes made. Not enough to address my concerns.
One concern I have is the amount of parking allowed at the Brentwood Coop. The residents of Brentwood will not have convenient access to their local grocery store.
I still have much concern over Brentwood Road congestion which is just terrible at late afternoon/evening rush hour. With more density there will be worsening traffic woes.
Councillor Farrell's response has made it quite clear that the community's ideas and concerns have not been adequately addressed and I share that perspective. Residents are tired of development being driven by developers' desire to maximize profit. Ironically since Coop is a member owned enterprise the community should have been determining what was desirable not a developer or a city council that seems not to have a very clear grasp of the effective ways in which densification can be attained even in TOD areas.
Would like to see a bold vision that envisions the Calgary of 2030 and not such an incremental change from the status quo.
The developer has addressed the concerns but it doesn't resolve the issue of changing the face of the community. Really is difficult to determine the end result on local traffic. What

happens if this causes a major bottleneck in the community, does the developer help to fund road improvements in the future?
Please see above.
30 storeys is still too high!
No. They seem more in line with what the developer wants rather than what the community wants.
I feel that nobody will do anything to stop this project putting the right of the people living at University City buildings and the homes around to live in a peaceful neighborhood.
It is better than the first plans, but I believe there can still be improvement
No, I think they deliberately applied for 40 storeys so they could appear to make amends by reducing the height to 120m. There is no reason to build past 90m.
No, the changes are merely a token. The character of the development remains exactly the same.
No. Given the honest concerns and reasonable concerns expressed by the community, I find the developer's response to be rather limited in both imagination and effort. Overall, the community is very supportive to have an extensive redevelopment of the area and is supportive of some rather large scale buildings on this site. The community is also eager to have a region that is vibrant and exciting. Thus, it seems that there is a real opportunity to create something unique and I see that we are heading towards large and sterile.
No they have not - the rationale for not reducing the height is not acceptable. The overall density is just too much. .
A bit, I think you should make the buildings a bit shorter.
NO. You need to start doing what you are told. You work for us, remember? Our community input needs to be taken as directions and instructions, not as ideas for your "benign" consideration. We are not imbeciles.
Stop screwing around with my neighborhood!!!! It is no wonder Farrell is the most threatened alderman. I look forward to the date when she starts inflicting her ill-conceived ideas on some other poor district. We have certainly had enough of her (likely the world has as well).
yes,
I think the city should stop dragging their feet and allow stalwarts such as the COOP's to redevelop and enhance our communities. That old COOP really needs to go and the overall vision of COOP and Quarry Bay are refreshing.
Minimum changes, token changes, and lot of excuses (in viability = read, we dont make enough money if we try to respect the wishes of residents.) Renters, and commercial developers come in and leave, their commitment to a neighbourhood is short and unemotional. Residents, as is the case in Brentwood, come, stay for 50 years, and contribute to a community over that entire time (schools, community associations, shopping, recreation, libraries etc). We may not be developers but we have a lifetime of experience in a community, contributing to what makes a neighbourhood great. We are in it for the long haul.
Yes
Minimally. They need to do better. This is a step in the right direction, but it's a half-hearted step that's still too suburban. This community is on the edge of the inner city, a city of 1.4 million people. The development is right next to a pedestrian generating machine, the skeletal transit in Calgary-LRT. This development looks like it would still "work" anywhere in Calgary.
It is always too late by the time the community has been consulted and they are always understated until it is too late for any changes. Each individual development is in isolation

and does not reflect the accumulative impact on the whole area. There are so many assumptions as to peoples behaviors that are based more on fairy tail wishes than realities. This is a city with winter and miserable weather for much of the year and you plan like we are living in California, with bike paths and walking everywhere all year long in the sunshine. Not the case.
Why doses the city keep changing plans without solid research. My neighbours and I would like more pedestrian and non-motorized access to and from the mall area for the house residents
No, in that 30 stories seems ridiculous.
getting there.
Perhaps you can get away with the highrise height if you do an assessment on shaded area, and orient the building to reduce shade in residential and greenspace areas.
I do not feel that the changes to the development plan have addressed the community concerns (and mine) of building height and Main Street orientation conform to the Brentwood Station ARP. Until someone tells me why 120m is better than 90m, I cannot support the added height. The re-routing of the Main Street is a terrible design for pedestrians and cyclists and their safety and accessibility to Blakiston Park. Adding pedestrian crosswalks
I think there is concern on the impact of introducing such high density into a primarily single family housing community. The vibrancy does not appear to include increasing green space but rather just leveraging the rather small Blakiston park. It appears all about retail, commercial and residential.
No, dropping 10 storeys is not addressing the communities height concerns nor does re-aligning commercial main street. I can't help feel that the business prospects matter more to the city and applicant than does their concern for the overall well being of existing and future community as a whole.
I don't believe that the City or the developer are listening to the values of our community. There are to many buildings being put into on small area that doesn't accommodate the redevelopment well that allows the collaboration of residents and visitors within the Brentwood area. I feel that there is more focus on the density and the benefit financially to the city and applicant. University City had promises on the development that weren't followed and now its an area where there are all kinds of issues of disconnect.
I think you may be missing the mark on what 'community' means.
No. The developer is not listening to the input from the community.
No, the developer is simply being self motivated.
No. Too minor and don't address the bigger concerns.
Only partially, for the reasons explained above. However: 1-3) The improvements made on the Blackiston Park side and the features of the commercial main street alongside the Park are unclear, because no three-dimensional rendering with an appropriate view angle has been provided; 2) The height of Building #1 is still excessive, and should be reduced to the current maximum allowable height (90 metres); 4) The pedestrian connections are improved with respect to the original plan, but residents at the east of the site will have to walk around the Co-op building even to access the Co-op.
They have partially addressed the concerns - however, the height of the buildings is still too high and the creation of a vibrant space and commercial street seem half-hearted.

<p>what about transit access to those not living within walking distance. will buses still run on the access road.</p> <p>there are a lot of seniors living near by that are no longer driving and coop no longer provides aid to shopping.</p>
<p>Partly. Traffic management is still a very big concern.</p>
<p>No.</p> <p>We saw minimal changes from the first proposal to the second. Largely some cosmetic changes and a height change that remains excessive.</p> <p>The community participated in two workshops in which ALL groups identified the need for a main street in the middle of the site. It is hard to get unanimous agreement on any development, but on this point, ALL groups felt the same way. This should be mandatory for Coop.</p> <p>There is no point in asking for feedback, surveys, workshops, etc. and then not listening to the results. Why bother? Why is the City spending so much time promoting a development that flies in the face of so much of the ARP? Why isn't the Coop required to respond to that feedback?</p>
<p>The issue of inadequate road infrastructure in the area has not been addressed.</p>
<p>I don't believe that the City actually cares at this point. There are too many times that the City has pushed these developments through and paid lip service to the residents. It's going through regardless in whatever way is going to generate the most tax dollars.</p>
<p>No. Not enough changes, and not the changes requested.</p>
<p>No. These seem totally out of line with everyone we speak with in the community. They do not seem contextual. They seem to have abandoned the TOD concept and are attempting to be a major destination site for all of Calgary spiking automotive congestion in the area. Pedestrian and bicycle traffic has been downgraded in priority and the surrounding community has not been considered.</p>
<p>No. Very little information has been provided about why the applicant can't provide the central commercial road through the development or alternatives besides the Blakiston Park road alignment.</p>
<p>Somewhat.</p>
<p>I appreciate that the heights of the building have been reduced and some input has been heard. However, I still think it's slightly delusional to think cramming another 500 people into an already congested area is a good idea. Since university city has gone up, the area has already become a nightmare to navigate and I'm sure this new development will do nothing to aid the existing issues that no one has addressed.</p>
<p>I think that the developer has taken steps to meet the concerns/ideas but we are still missing the mark. Basically, people have several classes of concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Visual appeal of all of this development (Co-Op and Rio Can). We don't think that everything can be treated separately, there needs to be some agreement on what the area is going to look like. Going to 30 stories doesn't address this. 2) Making this development a community hub. What I see is better pedestrian access (good) and a cafe and patio. I think that more care needs to be taken to figure out how to do things nicely and make it really a place people will want to come, and we have examples of other places in the city where this was done successfully. The current plan still misses this. 3) Traffic congestion especially along Brentwood Road, with all the new developments plus UofC traffic. This part was not really addressed either.

The ideas and concerns from the community have mostly been addressed. I think the developer has tried to be accommodating but I don't understand why the City hasn't held them more accountable to the redevelopment plan.
I think the community is unhappy with the large scale of the buildings. It seems like they may only be interested in what type of revenue they can generate over the visual appeal or how large they are making the buildings.
NO
No. Doesn't really look a whole lot different that the first one. If you want bring people to the area for dining, shopping, and to be entertained, give them a site that does that. This is a cookie cutter same old same old cold looking uninviting area. I'll bet this kind of development would never fly in *personal information removed* residential area of Sunnyside - even though there is an LRT stop there. NIMBY right *personal information removed*
Not really. The developer made some small changes but totally missed out on the 2 biggest ones, the height and the main street road. The most important aspects haven't been dealt with.
Not sufficiently. This time Brentwood is almost united in its dread about and dislike of the proposed heights of the buildings. This feeling even seems to grow over time!
I think that the plan as it stands is fine. I am concerned that with too many more iterations Coop will pull the project overall and we will be stuck with decaying buildings on the site that do not draw anyone into the space and do not provide businesses for the residents to visit.
Question 8: Do you have any outstanding concerns about the application that you feel have been missed?
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
Tower is still too high. Should be no more than University City; Disappointed "main street" concept was deemed not viable; Concerned there is not connectivity to University City. This development basically turns it's back to University City and looses any concept of community with the whole area. This is similar to what happend with the municipal building was built and turned its back to the east village.
No
I am hoping that necessary dumpsters can be hidden/disguised well in order to create a tidy space.
There seems to be no real consideration for an aging population in the area - very much geared to 40 yr old and under - Brentwood needs a residential alternative for people downsizing but wanting to stay in a neighbourhood
Waling to the park from the development
Traffic congestion has not been considered! Make access to Crowchild at the exit - from CrowCh at Jameison.
I think more thought & planning are required with traffic management - access to Brentwood Road is too limited - Consider a traffic circle even though many drivers need more education!!!
My concern is that all this public input will not be taken into consideration by the City.\
Parking. Traffic flow. What happens if there's an accident on Brentwood Road. People will be trapped in their condos, cars, parking area
Traffic jams on Brentwood Rd which is the route we use to get on Crowchild Tr. West bound.
A lot of time effort and planning went into the SARP and shouldn't be revised at this point. The developer can redesign keeping the mainstreet and original heights of buildings

