



Oakridge 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 2580 Southland Dr. S.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 five new buildings. The tallest building heights are proposed to be approximately 13 storeys (44 metres) and 7 storeys (25 metres). A total of 294 residential units are proposed and 14,500 square metres (156,076 square feet) of commercial space including office, grocery store, retail, existing restaurants, liquor store, gas bar and other commercial uses and 754 parking stalls.

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 Oakridge 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 February 2017 with an online survey and in-person open house and phase two included two in-person visioning workshop in May 2017. 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/oakridgecoop. Please note that the developer has conducted their own engagement prior to submitting the application and more information can be found at oakridgecrossingyyc.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 Oakridge Co-op Store from August 23 - 30. 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 64 comments on the sounding board.

Pop-up event

The City project team attended the Braeside Community Birthday Bash on August 19 from 12:30 – 4:00 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 78 citizens.

Open house

An in-person open house was held on Monday, August 14 at The Braeside 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 165 people attend this session and received 13 completed feedback forms and 105 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/oakridgecoop. Citizens were provided with the information shared at the in-person events and were asked to provide their comments on the application by answering 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 1,257 visits to the site in the month of August and received 172 completed responses.

Comment forms

We had comment forms available at the Braeside Community Centre 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 2 completed forms.

Overall we had 481 participants in the third phase of engagement for this project (in-person and online) and we receive 1,063 ideas and comments through all methods of input.

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 added a north/south connection and a better connection to Oakmoor Drive to improve pedestrian connections.

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

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 the building on the northeast corner from 11 to 7 storeys and has added second floor setbacks to improve the interface with development to the west.

2. Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input and is the reduction in storeys and setbacks sufficient to address community concerns? Please advise why or why not.

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 added a commercial main street, a place for the community to meet and gather, in addition to a publically accessible courtyard.

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

General Application

4. Do you feel the changes to the plan overall have addressed the community ideas and concerns shared with The City? Tell us why.
5. Do you have any outstanding concerns about the application that you feel have been missed?
6. 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

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

8. 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/oakridgecoop) that shares information and background about the Oakridge 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: 177,230
 - Clicks: 612
 - Click through rate: 0.35%
- 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 @nextcityyyc twitter account (@nextcityyyc 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: Oakridge events awareness
 - Paid reach: 3,774
 - Paid impressions: 13,716
 - Clicks to website: 265
 - Post likes: 48
 - Post comments: 15
 - Post shares: 16
 - August 8-14: Oakridge Co-op open house promotion
 - Paid reach: 3,014
 - Paid impressions: 9,177
 - Clicks to website: 113
 - Post likes: 11
 - Post comments: 6
 - August 15-29: Oakridge Co-op online engagement
 - Paid reach: 3,474
 - Paid impressions: 12,011
 - Clicks to website: 186
 - Post likes: 14
 - Post comments: 0

- A postcard mail out was conducted and sent to 8,829 residents in the surrounding community.
- Six large traffic signs placed throughout the community at high-traffic intersections, to push people to the website and our in-person events
- Information was shared with the Oakridge, Braeside, Cedarbrae, and Palliser Bayview Pumphill Community Associations, which they passed on to members of the community.
- Advertisements in the *Braeside Bulletin*, *myCedarbrae*, *PBP Matters* and *Your Oakridge Echo* community newsletters, were placed in the July and August editions.
- Sending emails to the 287 community members subscribed to our email list, sharing workshop information and encouraging sign-up.
 - 5 emails were sent between July 13 and August 30, 2017
 - July 13, 2017: List of August events, sent to 241 recipients, 164 opened, 30 clicked
 - July 24, 2017: What We Heard Report from May now available online, sent to 244 recipients, 169 opened, 97 clicked
 - August 10, 2017: August events reminder, sent to 268 recipients, 160 opened, 59 clicked
 - August 22, 2017: Online survey reminder, sent to 281 recipients, 156 opened, 28 clicked
 - August 30, 2017: Last day to complete online survey, sent to 287 recipients, 129 opened, 32 clicked
- Approximately 10,000 postcards were handed out at check-out in the Oakridge 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 oakridgecrossingyyc.ca and to their email distribution lists.
- Councillor Pincott'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 agree with the proposed changes to the application to address pedestrian connectivity, gathering spaces and like the addition of the commercial main street.
- Citizens have mixed views on the development fit, some agree that the reduction in storeys were sufficient while others feel it was not enough and still too high.
- Citizens have concerns over parking and traffic issues that could result from the proposed development.