I think allowing the ARP to be amended in such fundamental ways for a single developer undermines public faith in the whole process. We've already been through many of these issues for this site (and come up with better solutions)
Safety, in underground parking, and other crime in commercial space (break & enter) and spill over into surrounding community. Increase in population, easy access to community will result in likely increase in crime and cost more for policing
OPEN HOUSE – ENGAGEMENT BOARDS (STICKY NOTES)
If bike lanes are added, there will be increased congestion, cars idling, increased SGSs. I see enough potential for congestion. Bike lanes compound these (even now)
Cannot turn left during rush hour. Concern for personal safety re underground parking since it is so close to LRT.
Please review traffic at corner of Brisbois & Boulton already a safety hazard - parking, sight lines. Bike lane coming up from research park & under underpass very dangerous at corner
I don't think there should be a road by Blakiston park
Concerned about loss of easy passenger pickup from C-train ramp in general and for handicap people. Height of building casting shadows on park. It's good to have a fast food drive thru. 4C; elimination of access to Brentwood Rd. light will be congested; As a Coop customer who drives to the store concern with parking at street level. In competition with new apt. dweller
Because I think it fails to address the vision of the ARP. This is a site that turns its back on the rest of the Brentwood Station area, and jealously guards its access to the LRT bridge. Eliminating the commercial main street through this site not only makes it difficult or at least ugly for residents to access the LRT, but it also eliminates the visual cues that invite residents to explore main street and its businesses, meaning that it could reduce the success of the rest of the site as well. TOD means more than just density and they need to comply with ARP.
40 storeys? I don't think so! The height of the Univ. City Apts already impinge on our backyard view & we live just up the hill from Triwood!
We're lowering the building, we do have possible plaza space (can you give an idea of how big those areas are?) Public gardening on Co-op room
This project looks great! Thanks for all your work!
I don't want anymore of this 'densification' in the area. The Groves of Varsity. University City. University District. Enough. These developments do not serve the areas in which they are being built. They serve the developers. Varsity. Brentwood. Charleswood are beautiful, mature neighbourhoods with all the meeting spaces and amenities we need and adding more high-density housing will nothing but more traffic and other negative byproducts of the City's densification fad. The only question I am going to answer is: do you want some version of this project built? My answer is no. Thank you for the opportunity to share my views
Too much... guess its time for us to move out of this community... our home for 41 years.
There is no commercial mainstreet anymore. I would use that road to get to the LRT. With the building there I would have to walk around a big building.
Too tall keeps to the original heights in station area plan
Worried about interface of gas bar and convenience store with the park. The convenience store seems to have it's back to the park right at the park's entrance.
Brentwood Rd - the existing road is insufficient to handle current traffic. How will it serve the additional volume from tower tenants, business employees, etc?? New traffic lights at Co-op entry will only work if dedicated turn lanes are added. Traffic exiting the Co-op will potentially stack up if light is not long enough. If this becomes a problem, drivers may avoid light and drive or speed up around back of store(by park) to exit at University City. Lack of pedestrian

thru-way from University City to new Co-op/services. If the intent is to create a pedestrian/community friendly environment. This will not work - especially in winter. It would be a shame if existing residents of University City & future residents of the new tower are impeded from easy access to new shops, restaurants and services. Please do not repeat the wasteland of empty retail outlets that is University City.
I have a large concern about the fairness of the general process. Zoning is intended to balance interests on a non-specific, general basis. Changing it at the request of a specific case (apart from minor tweaks of necessity). It is inherently biased.
I'm concerned about traffic flow & density for shoppers east of the Co-op area. There is no left turn (ie. Exit) from the gas bar and only out lane able to turn left exiting the area. There is already congestion there and currently there are 3 roads in & out.
Walking from University City to the grocery store is going to be ugly, dark & long; Still too high: this is not the ARP standard; Flow through improved to other areas to East but still problematical
The tall building out of the flow from the east. The road between the 2 University City is ugly & dark enough now - what will it be like when the tower is built? Not very appealing. Pedestrian safety could be a concern as they have to walk all the way around the building to enter
I have large concern about the tunneling effect of the building on the prevailing wind. The café at the NE corner will sit in a gale, as will the one on the SW
All buildings should be restricted to the 90m. Maximum height of the ARP; wind studies need to be done to see what effect wind will have on the plazas; If the main street is along the park, the traffic circle needs to be maintained at University City - no thru traffic.
Definitely time for a major upgrade to the area - good concept
Thank you for taking the time to engage with the community. I think the company has worked hard to hear the concerns. I think it will bring new vitality to the community. I am excited for new restaurants and social spaces.
Brentwood Blvd is the access road to Crowchild Trail West - can see traffic issues
I really like the plan for the area that faces the park
Height from Crowchild to Brentwood community/ this does opposite
Concern: interface between park & grocery store is a challenge
Concern: great job on Blakiston park; road around the park?? Where will the deliveries be coming from
The height of the building is still too high. 17 stories at University City is plenty high; The development design fit, the height is of concern (24 story is enough) still achieve the TOD; vibrant spaces - concrete is not vibrant space; road alignment = where is the traffic study
31 stories is still too tall and the surface parking could have more trees/green space
Design lacks inspiration and innovation. Redevelopment is good but needs to be an enhancement to the community. Needs to be integrated with RioCans site
Traffic will be horrendous through this area! University traffic community trying to access local stores, restaurants. Poor planning by all developers in area.
It will add density to the neighbourhood!
The more building height should remain at 90 meters per current SAP; Yes indeed!
I anticipate that Quarry Bay will be allowed to sell resid. Units w/o requiring mandatory purchase of at least 1 u/g parking spot. The streets are already clogged with Univ. City vehicles as a result of their policy of making U/G parking optional.
Too many buildings for the size & dimensions of the Parentwood Co-op parcel of land

The height of the main tower the development turns its back on the rest of the TOD development. The main street concept through the area has been ignored!
Road alignment: please assess this in light of other near-by development U. City: University City, Northland, and ultimately increase in traffic on Charleswood Dr.; Ped Connect: pathway through the site "high street" is non-existent. Why? Clear input from residents on this. connect to U. City!; Vibrant Gather: The space could not be less vibrant. Very little green, stamped concrete does not cut it! After developer leaves residents are still here;
Pleased with modifications, we support T.O.D.
Gas bar next to restaurant?? Smell of gas & fumes from cars?
Wendy's is not good for bringing people together to meet/greet on a regular basis. We need to attract coffee shops/deli w/ a proven track record of bringing people together not a huge chain that promotes unhealthy eating & mostly drive through traffic which will add to traffic congestion
I am concerned about the quality of the residences. It looks like a concrete jungle - the buildings (residences) are very unappealing. Too high.
Dev. Fit: Height - 40 stories or 30 stories, too high based on guidelines of stn ARP stick to 90 metres; you will alleviate many resident concerns
I like the plan for trees in a number of spaces but was wondering if a row of trees/bushes could be added along Bldg 3 and Bldg 4
Buildings are still much too high. Should be no higher than University Centre Bldgs
The park (Blakiston Park) is full of paved paths/roads & not enough green space. However, I like the path from Blakiston Drive to the Co-op parking lot & LRT
Road - Brentwood Rd. The size of the current road will not handle the volume/density. Also the current lights at Brisbois Dr or Charleswood Dr. already are too busy @ rushhour. If someone tries to turn into Coop they disrupt the flow both ways. This needs to be solved before the building goes ahead
Please address - to addressing traffic at rush hr - major intersection
Wendy's does not create a vibrant community gathering spot - it's a quick dash through. Need a better solution for access for residents and shoppers
I really appreciate the hard work that has been put into incorporating community input. The changes show positive moves to making it more pedestrian friendly. Adding more "green" in front of several buildings would be another plus.
Gas bar should not be adjacent to houses ever; 30 stories still too high. Abide to ARP heights
Even the revised proposal from 40 stories to 30 stories height. What is the reason not to equal height same as in U City tower I. Where is just only 19 or 21 stories. It looks better & less traffic jam if reduced to less than 31 stories... like 20 stories in the proposal building.
The Brentwood Rd is not big enough to support the increased volume of traffic - already backed up
The apartment buildings are too tall for this community. University City is already an eye sore and now you wish to add more increased buildings to the community. The plaza is too small and hidden away - no one will want to go back there to sit and enjoy the tiny green space.
It is not safe to run a road along the side south side of Blackiston Park. Instead, we need more access along Brentwood Rd.
COMMUNITY SOUNDING BOARD
I am still concerned about the height of the largest building -- 30 stories. This seems to be significantly higher than the surrounding buildings.
Tower is still way too high! 86" higher than allowed don't care if you lowered it from initial plan.
30 stories still too high

The buildings should be no taller than the existing coloured buildings.
Many concerns! Building 1 still too high for surrounding area. Should be no taller than Uni City. (which is still 1/2 empty) 1175 parking stalls - too much traffic for road infrastructure, which is not being updated in this plan.
This is not good development for the area. 1. Way to high. No more than 20 floors. 2. Traffic flow not addressed.
There is only concrete and more concrete. Not a blade of grass or flowers.
Many concerns still not addressed in the latest plan - Building one is still too tall for the surround area. Should be no taller than Uni City note that Uni City is still 1/2 empty so adding more residential units are not req'd
1175 parking stalls when road infrastructure is not being upgraded - stupidity at its best.
No loading doors should be along the backside of the park. Unsightly and they will provide areas for crime
Considering the obsession with TOD this plan is very pedestrian unfriendly - where are the "vibrant spaces" we were promised with Uni City and it's just a hideaous concrete jungle.
Seniors accomodation badly needed in this area. Why build more 1 room places for students. They do not add to the community as they are transient. This is the perfect place for upsale seniors lodge that would be way more of a financial success than the students lodging model.
Hope you will listen more than you did with Uni City!!!
Coop is important to maintain - alternative to Safeway - close to LRT - close to residential.
Prefacing this as a "Co-op Redeveopment" seems dishonest - it's the condo builder's who hold the highest stake in this project and that should be reflected in publicly funded material. My primary concern with this redevelopment is the height and the location of the new tallest condo, I am a corner unit in the existing (personal information removed) and start to lose a great deal of view plus all the sight of our wonderful mountains and a signifcant loss to my property value as a result. I would appreciate 1. Greater honesty and transparency from the City. 2. Discussion of the nearly extreme height of the new buildings (personal information removed)
The City has stated that the Developer must prove that their concept improves the ARP - this does not meet that criteria
Regardless of any input this is a "Fait accompli" the road is a mess traffic the buildings are commercial eyesores take a park and ruin it
Traffic is a mess now. How will this be improved?
The road should go back down the center of the site as planned in the area redevelopment plan
There is a road right around the park? Anybody coming from the park will have to cross a road. The road should be in the middle fo the site so it connects with the road between 4 existing towers. Not on the park.
None of the community based concepts include a road along Blakiston Park. The plan shoul be rejected if it cannot meet any of the community feedback.
Maybe we should think twice about shopping at Coop
This will be a concrete jungle. There are trees in cement over a parkade. They will die and not grow big because they will be in shade most of the time. Where are the public gathering spaces?
Having the road against the park is ugly
Where are the plazas or place to meet and gather? Everythin is concrete, no grass, no floeers. Why would anyone want to come herE? Where are the coffee shops with patios?
City planning and council should reject this plan as it stands