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 pedestrian connections have been improved	<p>Some citizens feel the proposed changes have improved pedestrian connectivity on the light and alleviated concerns.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p>

	<p><i>“Yes. I’m very pleased with having the pedestrian access to the site. Its shows that you’re listening to the concerns of people like myself who don’t drive.”</i></p> <p><i>“Yes, now all of us who live west on Oakmoor Drive can enter the Coop from the backside like we did before.”</i></p> <p><i>“I believe it has resolved any issues with connectivity and safety.”</i></p>
<p>Citizens made suggestions for more crosswalks and lights locations</p>	<p>Some citizens made suggestions for specific traffic and pedestrian infrastructure such as crosswalks, lights etc.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>“let there be more lights, more crosswalk signals and of course more transitioning from the wide lanes east and west to make it easier for those who do not walk that fast to cross either way. Signalization of the street signals should be lengthened so we do not have to rush as not all of us are quick and nimble anymore and do need the extra minutes when we carry our groceries x-amount across the streets either east west or north south.”</i></p> <p><i>“I think there needs to be pedestrian crossing lights added to the cross walk on southland drive by the boston pizza. Vehicles routinely miss that there is pedestrians at this cross walk and it is very unsafe. I myself have had to stop midway many times to avoid getting hit, I worry about children crossing that aren’t making sure vehicles stop when they should”</i></p>
<p>Development Fit</p>	
<p>Theme</p>	<p>Detailed explanation and sample comments:</p>
<p>Citizens feel the proposed changes have address community input</p>	<p>Some citizens agree that the proposed reduction in storeys and setbacks have met community concerns.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“Changes to development plan and reduced height are acceptable.”</i></p> <p><i>“Yes, I believe density is important and have no issue with the storeys or setbacks.”</i></p>

	<i>"This is really going to add good spaces and housing options to our area. I am excited for the updates, although the corner building could have stayed taller"</i>
Citizens have concerns with the proposed building heights	<p>Some citizens have shared concerns about the proposed building heights and feel these are too tall for the community.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>"7 stores is still high for the area. Maximum of four stories is acceptable. A setback will improve the look of the structure, however 7 will still appear out of place."</i></p> <p><i>"I appreciate the reduction in height of the northeast building, but still feel that 7 storeys is quite significant for a stand alone building on the corner of the property. Is a further reduction, even by 1 or 2 storeys, possible?"</i></p> <p><i>"That scale and density of development is suited to downtown and possibly Macleod Trail areas and definitely not a suburban low density neighbourhood commercial site or area located on the City periphery. Seven stories will change the entire character of the site. It also does not allow sufficiently safe visibility lines for the Southland 24th intersection. There are no other buildings in the area over two stories and certainly nowhere near seven stories anywhere within miles of this location."</i></p>
Vibrant Gathering Spaces	
Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
Citizens feel the gathering spaces have been improved	<p>Some citizens feel the proposed changes have addressed community input for vibrant gathering spaces.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>"Yes. It will be nice to see some vibrant and exiting new shops"</i></p> <p><i>"I am in agreement with this change as well."</i></p> <p><i>"I believe it has enhanced the vibrant gathering spaces."</i></p> <p><i>"I think the proposed changes are a big improvement and are welcomed!"</i></p>

<p>Citizens like the main street concept</p>	<p>Some citizens like the addition of the commercial main street concept.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>“The main street style shopping walkway will add a much needed interest point to our neighbourhood.”</i></p> <p><i>“Love it. Make sure it is fully accessible and does not become a hang out for individuals who have no where to go and intimidate shoppers”</i></p> <p><i>“The courtyard and Main Street is great. Now it won't feel like it is all for the condos and not the public.”</i></p>
--	---

General Application

Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
<p>Citizens feel there is inadequate parking on the site</p>	<p>Some citizens feel there is inadequate parking on site and the spots allocated for commercial will be used by residents and visitors. There is also concern for spillover effects into the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Sample Comments:</p> <p><i>“I feel the number of parking spaces still is not adequate when compared with the current site and the related businesses; especially during peak visit times”</i></p> <p><i>“I still think that parking and traffic is a major concern that I do not think has been addressed. I am wondering where visitors, maintenance vehicles, etc. to the apartments are going to be parking? Is there assigned "Visitor Parking"? As someone that lives on Oaklawn Place S.W., I just think it is turning into a nightmare as far as parking goes. I am sure that people will be using Oakmoor Drive, 25th Street and Oaklawn Place for extra parking. If you were to drive down Oakmoor Drive on a weekend, you would see that there is no excess parking to be had.”</i></p> <p><i>“There has been little if any move to address the parking issues that will arise from such a high density plan”</i></p>
<p>Citizens are concerned about the impact of additional density on traffic</p>	<p>Some citizens feel that adding density to the area will further exacerbate the transportation network and will create traffic issues.</p> <p>Sample comments</p>