40 stories is twice the height of anything in the area. Way too high! - actually it is only 31 but that is still way too high.
The City should not approve a plan that contravenes some of the most important elements of the ARP to do so would be too waste all of the previous public engagement and planning thought and time. These elements include: - blocking the centre road through the site, there by limiting pedestrian connectivity between the SE side and the LRT. - creating a road along Blakiston Park which will become loading docks and garbage zones it will prevent interface with the park. - exceeding the ARP height limit and massing. - putting a fence along large portions of the Blakiston Park. Allowing this development will make a mockery of the ARP planning process and the money spent to rejuvenate Blakiston Park and elimination of the commercial main street will prevent any attempt to redeem the interface with University City.
Building 1 & 2 block off the existing towers and turn their back on the other half of this whole area. If you want to walk from London Drugs to the Coop the buildings block your path.
The Main Street is cut off along with pedestrian access to the LRT without walking around a loading dock.
Pedestrian connections to where? The building cuts off the LRT?
This looks like grass but it is actually a green roof. There is no grass in this entire site. Only Cement
Tower at 30 stories is still far too high - needs to come down to 23.
Where is the green space - this is all just concrete?
Nothing about this is Transit Oriented Development - besides the fact its next to a LRT station. We can and should do better than this. Just because the rest of the site was a failure doesn't mean we should just accept this bad plan.
Station Area Plan: Height of building must not exceed what was specified in the SARP! A road by the park is STUPID! Chain link fence is outrageous. City Planners and Alderpersons failed with the University City - a mess, don't miss an opportunity to get "Brentwood Coop" right. Who is this for? Who will be displaced?
Looks to be commercialized. I will really miss the smaller Brentwood Coop. Coop stores in general have lost their small town feel where they originated. I hope the store doesn't get too large. I guess this is progress.
31 stories is still too high and many
The City stated that in order for them to change the rules in the ARP (and approve development) they must show an improvement - this is missing any public space - there is no public main street concept - the road around the park doesn't provide any connection to the park.
Community wants/ needs the "main street" to connect with RioCan mall. Without that the whole pedestrian oriented concept will fail. Coop development needs train passengers walking through it to the SE.
The entire area needs to be considered as a whole right from London Drugs / Safeway. The proposed new building will cut off that entire side of the whole area. There will be no main street for pedestrians, rather a dead end at the Coop
I find the contempt for the ARP definitely in contradiction with Coops member/ citizen cooperative business model. Please respect the spirit of the law.
The ARP is for max 90 metres! Please meet the ARP!
No, no, no to these ideas!
Why cutting Coop off from Uni City development? Thru road? What happened?
Brentwood does not need any more apartment buildings.
Charlie

Brentwood does NOT need a 40 storey apartment building. There are enough apartments here now.
Eastbound traffic on Brentwood Road making a left hand turn into Coop will block all single lane traffic heading east. Need turn lane
You need a Tim's!
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
The proposed 30 story tower still looks ugly and devoid of character. Fixable, but if it's going to be boring compared to University City made it look boring instead of like a scaled up version the Park on Central Memorial.
Bike parking, and the ability for bicycles to go from Brentwood Road to Blakiston Park are not covered online. Minor but something I do a couple times a month. (And it as it stands it sucks)
I believe this development has not considered the traffic implications at all. A Traffic Impact Study is required prior to any further decisions being made.
See comments above....and please just listen to those of us who live here. That wasn't done with University City and look what we got - a grossly flawed project. Residents know a lot of things better than those who do not frequent the area every day.
Avoiding urban sprawl doesn't mean skyscrapers in every neighbourhood!
All of the issues are on the table
As above.
The fact that the developers are ignoring the high-density high connectivity plan that was developed by the city and community is going to turn me and my pro-redevelopment neighbours into NIMBYs. This is really sad. Coop needs to hire an architect who is willing to work within the parameters of the original station area plan. There is plenty of room for profit within this plan, they simply are being greedy and are planning on building a monument to their greed that will lower the overall value of the entire community, including their own development. If they instead build a series of buildings within the existing plan, these buildings would benefit from the value added by the fact that they would be located in a well connected, multi-transportation-mode larger community.
Parking is already a huge problem in the area. The plan may "meet needs" but this is Calgary, people always have more cars than spaces. Would prefer 25% more parking incorporated into the plan to prevent parking overflow into community that's already happening from University City. Lack of parking also limiting local businesses to local traffic, nobody comes TO Brentwood because there's never any place to park.
There is no point in listing outstanding concerns such as safety, loss of community, crime and loss of park space (Blakiston Park will be useless with this development). This Council has never listened to the residents of Ward 7. With the redevelopment of Northland Mall and more useless bike lanes on Northmount Drive, increased traffic and speeding on Brisebois and 52 Street because of the bike lanes and congestion we have made a decision to move from Brentwood after 25 years.
With increased traffic, Brentwood Road will need to be revisited as it is already congested on some days and does not adequately address the needs of the community at the moment.
Yes. You are trying to modify a project, that does not meet the communities concerns, when it is not possible to meet those concerns with the current proposal. Now that you have the communities concerns, restart the project to meet those needs.
Not at this time.
Please get on with the redevelopment.
Please keep accessibility for residents with mobility challenges top of mind.

<p>I really feel that having the tallest building backing right next to University City is really poor design. There would now be three tall buildings back to back to back. Are we creating a future "projects"/slum here? Walking through University City is really not too appealing and adding another tower adjacent will just compound this problem.</p>
<p>I am concerned that people using this area will shortcut thru the neighbourhood.</p>
<p>There are so many projects in the cities NW being approved (residential units apartments/condos). I feel there will be too many left unoccupied creating a future problem with maintenance and safety.</p>
<p>The application seems like a drop in. The proposal is interested only in what can be done with the land in question, but we are talking about a community, not just a parcel of land. Whomever works or lives on this new space will want to be welcomed by their neighbours. Without considering why you want to be here, you end up creating a space for new people / visitors who will be looked at as part of an architectural affront to the neighbourhood, which does not set us up for productive relationships.</p>
<p>I may have missed the relocation of the service station??? And as stated above, the concerns of the increased traffic on Brentwood Road which is already a complete fiasco (thanks City hall!!) . Did Brentwood and Triwood community Association ever receive a 'grading' report on the aftermath of building University City??? Did anyone read it at City Hall and take note of the fiasco it is!!!</p>
<p>Concerns heard but not acted upon.</p>
<p>As indicated above, yes, the location of Building 1. Please move it to the other side of site, or flip the whole site horizontally so the new site becomes something to be proud of for the residents living around it rather than a disgrace.</p>
<p>Drives. Too much focus on pedestrians. Count the ratio of drivers to walking in this area and see.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blakiston Park is NOT enough! If you want a properly designed, people-friendly neighbourhood with green spaces, then you'll have to include more of them in your plan! What about tower courtyards, green rooftop gardens, edge plantings of trees and shrubs, potted plants (in season, of course), and even indoor green spaces such as an atrium, arboretum, or glassed-in conservatory? These could be incorporated into the future buildings! 2. Calgary is a WINTER city. The weather is not hospitable to outdoor "vibrant spaces" for much of the year! We don't live in California! 3. Have you considered "Plus-15's", such as we have downtown? They could incorporate tables and places to sit and eat for the local residents. 4. THIS PROJECT DOESN'T EXIST IN ISOLATION! ARE YOU AWARE THAT THERE ARE PLANS AFOOT TO CONSTRUCT A 40-STORY TOWER WHERE LONDON DRUGS AND SAFEWAY NOW STAND? THERE ARE ALSO PLANS TO CONSTRUCT ANOTHER 40-STORY TOWER WHERE THE TD BANK AND HARVEY'S NOW STAND! PLEASE THINK OF THE FUTURE, AND DO YOUR PLANNING WISELY IN CONSULTATION WITH THE OTHER PROPOSED PROJECTS AND HIGH-DENSITY "TOD" WHICH WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT THE COMMUNITY! 5. DON'T FORGET THE WISE WORDS TO JONI MITCHELL'S FAMOUS SONG: "THEY PAVED PARADISE, PUT UP A PARKING LOT!"
<p>The addition of more parking stalls than the City's requirements is great.</p>
<p>Destroying the Brentwood Community by turning this cozy, homey, quiet area into a buzzing, over stacked, high rise ridden complex. People forget that if you make it like everything else then way would you go there.</p> <p>That is why the smaller developments will attract the softer people.</p>

Yes, the interface between Blakistan Park and the development are car focused (textured pavement, cars will park and drive) rather than pedestrian friendly (park like gathering and safe walking).
Any charging stations for electric cars? Bike racks?
Ample lighting around the site for night. Better sidewalks with trees.
Increased congestion on the road due to increased housing, need another way to get on to crowchild / exit
Of course, the mess of construction. I doubt that I will see the end of it in my remaining lifetime and I'm on the west side of Brisebois very close to Crowchild. (Poor me).
Green spaces
Building height.
The design needs to be vibrant as promised. If we get another bland and depressing hellscape like University City, I will be very disappointed.
How will the city manage the extra community traffic?
I am concerned that people using this area will use Brentwood Blvd. and Blackiston Dr and basically shortcut thru the neighborhood. I am concerned about the number projects in the cities NW being approved (residential unit's apartments/condos). Hopefully those developers are listening better to the community input than the Co-op developers.
See above.
No.
Low cost and disabled housing
Elevator for wheelchairs to get access to the ped bridge.
Why, when University City is being built, would we need, in this economy, more condo towers?
My primary concern with all high density development projects in older communities is that they do not utilize existing amenities such as schools, parks and small businesses.
No
Commercial main street. Coop/Wendy's was always cut off from the rest of Brentwood Mall, and this development has a chance to rectify that. The Commercial Main Street in University City is already severely under-utilized, and unless the Coop redevelopment actually follows the ARP, it will continue to do so.
To me, it looks like the applicants have and continue to ignore feedback and the ARP.
no
This development plan would've been better if it were applied to Northland Village Mall instead as I could see an increase of consumers and customers if redevelopment were to be done in that area. I could also see this a development in this area to be beneficial to the existing residents in the area. However, I just can't justify how more residential units in the area in the form of condos would help the development of this community. Especially if this plans chooses to ignore the traffic and social problems it brings.
There are post elementary two schools in close proximity to this enormous project. Are there plans for more schools? Has this even been considered, with the amount of dwellings, there will certainly be an increase in student population. What has been discussed with regards to those needs.
its too tall. traffic. sun.
No.

I'm concerned about the increased traffic that 500+ additional residences will cause on Brentwood Road and Crowchild Trail.
Idiots
I don't think the potential traffic problems have been addressed adequately, because quite frankly I don't think there is enough space to accommodate the increased traffic. While it is encouraging to see the pedestrian needs addressed somewhat, realistically, Brentwood Road needs to be widened to allow for better traffic flow before the changes take place.
My concerns have been previously identified except comment on access to those that want to be picked up after taking the c train and parking access.
Traffic. September - June rush hour traffic is not residential. The pressure to be put on the one existing entry point..... there r now 2..... is to much. Traffic to surrounding streets particularly brisbois have not been addressed. How will increase traffic affect Northmount particularly with the reduced lanes on Northmount ?
no
I still would like to see some sort of green space or community space atop of the Coop for the adjacent apartments instead of an ugly flat roof top.
A wind assessment needs to be done. This area will be totally useless as an urban village if we have winds like the ones amongst the high buildings in the downtown area. The number of tall buildings in this area is quite negative in my opinion. And it appears that this development is not the end of what will be added in the future.
Already University City is the victim of funnelling winds.
No.
Yes...mentioned in several sections above. But to focus on a fundamental problem: what is the point of having city wide planning, general integrated planning design done in a context that permits balanced consideration of everyone's interests, if every individual development results in changes to zoning guides that favour the developer and subordinate community interests? Why is Quarry Bay in particular even allowed to bring a proposal forward that is so contemptuous of this process? Approve this development as proposed and you destroy any remaining respect I have for the moral principles of rule of law in City administration.
Please see my comment above.
The information given in the current phase 3 consultation is very minimal or to difficult to find. The timing for phase 3 in the of middle of summerbreak is very poor and does not leave sufficient time for Brentwood citizens to comment.
I am concerned about the overall appearance of the area. I think it will look like a congested concrete area -- somewhat like downtown Calgary. This is an appealing area of the city ; older trees & maintained homeowners yards are an asset. More landscaping should be considered.
Why is more housing being considered? The Towers beside this area are not filled!
1. I think more thought needs to be given to the subdivision of this site, and how the infrastructure and strata will work with two places on the site (north end and Wendy's drive-thru) where the road goes underneath buildings. If this isn't addressed now then it will just lead to changes in the building design and last-minute relaxations during the DP process. 2. I think if green roofs are going to be featured so prominently in the applicant's plans, they should give comment about addressing the Nose Creek volume control targets so that this site can be an example of LID implementation.
Limited and poor attempts to engage the neighbourhood are now understood. This application should never have gotten off the ground.

<p>The traffic congestion that already exists on Brentwood Road during busy times of day is already out of control. Adding this many residences and cars will make the congestion at the intersection of Brentwood Rd./Blakiston Dr., and Brentwood Rd./Brisebois Dr. a major traffic tie-up, and will affect the businesses located on Brentwood Rd. I will avoid driving and shopping in this area because of the traffic issues.</p>
<p>Yes. Its the traffic flow and volume of cars all turning right unto Brentwood Road and unable to merge unto Crowchild at any given day . Its a very long line up from 32/Charleswood Dr. NW to 40th/Brisebois Dr NW .It is only one lane because the city made a bike lane . {Originally there was 2 lanes}</p>
<p>I would like to see the inclusion of on-site greenhouse facilities as is being proposed for the Oakridge Co-op redevelopment be included here.</p>
<p>Generally covered the major concerns.</p>
<p>I do not see anything here about access roads into the proposed new mall. Perhaps I am wrong, but I see only ONE ENTRANCE/EXIT to the parking lot. Is that correct? If so, that is not nearly enough!!! What if that one entrance/exit has an accident? Or the proposed traffic light acts up? Or the ramp gets iced and cars have trouble getting in and out? Or a meeting ends at Coop and numerous cars are trying to exit all at the same time? I note that Brentwood Coop currently has 4 entrances/exits, Dalhousie Coop has 3, and Crowfoot Coop has 2. And let me tell you that from experience I know that the Crowfoot Coop access is by far the worst of the three parking lots. Right now the Brentwood Coop has 4 entrances/exits for JUST shoppers. Think how many more people there will be when 500 additional residences have been built!!! I hope that the Brentwood Coop will have at least 2, possibly 3 entrances and exits. And please do NOT tell me, "Oh there won't be that many vehicles as people will walk." I do NOT believe that!</p>
<p>These changes seem to show that the development is a forgone conclusion based on what the developer wants. Most of the changes do not reflect what the area citizens want. We are concerned that this will turn into another concrete void such as what has happened around the 5 ugly towers.</p>
<p>I have concerns about everything in the project , please read my above answers</p>
<p>The development vaguely preaches that they are installing CHP. I have a concern in that the neighboring University City development has installed high velocity vents on Brentwood Road that make a considerable and noticeable racket. The same configuration is quite possible if they install a poorly designed CHP so I would stress AUC Rule 012 compliance is a must for CHP.</p>
<p>I would like to point out that it seems that whom ever is doing these designs seems rater incapable. I mean who steps down a building towards the north? And places big towers in positions so they will overcast the entire site? Or did sun light became a bad thing some how?</p>
<p>The community is concerned the new development will have a negative impact on traffic (increased congestion) and transit. The City response: Transportation analysis has been carried out to ensure the mobility network in Brentwood can support the proposed density. Appropriate infrastructure, if required, will be in place to accommodate the additional density.</p> <p>This appears to be mere lip service and a token response. When the 4 University City Towers were completed (approx 700 units?), the City added a bicycle lane and removed one vehicle lane. This has resulted in quite a bit of congestion at the 5-6:30 pm rush hour. Now we're adding another 500 units and the design boards show no upgrade to Brentwood Road. Appropriate infrastructure, if required? C'mon it "WILL" be required.</p>

I don't see any evidence of the spaces that would be created around the buildings to support the development. This seems to be either of little or no concern. I hope that the city and the developers think about how people will use the spaces (year-round).
The increased traffic on Brentwood Rd. has not been addressed. I understand this is a City of Calgary issue, not necessarily Coop's however you can't do one without the other. The traffic is already heavy on Brentwood Rd. Adding 501 residential units even if they don't all have cars is not going to help. Plus, there must be some plans for the redevelopment of the Safeway/Brentwood Mall site which will again add to the congestion. Isn't there an alternative the city could come up with to access Crowchild Trail from Charleswood Drive?
No.
Keep it low. Keep the density reasonable. Make it fit into the neighborhood, unlike those Crayola monstrosities already showered upon us; make it elegant, not an eyesore.
no
NO...unless you include the CITY continuing to drag it's feet on this and other development ideas. This is the time we should allow good community companies to help us redevelop and keep the city vibrant!
Non convinced that a thorough Traffic Impact study has been done, taking into account Northland redevelopment, University of Calgary happenings, Rio Can and Co-op. spoke to the Traffic guy at Triwood, and it seems to me there is not a holistic work up done, it is piecemeal by developer, who are not interested in anything beyond their own project, i.e. get it built, get out, and let traffic be someone elses problem.
Traffic on the road - can we see a city traffic study
I don't know all the details of this project linked below, but are Quarry Bay/CO-OP thinking big enough? I'm also unsure about the luxury orientation of this project linked below, but scale-wise this is along the lines of what they should be thinking. Can they provide themselves enough flexibility not to preclude future phases after all this planned development is done? http://shapeproperties.com/projects/the-amazing-brentwood/ http://www.ellisdon.com/project/brentwood-town-centre-redevelopment-phase-1/
Where are the reen spaces?
More local small business space. Less culture-zapping big block stores.
Also, I have heard comments from neighbours of the proposed development and Blakiston Park. They have noticed undesirable behavior at the ground level of University City. The proposed Development with loading/delivery docks, parkade ramps, garbage pick-up, along with the dead space between Building 1 and University City, adds to the already dark and pedestrian unfriendly space.
1. The Brentwood Road was designed for commercial areas and should be updated for the new capacity for vibrant business and high density residents--additional 501 resident units and 1,113 parking stalls from Co-op alone. 2. Extra lanes should be installed for the Westward and Eastward of the Brentwood road along the new proposed Brentwood Common area, to solve the congestion of traffic currently already shows up from Brisebois Brentwood traffic lights. This is especially congested when the economy was good during rush hour traffic 2 years ago. This is also true after one lane was taken out for bicycle paths.
These are the objectives as I read them and my comments to each. Greater mobility choice through improved walking, transit and cycling options; - I question the improved cycling options with the poor design of the Brentwood C train station

- Increased housing, employment, and service choices within existing communities; - Is there a lack existing in this space that needs to be filled. No data to support this.
- Promoting a better jobs/housing balance;- unclear how this assists
- Health benefits of walkable communities; - where are people walking to -to/from the C Train station and their condo>
- TOD as a catalyst for economic development;
- Reduced greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicle trips; - questionable when you can't get on the CTrain so new residents may just drive
- Improved air quality through the provision of- transportation alternatives; - again questionable with same reasoning above
- Reduced energy consumption resulting from efficient land use and transportation choices; - ??
- Maximum use of transit infrastructure; - it's already at capacity when needed
- Reduced traffic congestion-related costs; very questionable considering the fiascos already in place at West Hills and Crowfoot
- Redevelopment of vacant or underutilized industrial and commercial sites. - do we need more

The objectives appear more to benefit transportation as opposed to the vibrancy and quality of life in the community.