	<p><i>“Traffic - not addressed here but inevitable to increase if this centre is to remain viable. I would rather deal with increased traffic than lose the only grocery store within walking/cycling distance.”</i></p> <p><i>“No it hasn't. It should not be built. It will bring more traffic to the area that already has alot. There is no need to change this area in anyway.”</i></p> <p><i>‘This development will result in increased activity, density and traffic to a quiet corner of the city. I am not in favor of the development but if it must be done, no building should be taller than 3 stories and new apartments should be reduced by at least half.’</i></p>
<p>Citizens feel that this development does not fit with the existing community.</p>	<p>Some citizens feel that the proposed development does not fit the community and is too much for the area.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>“don't understand the desire to increase the density to such a degree in this quiet area of the city. think it should be a lower number and height of buildings to fit in with the neighbourhood”</i></p> <p><i>“Apt. building too high for community”</i></p> <p><i>“The high structure doesn't seem to blend w/ the surroundings. Why not spread out instead of up?”</i></p> <p><i>“This is too invasive for our small community. Towering over the homes and casting shade over the homes and gardens of local residents.”</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 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/oakridgecoop.

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.

<p>Question 1: Pedestrian connectivity and safety Community Idea / Concern: Citizens told us they desired an improved journey to and through the site.</p> <p>Applicant's proposed change: The applicant has added a north/south connection and a better connection to Oakmoor Drive to improve pedestrian connections.</p> <p>1. Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input about pedestrian connectivity and have improved the pedestrian interface? Please advise why or why not.</p>
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
Not in the least!
Somewhat
OK
Not sure what green space will include - park vs. just a "main street"? Bistro tables for sitting? Playground?
Yes. I'm very pleased with having the pedestrian access to the site. Its shows that you're listening to the concerns of people like myself who don't drive.
There is no space for mingling. Need to have an inviting area for people to enjoy and meet. Outdoor café. Restaurant. Sizable green space. Landscaping. Flower soften the development. Crosswalk on Oakmoor to development. Don't make the development too close. It will turn people away.
a.) No - A pedestrian crosswalk should be across Oakmoor Drive at Oak tree Cross (just east of 26th St. Popular crossing. b.) The plan to have businesses tucked down on Westside of West connector out to Oakmoor Drive may not bring in business. Should be out in the hub where everyone is & will become involved with.
No I don't believe it has. I still think there will be significant pedestrian impact on an around area
No
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
No, this feels like a giant parking lot still. Too car focused. It would be nice if the public space were more approachable for all and was in the central part of the concept.

Yes, now all of us who live west on Oakmoor Drive can enter the Coop from the backside like we did before.
Uncertain
<p>I think they have improved the pedestrian interface, but there is a lot more that could be done. The revised plan has created additional issues.</p> <p>The present siting of the westerly pathway will put the walkway in shade for during winter months almost all day. This will mean a lot more snow and ice build up, unless the pathway is cleared and maintained to a much higher standard than regular City of Calgary pathways.</p> <p>The present "tack on" of calling the Main Street a pedestrian corridor is not accurate. It is still a roadway, and will see significant vehicle traffic from Oakmoor into the site. It is no more pedestrian friendly than what exists today. And shading will likely be an issue here too, especially during late fall, winter and early spring.</p> <p>Both of these "solutions" can be improved substantially!</p>
I think the plan is too large in scope and will negatively impact the quality of traffic, overpopulation, and business of the area as a whole. Pedestrian safety will still be a problem given the current bus routes.
Section 4 while improved, is essentially a road with a couple of crosswalks. The city asked the developer to improve the pedestrian connectivity AND safety. The North South Connection ideally should be completely pedestrian only. This would also increase the likelihood of augmenting the gathering area
<p>Highrise apts/condos do not benefit a residential area such as Oakridge, which has always been a quite, nature focused, family oriented, pseudo wildlife preserve within a city of noise and hustle bustle. As well, there are many existing problems with traffic congestion along the major routes leading out of Oakridge. There have been serious traffic fatalities/accidents either involving vehicles or vehicles vs pedestrians, especially considering the high number of elderly in the area and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Due to the imposition of the S.W. ring road and the related changes to traffic flow in and out of the area as well as the structural changes, all opposed by the residents without receiving the slightest consideration, why would any other proposal ever be considered beneficial to anyone but those promoting this self serving project, again at the expense to the residents.</p> <p>People have moved into Oakridge because of the neighbourhood as it exists and not because of what a developer or City Council thinks it should be due to other interests, economic benefits, favours, other influences, friendships, potential beneficial connections whether realized now or later, benefits to family or those connected to family, political favours, etc., etc.</p> <p>When the owner of the land parcel also owns the largest commercial entity on that parcel, is the landlord regarding the existing Strip Mall at the same location, owns the liquor store at that location, owns the development company heading up the development and has great influence over City Hall for obvious reasons, one has to realize that other than the city coffers benefiting, it's the existing landlord who has everything to gain, again at the expense of the existing residents.</p> <p>Generating even more income is what this development is all about (for both the Co-op and the City of Calgary regardless of the consequences, needs, wants nor desires of the tax paying residents) but the added congestion, increased transient population, disgruntled residential population, along with the subsequent effects to South Glenmore Park, Wildlife, Flora and Fauna, unlawful activities in Glenmore Park, added strains to police services due to the transient portion of those renting in the area, potential strains on the fire department and EMS due to increased numbers of people and density, additional infrastructure and maintenance, increased city services, etc., etc.</p> <p>Once again, as per usual, very poor planning and extremely short vision on the City's part.</p>