Rainwater harvesting, rooftop gardens, solar photovoltaic windows, annualized geosolar, thermal mass within each unit that runs into a central vent for passive air conditioning and heating, living walls for each unit, commercial offices on the north and residential on the south for maximum reduction of heating/cooling expenses for homes (because for-profit businesses can afford to pay greater sums than homeowners), rooftop compost collection, passive solar hot water, vermicompost kitchen bins, food forest in the parking lot including an orchard, exercise room that generates electricity

The flow of the entire site is a concern. I don't feel that is going to be a very attractive site. I have already started going to other communities that are more vibrant and appealing. Not enough green spaces, trees and grass. Just a lot of concrete.

I think traffic is going to be a major issue and I would rather go somewhere else than deal with the traffic congestion.

Yes - societies are at the tipping point. Please don't build and plan as though it was 2010. We must plan for the future.

Consider the holistic vision. Food security, chemical free green spaces, community interaction, energy efficiency.

Thank you.

When the Brentwood Common finished building, there will be a big increase in traffic coming from Brisebois Drive along the Brentwood rd East bound . Now there is only a single lane going either way. Cars will be stuck waiting for any car that wants to turn left. There should be a turning lane to allow East bound traffic flow through. I remember 3 years ago when Calgary economy was still good, there were a lot of traffic especially during the rush hour. This also includes the West bound on Brentwood road as cars were waiting from Brisebois Dr. to the pedestrian overpass for the C train station. The traffic study you have may be done recently and this does not reflect the true picture when the economy was in good shape. May be we should set back the Brentwood Common building with 2 red spots north to allow the creation of a turning lane?

we need a extra lane on Brisebois Drive for turn in new development area

Thank you to The City's planners for helping make this the best area possible for all the citizens of Calgary.
I don't think the city is being forceful enough with the proposal and are accepting lame excuses. Since when is a gas station a valid part of TOD development? Let's all go to the TOD to get gas for our cars...
Yes. This is not contributing to a walkable, cohesive shopping area between Brisebois and Charleswood. It's not connected in a meaningful way with the Brentwood community.
Yes, the potential lack of tenants for the retail space. The almost empty retail space in University City already make it look like a ghost town. Ideally, the commercial main street should have an elegant look, with elegant stores. Are we sure that we will not have convenience stores, mediocre restaurants or large retail stores such as Bed Bath and Beyond?
Traffic along Brentwood Road
There isn't a main public area or real gathering space other than in Blakiston Park which is separate from the development. Other than to shop at Coop, why would anybody go there? We've already seen how the 4 towers have failed as a vibrant area. Do we just want to create more spaces like this? Density as a goal in itself doesn't work. We can cram as many units as possible into the site, but it will never work as a vibrant community destination unless there is a long central street that I want to walk and linger on. One that draws me from one end of the site to the other, right down to Charleswood. That won't happen if the Coop is placed right across the intended road. If I can't see down the length, why would I walk around a building?
The development cannot be supported by the existing road infrastructure.
The public forum was too short and held dubiously during summer vacation. I don't feel people from the community feel like they had a chance to voice their concerns.
The cumulative development of Brentwood Coop's site, the existing University City and RioCan's proposed Brentwood new development hasn't been considered adequately. The individuals representing Coop, City Transportation, etc., seem to at times have conflicting or inadequate information which is a real problem - who to believe?
Yes, I simply don't understand how I'm only hearing about this in phase three of development. The Brentwood Co-op and Gas bar are the only places I shop. I'm there several times a week... how is it that I only saw a sign to complete a survey when the decisions have practically already all been made?
Please see my answer above. In case these different answers are being parsed out separately, I will paste it again: I think that the developer has taken steps to meet the concerns/ideas but we are still missing the mark. Basically, people have several classes of concerns: 1) Visual appeal of all of this development (Co-Op and Rio Can). We don't think that everything can be treated separately, there needs to be some agreement on what the area is going to look like. Going to 30 stories doesn't address this. 2) Making this development a community hub. What I see is better pedestrian access (good) and a cafe and patio. I think that more care needs to be taken to figure out how to do things nicely and make it really a place people will want to come, and we have examples of other places in the city where this was done successfully. The current plan still misses this. 3) Traffic congestion especially along Brentwood Road, with all the new developments plus UofC traffic. This part was not really addressed either.
No

Maybe some small store/restaurant/shopping facing Blakiston Park where vehicle traffic would be minimal and one could grab a coffee or an ice cream cone and go for a stroll in the park - not in that shadows of some huge eyesores.
Wind. Strong winds blow mostly from the west. there are already a lot of wind tunnel effects in the middle of the 4 towers and this will be even worse. There are not a lot of open spaces for wind to disperse. Bike lanes on Brentwood Road. Consider removing them from the road and making it 2 lanes each direction again. Move the bike lanes into the site instead. Having Brentwood Road be only 1 lane is going to be a big problem.
I am not sure if the City will back up its Brentwood SARP.
None.
Traffic & Parking Do you have concerns or suggestions about traffic in the area? The overall site provides an excess of parking over that required by the relevant Development Bylaws and Codes. We are still sceptical as to whether this development plan will congest traffic in Brentwood Road and, even worse, in Blakiston Drive. Are data from an in-depth analysis available?
General Application Does this achieve the goal of creating a vibrant, active development that succeeds as a good example of transit-oriented development? As it stands, only (very) partially. The project is vastly ameliorable.
Question 9: Do you have any additional questions about the application for the project team? Common questions will be used to help populate our Frequently Asked Questions section on the project webpage.
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
Is it possible to put a wind barrier on the LRT bridge over Crowchild? In winter the weather is brutal there (wind tunnel).
Could the development be "classy" not budget (cheap)?
501 residential limits! How big? Will this be another low quality, poorly designed university housing with transient residents? Too many units. Build quality decent size family apartments
There may be new considerations arise due to ward change - depends on civic election...
What's the evacuation plan in the event of disaster. Where will all these people go? How will they get there? Very crowded in a small area, limited units.
Why is this applicant allowed to have a public engagement session before the last weekend in August? This is not an effective way to engage members of the public as so many will be away
What is the maximum height of the current UniverCity buildings? This would provide better context for how this proposal would fit in with the existing community.
How much influence do actively engaged, and critically engaged citizens who care about the community and city have?
OPEN HOUSE – ENGAGEMENT BOARDS (STICKY NOTES).
All the 3-D model pictures do not have adjacent buildings. Can we have the adjacent structures in color shape & height to allow us better evaluate the overall suitability.
I understand that the City's maximum allowed is 90 meters. Why is Quarry Bay putting in for 116?
Why is this development not following the Station Area development philosophy of larger buildings adjacent to Crowchild Trail?

What weight do planning dept give community members?
Is is possible to have even more 'connectivity' with Blakiston park? Pedestrian friendly park like?
I feel that even with the changes, it will not be enough to make our community safe & nice
Why can't the main thorough fare intervene through this development? (putting a street next to the park is bad planning)
There are currently 4 entrances into the mall from Brentwood Road. This new plan appears to have reduced this to one from the south side. What if the lights malfunction? What if there is an accident at the lights?
Ditto. [Reduced this to one from the south side. What if the lights malfunction? What if there is an accident at the lights?]
Double Ditto. [Reduced this to one from the south side. What if the lights malfunction? What if there is an accident at the lights?]
Please - if you add bike lanes be sure to have safe ways for eyelets at bike lane stoppage (not on parking area)
Love to see added art and sculpture to the area.
Wondering about traffic lights - only one entrance into area. Have we done a traffic analysis? Bike lanes not being used. People are biking on sidewalks now.
I am very concern about the increase in traffic along Brentwood Rd. It's congested as it is now. I see there is a traffic light, but without more lanes, the traffic will be super congested. There is only one lane going to either direction now.
Will the traffic lights on Brentwood Blvd line up with the exit of the area opposite the development? How will the send entrance to the area be handled?
How about green buildings? Can ensure that built facilities will be energy efficient?
Is it possible to connect existing bike lane with the parral roads?
Additional high rises are absultly not nessesary. After all Calgary only 1,300 people.
Please start using no parking spots at least 2 cars lengths on Brisbois across Boulton & 2-3 length on Boulton. The streets is totally filled with cars - Can't see corners when trying to turn onto Brisbois
Would you consider replacing the traffic light with a traffic circle (roundabout). Perhaps double lane which will require buying land on the South side of Brentwood Road.
What is being done to ensure the survival of trees planted in the midst of concrete?
Will the 30 story create shade for the U. City and single homes on Blakiston? It appears access to direct sunlights will be limited
Concern about the loading dock entrance. Is there enough clearance to have the trucks back in & not block the rest of the road?
What is the emergency evacuation plan? Not too early to think about it. It's too late when disaster strikes!
Why does the ARP not have more standing? Is this a bargaining process for a single developer, or is this about long-term community development policy?
How will one ensure residents use Parkade? If they use street parking, even for short periods, then "in, out" traffic- shopping, pick up, etc will have no where to park
Too big
This project needs to go back for a significant redesign to address: High street (lack of), park access; and surface parking; Building height; area traffic flow. This project needs to be great!!!
COMMUNITY SOUNDING BOARD
What is the timeline for construction?

How long will the Co-op be closed?
Where are the pedestrian spots such as plazas, meeting places etc.
What happened to the community concerns?
What happened to the Main Street Concept? This is not friendly.
Where on the site map where will the Coop be located?
Where is the Tim's?
Will the Coop still be here?
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
Why does the proposed development contradict the Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment concept of taller buildings adjacent to Crowchild Trail & shorter buildings adjacent to the neighbouring residences? 501 residential units are being proposed. How many vehicles is that? How many daily customer vehicles are expected? How many daily delivery trucks are expected? Why is the gas station still proposed when there is no space for it?
The community will not be happy with the idea of "amending" what was already seen as an overly generous to the developers area redevelopment plan. The community cooperated at the engagement workshops but our main comments/concerns/requests have been ignored. The next public meetings will not be a friendly, and this makes me really sad, because I want to like coop, I shop their almost exclusively, and I want them to build something nice that will improve my community.
Where has the Wendy's been relocated?
What will the City of Calgary be doing to improve it's infrastructure connections to the development? The c-train access bridge is an outdated and unattractive part of this overall area.
What is next? Will our additional concerns be addressed and how will they be addressed?
I don't understand how the parking allotment works and my assumption is that there are enough spaces as outlined in the SARP (no reduced spaces / bonus)
Why not put something in that is welcomed by the neighbourhood, rather than having to scale back just enough to get approval? There is value in this community, and people will pay to live in and/or visit a more integrated development.
Who will be handling the questions/concerns about Brentwood Road.
Will Brentwood Road be able to handle the expected traffic!! What about congestion on Blakiston Road.
Nope.
N/A
1. I would ask the project team to consider all of the proposed plans for the "TOD" projects in the general area, i.e. why are there plans afoot to construct a new LRT station near Northland Mall? We already have Brentwood LRT station and Dalhousie LRT station! Why put another one along the northwest line? It will cost us a fortune to install the Green Line in the near future -- and only half of it will be built due to lack of funds! Did you know that Northland Mall has also been selected for high-density residence towers and a revamp of its shopping centre? That is now being put on hold because there is no current need for a new LRT station in that corner of Dalhousie. People enjoy using the indoor mall, particularly in winter. The plans call for a strip mall with an "outdoor courtyard" for skating, etc. Who would use it? I have no idea!

Why not just move the Bigger Coop closer to the C-train pedestrian overpass, put smaller store shop buildings around some scattered residential housing? Build into the community?
No
Living between Brentwood redevelopment, Northland redevelopment, Northmount @ Brisebois Drive construction, Northmount Drive redevelopment and shortly Dalhousie Coop redevelopment, I hope oversight is in place about how one geographic area can be impacted on many fronts at the same time. The input and planning processes for the several developments could be seen in isolation, but here in my area they are being lived and felt as major, collective change. Services disappearing and not being replaced, blocked access due to construction, construction traffic and noise, empty retail space, ... Growing pains! There is lots to look forward to, and there are improvements to celebrate. But, please be careful about planning in the Brentwood/Charleswood/Charleswood Heights/Dalhousie areas as a whole.
The pedestrian underpass beneath Crowchild at Brisebois will likely be used more. Right now it is deteriorating and somewhat dangerous particularly in the evening and night. We will have more transients. What can be done there? School yards are so under utilized. I know there are safety and supervision concerns when we make them more public; however, consider something like mixed use, division between public and school use on the same property. Whispering Woods is lovely and there is a distinct break between school and public land. Any possibility of using a model like that? What controls will there be to avoid the facelessness of University City? What cultural/city sponsored programs can be introduced into those buildings? Can built-in indoor community activity be provided? City Parks and Rec programs.
Where will the Wendy's be located?
See above.
No further questions. I am strongly in favour of this project. The Coop and existing commercial site is sorely outdated.
How big will the apartments be? The 350-650 square foot ones in the other ugly towers are very small. Who would those apartments be designed for?
I am late coming into this plan. I see all the development in this neighbourhood and fear the density is too high, attracts a limited demographic (students, singles, couples without children) and wonder if this market isn't saturated by all the high density development already in place or under construction. Is there a way we can include development for families, seniors, children, so we can have a more diverse community and heterogeneous community?
No
Does the proposed Commercial Main Street actually connect to the south part of the site in any way?
Where will ground level retail be present on the proposed site?
no
I just hope the City would take a harder stance on this matter and reject the application unless Co-op truly comes up with a plan that satisfies the concerns of the community. As of now, this plan looks nothing but a cash-grab proposal for Co-op at the expense of the existing residents who live in the area.
The city seems to ask for input, but as a cynic due to a number of input sessions that we've attended in the past, the council seems to have their own agenda and these are just forums to give the politicians a pat on the back as a way to say to the public, well we asked for opinions. Projects are planned and this is simply a formality. Like many cities across

Canada, there will be a glut of condos that will remain empty or scooped up by buyers from other nations.
its too tall. traffic. sun.
No.
Everyone knows you have no intention of changing anything. You will pick and choose which responses you get to show your plan in the best possible light. Too bad Brentwood won't be in the sunshine anymore.
Where would people picking up c train passengers be parking and how will they access that parking?
What r plans for rest of Brentwood mall? Will that development be piecemeal as well with developers asking for an 80 story building then accepting only 30 stories even though the city itself says even lower is better? What about traffic? Cars I mean . How will this development affect the proposed Northmount drive? What is the standing for the new northland mall project? The new coop project in Dalhousie? R they all piece meal apps as well! Brentwood is not downtown. Even kennington would not allow these 2 buildings. Some development around ctrain is great but if I had wanted to live in a high density urban area with attendant crime and traffic congestion I would have moved to the belt line.
no
What size apartments are being proposed for these two tall apartment building developments? Another set of university housing residences? Or family style with two to three bedroom to encourage long term living.
If you actually approve this project I would like to see some discussion of how the "public" interest is considered in theory. I say this because fundamental ideas like the rule of law and representation of the public interest, and "judicial neutrality" that is supposed to be protected by Council approval authority isn't working as it stands.
When will the detailed views and landscaping features be presented to the public for viewing to provide a better understanding of whether this development actually will fulfill its mandate of creating a community feel?
I have been excited about Brentwood TOD since it was announced (I live here), yet I haven't specifics about the project until this month. Have communications really been going out to local residents prior to August 2017?
Please provide updates on FAQ on traffic congestions concerns on Brentwood Road. Thank you.
Why is so much of the community engagement being done in August when so many folks are away on vacation? Why is this project seemingly being rushed through?
Why weren't the local citizens consulted about what they want for this area, before this development was proposed.
I don't want a road passing in front of the green and yellow building (the back of where they want to put the new Coop). That will diminish greatly the quality of life of the people living on that side, due to noise, traffic all day long, garbage collection, smell. Today there is an enjoyment of looking at Blakiston Park, and with this road they want to construct, it will affect also the peaceful enjoyment of the park with children, and enjoyment of the Condos where the people live, nobody will want to open the windows, and being in the balconies to see that.
The plans that are being shown at the Farmers Market and at the Co-op are very confusing to read. There were other plans that the Community Association received that shows more detail. You have to remember that 95% of the people who look at these plans do not know how to read them. For instance, you show green, so everyone thinks that is a park, when actually it is the green space on top of the building. Also there are circles that people thought were trees, when in actual fact they are cement. I know this is very tedious to have so many

pages in the plans, but it would be nice if there was something that showed exactly what everything is.
The plan seems to be a hybrid of sprawling gas bar/surface parking reminiscent of a 1960' mall, combined with Manhattan-like density on the rest of the site. What exactly do the 'density requirements' ask for when it comes to extreme differences in density and intensity? Other malls (nearby Stadium) have proposed underground parking and have more even intensity across the site.
I am concerned that community concerns are really not incorporated in any meaningful way into the plans. I worry that the developers have a set vision and consultation with the community is done only to say that it was done and our feedback does not help to make any changes. I am thankful for the opportunity to express my thoughts on such an important redevelopment and I hope that we seize this opportunity to truly make this an important component of Brentwood!
No.
no
The entire project is creating a concrete ghetto. High density living has never created community.
My question for the city developers is What weight do you assign to concerns of citizens, if any, or is this just a thing you do so you can say to our elected officials, yes, that box has been ticked.
Can the city require family-sized residential units? This community is going to face elementary school closures in the near future (5-10 years) as new schools are built elsewhere. The residential units should be sized to be flexible enough for families, not just childless couples or singles. Can the city require say 50% 3 bedroom units? Families also have larger household sizes and buy large quantities of goods from grocery stores like CO-OP. The developer is just flipping condos and may have the owner (CO-OP) thinking too short term.
Could the access to and from the mall on Brantford Rd be used only by non motorized vehicles Keep the other back access on Brentwood Blvd behind Safeway for motor vehicles. I would like to limit cars and encourage walking, biking and other non-motorized means of transportation for this TOD site.
Can you slow down process, and allow time for more neighborhood observation. Employ sustainability practices Prove that you are using permaculture principles.
no
How have you consider access by seniors to this area? Driving is often the safest for us. Getting onto buses can be difficult if you are using a cane or are unsteady on your feet. Walking longer distances is difficult too. Hopefully there will be many benches for people to sit on. From the 2009 document that I read, it seems older people have not been considered at all even though it has been people like me and those before me who have made this neighbourhood such a pleasant place to live. I am someone who does like change. I just do not appreciate being consulted after all the decisions have been made. Given what is already happening in Brentwood, I do know that despite input from the

Brentwood Community Association and individuals concerns re development at the Brisebois and Northmount intersection, the developers seem to have what they wanted, a 5 storey retail building. The community living around this, less so.
What is the capacity of the C Train during rush hour and will it accommodate the increased residential numbers proposed for all of these communities along the NW leg.
What role does the city have in creating incentive for planners to be progressive in making new developments reflect sustainability principles, like photovoltaic windows and passive house design?
Radiant heat, etc.
Traffic will be a major concern for this TOD, the city needs to deal with Brentwood Road.
Why is the developer allowed to amend the rules set out in the Station Area Redevelopment Plan? It's not right.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a reasonable estimate of the expected time of completion of the project? - Does the City have plans to prevent "wild" parking on Blakiston Drive? - Will there be another meeting in September or October?
How can traffic congestion be resolved along Brentwood Road? It is an issue now....before adding 1,000 more residents and businesses.
<p>During the workshops, we were told a 2-storey Coop was a possibility. It would have had a smaller footprint and fit into more spaces on the site. In Europe there are many such grocery stores. Why is this not being considered?</p> <p>Why is there not a better bike connection through the site that doesn't pass directly in front of the Coop entrance? I ride from Brentwood to the LRT station coming from the north. Riding in front of the store where people are coming out with carts seems like a bad plan.</p>
No.
<p>Where are detailed drawings of the plan?</p> <p>How will this project impact the surrounding community?</p> <p>What considerations have been made for traffic flow to and from the site?</p> <p>How will these changes affect the redevelopment of Blakiston Park?</p> <p>Please provide more information on surrounding roadways and how this project may affect their congestion.</p>
<p>Honestly... just why are you trying to hurt our community? In such a painfully hectic world, finding some sense of familiarity in your community is a major comfort to some who don't have many.</p> <p>The idea of having such a huge disruption that lasts for six years is a huge burden.</p>
<p>I don't know if this is a fair question, but it again relates to the fact that both Co-Op and Rio-Can are planning to add hundreds of new units to this area. I know it isn't the City's concern whether all units can be sold, but assuming that the real estate market in the area becomes really saturated, what will this mean to people already living in the area? And what will it mean if units are sitting empty for lack of renters? This is partly to be dealt with by individual home and condo owners, but that is maybe the problem - the developers build and if they can sell units, it isn't really their problem anymore if all units can be occupied. Does the City play a role in checking if the market can withstand this influx of living space from both developers?</p>
<p>Do you have any imagination or are you all too attached to 3-D design computer programs. Get out and explore some other cities with some culture.</p>
No.
<p>The Co-op really needs to be replaced/updated/upgraded. It is very out of date and small, and I am happy that there is a proposal here to do this. I realize this redevelopment has</p>

much more than just Co-op upgrade/replacement, but I am happy to see this happening, given the state of the current Co-op. The addition of residential/commercial space doesn't bother me. In fact, the addition of more space for smaller businesses is great, as it will hopefully add spots for new businesses to come into the area and make the community more walkable and have more options than it currently has.

Open house engagement board

Question 1. After reviewing the panels around the room, do the proposed changes and information provided address the community concerns and ideas that were heard in the first phases of engagement? Please place a dot in the yes or no column if you feel the concern and/or idea has or has not been adequately addressed by the revised application and/or the additional information that we have provided.

Community Idea/ Concern	Yes this has been addressed	No this has not been addressed
Parking Concern there will be inadequate parking on the site	30	8
Development Fit Concern that the new development will not be visually appealing and will be too high for the existing community.	14	53
Traffic Community is concerned about the effect of additional density on traffic and road safety.	14	42
Pedestrian Connectivity and Safety The community desires an improved journey to and through the site.	19	24
Vibrant Gathering Spaces Community feels there is a lack of local, small-scale businesses and vibrant places to gather.	18	27
Road Alignment The community would like to have a commercial main street that connects through the station area.	6	35

Public engagement evaluation

Question 10. How satisfied are you with the opportunity to provide feedback?

	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
I am satisfied with the opportunity to participate and provide input	78	51	7	14	12
I received enough information to provide meaningful input	52	54	15	20	19

I understand how my input will be used	43	27	32	26	28
The format was an effective way for the City to collect input	67	42	24	2	11
Question 11. What worked for you about the feedback opportunities provided to you? Is there anything we could do differently to make it better?					
Online and open house - good					
The option to provide feedback either online or at the open house is appreciated					
Computer					
Not build so many units in such a small space					
City of Calgary & various developers in the area have a credibility problem. We have gotten the impression in the past that this is all smoke & mirrors and the City & developers will do what they please. This forum, however was well done - yea!					
I would like to see a 3D model of proposed development					
Yes. Listen to the community & stick to the SARP. Otherwise, stop wasting time & money for developing SARP's					
I concerned that the developer will push thru with their own plans and the city will cave in to their demands.					
I think the City did a very good job with their 'what we heard'; Applications renderings could be confusing for a layperson, could use better callouts; Should have moved public engagement to September					
The in-person sessions were better than providing feedback on-line. I was able to converse with both City staff and other residents to gather info. Also, it was easier to refer to a hard copy of the poster boards at the tables than to refer to the PDF pasted online - easier to slip back & forth between pages for comparison.					
Not sure, I may have wasted my time, ink and the opportunity cost to work in my garden, unless there is some feedback and evidence that residents have been heard					
Present ALL information including detailed pictures and thorough maps of the proposed development (including the recent changes). Until we have this information, how can we provide meaningful input?					
Most of us Brentwood residents feel that all of these consultations are just a band aid to make us feel like we have any say, when in fact most decisions have already been made and are driven by dollars and cents and not what creates a desirable environment for those of us who live here (we are not opposed to redevelopment, but it has to be reasonable). Please prove to us that our mindset is incorrect					
I feel engagement was well executed and readily available.					
In the past I have participated in these engagement studies, and then find that there's been very few changes made to what was originally planned. I keep trying, but do not feel that the public has an actual ability to be heard.					
Listen and make appropriate changes					
The revised "concept" doesn't include a map, that I could find online anyway, making it difficult to see what changes, if any, were made to the proposed layout of the buildings. It is obvious that we are meant to not notice the fact that very little has changed. It seems that the feedback provided in the previous round has been read and ignored (or only has been incorporated into the most superficial of the modifications to the plan. I guess the original coop plan was really a fait accompli, which is disappointing, since it means that my neighbours and I have been					

wasting our time trying to convince coop and the city of the need for some major changes (main street and lower building height). The next steps section below is a bit disingenuous. What landowner rights? I can't even build an addition, let alone a 30 story tower, without fitting my zoning. Coop and its investor developer friends have had access to the station area plan for almost a decade, so they know very well what they are allowed/not allowed to build. They should simply be required to work within the existing plan, which has a good vision and is already generous to the various developers.
Very concerned that the community's concerns with building height are going to be ignored. Would like direct response and immediate assurance that no building higher than current buildigns will be approved.
Engage the public first, then design the project. Presenting a design that is not wanted, then asking for input, is a bad community relations approach.
I appreciated the street signs and the mailing that reminded me to review the application and provide input.
Thanks for adding the links to all the relevant planning documents.
Yes - listen to the people in the wider Brentwood / Charleswood area that will be affected by this
Efficient, user friendly, hopefully concerns are heard and acted upon.
As mentioned above, a more detailed listing of the changes from previous plans to this plan would have been really useful. It is really difficult to figure what has changed, unless you know where to go back and review the previous proposal.
I really have difficulty see any significant changes that really incorporated the community members' input.
You have been very good at getting notice to us, and providing the relevant information. I am not a big fan of this proposal, but I am grateful to the city for the way it has been handled.
There has been a pretty good feedback and opportunity for input. I truly hope City Planning department really listens to the input from residents and takes notes on how 'not to' build from the mess that is University City.
This site was I bit difficult to access.
Juxtaposition between what the community wanted and what the applicant changed before the question boxes was really helpful in comparing the two.
I know it is not possible, but a referendum style vote would be best
The maps were helpful.
I would suggest that you provide a direct link to the feedback form. As it stands now, a user has to play around and eventually try clicking on "Phase Three" in order to get to the feedback form! Some people will give up in frustration, which will reduce the number of potential respondents. Please REVISE a.s.a.p so that the maximum number of respondents will be able to provide their input. THANKS!
I didn't hear about the engagements in Phase 1 and 2, but I received a postcard in the mail about Phase 3. Postcards to the local community is an effective way to seek engagement.
We will see... The Area redevelopment plan clearly stated the need for the maximum height and a main street concept. The community input on this design restated the same things very clearly in the public sessions. If the developer is still successful with this design (the height and the road position) then feedback opportunities are obviously just a way for the city to claim engagement without actually respecting it.
Yes, taking from the best complex redesign feed back experience with the Cadillac Fairs's Chinook Center redesigning. Feed back was done by showing the completed model and then

<p>having people comment on the design with the assistance of knowledgeable people telling what changes they had planned (from previous interaction of course) the designers would SURVEY people about the designers own changes (good or bad). also the people with all the personal interaction with the designer could give there own changes to the designers. Personal knowledge In Person directly with a scale model in front of them, discussing and voting. No games thank you.</p>
<p>Responding online.</p>
<p>Thanks for online opportunity.</p>
<p>Reduce size of the report from phase 1-2 to key findings and trends supported by the detailed report, to make the report consumable</p>
<p>You've done an important job. Unfortunately development doesn't seem to be possible in a totally altruistic way. Community board was useful and I do hope to come to the August 24 open house. No doubt more questions and clarity will pop up then.</p>
<p>We received a postcard in the mail giving us the chance to provide online feedback. I do not recall receiving this in the past for phase 1 and 2 community involvement. I never saw any option to be involved. We thought this was our first chance to provide feedback. I was surprised to see that this was already at Phase 3. Also, no where on the postcard does it say that. We really thought this was phase 1 feedback. I don't feel like my comments will be as valuable now.</p>
<p>It is awesome as is.</p>
<p>Kudo to the city for providing easier access to the permit information and well as online access to renderings and feedback.</p>
<p>If the developers go back and design the towers to a max height of 90 meters, loading docks are put underground, there isn't a road by the Blackistion Park. Then the format for collecting input was successful otherwise it was just formality if the City and developer procede with the current proposal.</p>
<p>I missed previous chances to have input into the project development as I did not even know this was happening until I recently received the city of Calgary postcard (which was really appreciated!) with the information, which means I didn't see anything whereby I could have had previous input. My input to the online survey is limited to the information on the website which is comprehensive but hard to sift through so I will definitely be visiting the Tripod open house.</p>
<p>Stop building.</p>
<p>Better drawings. More angles. Video renderings. Better legends and descriptions for the illustrations. More detailed shadow studies.</p>
<p>Let's face it, it is a done deal no matter what our community says. So why pretend our input will change everything? We will still have ugly towers, lots of construction, a loss for those who live on Blakestone. Excuse my skepticism, but I have seen it all before.</p>
<p>This is the first time I have received detailed information about this project. Perhaps this is because I only live part time here. Nevertheless, I welcome the opportunity for feedback.</p>
<p>My main source of local news is CBC Radio 1. It would be great if you could reach out & have this covered on the Eyeopener or the HomeStretch. I feel like this has been going on without much opportunity for information or feed back.</p>
<p>Do not let developers control this kind of thing....The TOD is already done alot with the previous development..</p>
<p>Put a link to visual depictions to changes in plan with relevant questions.</p>
<p>More surface parking to properly accommodate shopping and business visitor parking.</p>

<p>More information in the documentation. Providing a single low resolution image of the site gives next to no idea what is going to happen where, and makes me feel like someone is trying to hide something.</p>
<p>I like the option of online or in person.</p>
<p>I believe the City did a great job by opening several rounds of Public Engagement Process for this development. But the real concern remains, would the city continue to act against the will of the people? When the University City Condos were built, I believe the City did the same Public Engagement Process. In the end, even though the majority of the residents in Brentwood were opposed to the idea of building residential condos, the city chose to approve the plan regardless. 5 years later, Co-op is proposing to building an additional 500 residential units in the area. The City launches a Public Engagement Process and the people have made it very clear they do not want to see anymore Residential Condos. So it will be interesting to see if the government chooses to ignore the people and act against their will and concerns.</p>
<p>This was thrown at us during the summer months when most of us have been away. perhaps it could have been handled in a more timely fashion.</p>
<p>i would like to have seen a map with driveways/access/walkways not an artist rendering which often mucks with perspective.</p>
<p>I found that the presentation of previous phases was a little bit disorganized. I had to download four separate PDFs and open one up in a split view so that I could compare the different site plans. The input form was great: very specific.</p>
<p>This attempt to pretend to listen to citizens (you know, the people who pay your salary?), is a total waste of taxpayers money. If it were up to me, every one of the lazy twerps that are on the public dole at city hall (you call them employees but they're basically collecting welfare) would be fired.</p>
<p>City staff should clarify and be straightforward as to what they see as input into their recommendations versus input which will just form comments they will forward to approving authorities.</p>
<p>The survey assumes the City will approve it and I disagree with the development going ahead. It seems the City approves all development plans at least that has been my experience living in this community.</p>
<p>Let us know what the entire plan for my neighbourhood is b4 u come to me? Is there a maximum density for Brentwood? How will this development impact future developments ? No effect?</p>
<p>I feel that this development is moving forward quickly and is really not considering the communities needs and wishes. I understand redevelopment is necessary but to maintain community please keep families and seniors in mind.</p>
<p>The main reason why I had the information to participate in this questionnaire is because the Brentwood Community Association held a meeting that allowed me the opportunity to see the drawings for the development.</p>
<p>As to how the information will be used, I have seen little response to the previous community input, and doubt if community comments will have little effect on what the city accepts.</p>
<p>I hope someone is listening. Brentwood is a terrific community and that is worth a lot.</p>
<p>Put the burden of gaining approval onto developers instead of giving them the authority to cherry pick public input. Make developers explain their plans, and the rationale for their choices. Make them document their claims with objective, independent information. Let the public criticize their plans instead of pretending to give authority to actually design the development. Actually, why not have more than one developer submit competing professional designs, with the public given the option to choose between them on the basis of public presentations?</p>

The information is presented clearly but unfortunately there does not seem to be enough of it. It is very basic. Also, it would be helpful to have compared this to the sections of the ASP that it was addressing with some illustrations.
The full set of plans should be available online for those who were not able to attend a workshop.
See my notes above.
a few more open houses and community sessions outside of the summer vacation months
I don't think it's appropriate to let an applicant host public engagement before the last weekend in August when many people are away and council isn't running; they should be forced to move to September. It also would have been nice to have a bit more explanation on the summary sheets provided for 'the original concept' and 'the updated concept'. Talking to people at the open houses and the board in front of the Coop store, many of the concepts/concerns such as the elimination of commercial main street were still a little unclear to people until they saw the ARP connection figures side-by-side with Coop's site plan. So perhaps the City could be providing more context beside Coop's figures, or even text callouts pointing to specific areas rather than just a list above the figure? Otherwise I think the public engagement was pretty good, I liked the bulletin board outside of Coop.
There has been no engagement up until a card arrive in my mail box two weeks ago. Suggestion: Have city planners work with the people who will be making million and million by taking advantage of valuable land. Let them sell their units but: -ensure the quality of the building and units is not subpar -ensure the units will be attractive to young families who can take advantage of the wealth of infrastructure the community has (low -income towers for students already exist) -ensure that local residents will give a second thought to getting in their car to go somewhere with amenities and character
I appreciated the opportunity to provide input, but other than the developers resubmission, didn't really here why our changes could not be incorporated.
I will be interested to see if the City responds to the feedback of the residents of Brentwood, in addressing their concerns. It often seems to be the case that the decisions are made before the community is asked to participate in the discussions, and that the surveys and meetings are just formalities that are required before the project can go ahead.
All the information I required for a thorough review has been available, sites easy to access. Thank you
Well I think its a done deal regardless. I am thank full the height from 40 to 30 has dropped BUT it should go lower yet. I have chatted with customers at co-op, I am a 40 year member. Most people are concerned about the traffic flow and volume of cars. Its going to be congested.
Try to hold the open house at the Brentwood community centre (sportsplex).
Do not hold key sessions in the summer. Do not put up a board outside at Coop where most shoppers would not even notice it. It should have been INSIDE the store. Follow City rules. The 116 heights should not even be considered. The limit is 90. Even that is questionable. What do the shadow studies show from this tall buildings so close to the park? Listen to what the citizens have to say. We have to live with this.

As I said above. Better plans that people understand what they are looking at.
It is hard to believe the City is seriously going to consider this input when the developer is asking to repeal a recent and comprehensive TOD public input program and land use designation. One or the other of these may have been a sham so I guess this decision will show if both public engagement programs were really a waste of time.
The perspective at the top of this page does not show the interface with the community. Perhaps a secondary perspective would had been good
Yes. Understand that they are NOT, in fact, "feedback opportunities", but referenda from the community on how well you are doing your job of working for US. Long before any initial plans were drawn up and proposed, community meetings should have been held to establish what your criteria, limitations, etc., were. Then you could have shortened the remaining feedback process because the initial design would have already have addressed key requirements and limitations, such as height and resulting density and traffic volumes. You put the cart before the horse.
I have completed this survey already but forgot to mention that I really appreciated the postcard delivered to our mailbox. That was a great way to get our attention and having the dates handy was very helpful Thank you.
there was someone available and knowledgeable who was able to address my questions. There was lots of background information to show the process up to the current point and the ideas that informed the decision making. I understand the objectives of the project and how the applicant made changes to address the needs of the community. There was also sufficient information to explain why the applicant was not able to accommodate all of the requests from the community and the steps they took to try and address those concerns the best they could.
I think the use of adjectives such as vibrant, is ridiculous. What does it mean? How is it measured?
Please continue to meet with community associations who interface with the city on these issues. While appearing neutral, I wonder if city planning department really aligns with developers more so than citizens. Your jobs do not depend on being elected, and it seems to me your agenda is to push things along and longstanding relationships with developers take precedence , please clarify planning mandate and relationships with the various stakeholders.
Include the community earlier
Lots of opportunities. I wasn't able to make either the Brentwood CA's open house or the city's, so online was good this time. Took part in the board games. Was disappointed in city staff prep for that activity. They needed more awareness/familiarity with this specific project to facilitate. Bigoted people at my table were against affordable housing for example, as the city staff/community person kept the idea of a homeless shelter like Inn from the Cold/Mustard Seed. Also felt it should have been realistic, in terms of city staff actually requiring the participants to meet CO-OP's requirements re phasing, scale/viability.
I along with many others do not believe that my input will make any difference in what has already been decided by the City of Calgary. This is seen over and over as communities try and work with the city and are by and large on the losing end. And as for the Brentwood ARP, looks like a city manifesto to me -- a done deal!!! For example, http://www.bankview.org/bankview-community-association-opposes-the-village-project/ -- read the letter and the comments.
The timing of this survey during the summer period when many people are out of town is very inconvenient for feedback (but convenient for development approval under the radar).
More open houses this summer as many people were away.

<p>This is not a Coop problem, however, will the City address how this extra residential density will impact an already congested Brisebois and the Brentwood Roads?</p>
<p>I hope the parking won't be an issue because the general design of the building looks great and the area is trying to be community friendly. Families who buy groceries can't do it on a bike and if you don't make it easy by allowing enough space for staff, shoppers and those people who will be parking when they are visiting the apartments, then people will go to other stores to buy their groceries.</p>
<p>When this project is built, if the surface parking is full and the traffic area is congested, I will not take the extra time to park underground. As a long term Coop shopper at the Brentwood store, I will go elsewhere and that would be a shame.</p>
<p>I live in Banff Trail and shop in Brentwood. The changes there have impact on the neighbouring communities and I don't think we hear enough about the development early enough.</p>
<p>links alongside the comments directly accessing the more detailed information would have been helpful.</p>
<p>A bit of a door-to-door information campaign.</p>
<p>I have taken part in all of the engagement and feedback opportunities provided by the City and Co-op. All were valuable – thank you for the opportunities. However, as they say, the proof is in the pudding. I would be very disappointed if the City allowed for the Main Street concept as proposed in the ARP was not adhered to. If a developer can have it amended because they want a larger spacer, or located in a different orientation than the ARP allow (rather than design to the ARP), then I worry for the remainder of the Brentwood Station area being developed according to the ARP.</p>
<p>Consultation so close to the actual timeline of the development does not feel like consultation. The walkways are already laid in concrete behind Brentwood co-op, so development is happening as I write this.</p>
<p>Consultation or at least information 3-4 years ago and timelines for community input over those 3-4 yrs would have shown that the community was valued. Information could have been posted in the library, the rec centre, the grocery stores, pharmacies would have enabled more of us to truly participate</p>
<p>Opportunity to speak with someone at Triwood Centre</p>
<p>The redevelopment plan document is very difficult to go through and better thought should be made to make it more user readable. The time period the community has to provide feedback was unfair being that it fell during the summer period when community participation will be low.</p>
<p>It would be nice to see the percentage of feedback that is for or against the project from all workshops that were conducted. The community members were not in favor of the current development but there have not been significant changes to reflect the workshop mapping that was done. How is the community heard about their concerns and who really cares.</p>
<p>Give an option for people who provide feedback to give email if they want most up to date public announcements on project.</p>
<p>You're in such a unique position to truly shift best practice for development, lifestyle, commercial and residential living for generations to come.</p>
<p>Please take innovative, holistic, sustainable design seriously.</p>

Thank you.
The 3 D picture should include neighboring building and structure with elevation and real color. This will give us a better sense of how this whole complex sits among the environment. It is hard to say 37 story or 40 story is good without knowing what it is situated.
more advertising for open house or request public inputs
I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback, but I also feel this is a "check box" exercise so the developer can say they solicited input, and then they go and do what they want. There is very little change from the original development and this latest revision.
Better maps so we could see the proposed changes.
The feedback system works very well. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main meeting being in August prevented too many Brentwood resident from participating; - The single three-dimensional rendering provided is obviously not sufficient to make any evaluation on the new plan.
Be a little more transparent with what you acutually really want here - by you I mean City Council.
Complete traffic analysis and present enhancements that will deal with current issues and anticipated growth.
I am glad that the city has an opportunity to provide input, however, the information provided was extremely confusing and difficult to sift through. (i.e. the transit redevelopment map)
I think that you should not be doing the bulk of the consultations over the summer months. Also half of a month is not enough of a window for feedback due to holidays etc.
I think there has been multiple opportunities to provide feedback but the problem is nothing has been done with that feedback. The City can create pages and pages of what we heard reports, but at some point, they have to do something with that information. In this case that means telling Coop that their current plans need to be substantially changes to comply with the ARP, main street and all.
Maybe highlight some of the proposed changes more clearly in the architectural drawing. And please make sure that people's comments really are taken into consideration in the second review. Thank you for this opportunity!
Online feedback works well for me, but more detailed drawings, with dimensions or a graphic scale and thorough annotation would allow for a more complete understanding of the proposal.
The map could have been better, with some identifiers on the landmarks.
The plans and blueprints were hard to understand or read, without someone present who could explain them. There needs to be more written on the plans, instead of trying to guess what it means or what is is.
Thank you!
The vision workshop was really interesting and rewarding; the opportunity to provide more feedback and review developer re-design is very helpful.
There was ample time to read up and participate. I really appreciate this opportunity to get engaged!
We need better detail (visual) to have an educated input. This seems very vague, misleading and may have a destructive outcome for the community.