Once again we are rapidly moving toward becoming a banana republic and everyone can see it except those hoping to make self serving gains at the expense to others. Very Diappointed.
I don't care about pedestrian connectivity one way or another.
What does "connection" mean? Is this a pedestrian overpass/walkway? Is it lights? I believed a pedestrian overpass is required, anything less is not sufficient as traffic will be increased in the area due to the ring road connection . Pedestrian traffic needs to flow freely over an overpass or traffic will be impeded.
Yes, due to N/S pathway, gathering space.
I would like to see the proposed layout before I pass on any opinion. However, I'm not sure I like the idea of a highrise in that area. Perhaps a new market and new shops and an upscale or trendy restaurant?
I am aware they are trying to fix this issue and hope it works, but if so let there be more lights, more crosswalk signals and of course more transitioning from the wide lanes east and west to make it easier for those who do not walk that fast to cross either way. Signalization of the street signals should be lengthened so we do not have to rush as not all of us are quick and nimble anymore and do need the extra minutes when we carry our groceries x-amount across the streets either east west or north south.
I think this is an improvement over the original design, but is still far from being pedestrian friendly. The north south corridor does provide better access, but seems to be mainly focused on car traffic, could it include or be a bike path? The access to the neighbouring park appears unfriendly in the diagram, as if it would be dangerous to walk there at night. Would it be well lit? The development in general still appears very car focused since pedestrians would have to cross large stretches of parking lot, but the connected cross walks are a positive step. Would there be smaller retail shops on street level throughout this development?
OK
Maybe. I want to see where it is. Where's the map showing it?
Yes
Not completely. Safety from pedestrian access points are still not considered fully i.e. pedestrian crossing at interchange from gas station (no sidewalk through gas station area) and Southland Drive crosswalk (needs flashing lights to cross safely here especially if road will be busier and no sidewalk north alongside Boston Pizza). Visibility of pedestrians to drivers at some crossings on site may be affected by planting especially at SW corner of COOP 4-way - this is a difficult corner for drivers at present.
I think there needs to be pedestrian crossing lights added to the cross walk on southland drive by the boston pizza. Vehicles routinely miss that there is pedestrians at this cross walk and it is very unsafe. I myself have had to stop midway many times to avoid getting hit, I worry about children crossing that aren't making sure vehicles stop when they should
Yes it seems to have addressed this concern
It has addressed them but not made the devlopment anymore attractive form a residential point of view
No they haven't. It should not be built.
I live two blocks from the co-op, go there every other week and I have never heard of this development until today, August 14th. How can that be? I have not seen anything in the Calgary Herald and only today did I see something posted on Facebook. If you are truly doing public engagement you need to do a better job of informing the public of these projects.
Yes

<p>this plan isn't very good, as a resident of Oakridge for over 10 years. We have enough residences in and around this area. I'm completely for the the revised look of co-op without the tower and town homes. With building this tower and townhomes This will create too much traffic in and around a tight area already. It's busy enough already from communités from Oakridge, Palliser, Pumhill, Bayview, Braeside and Cedabrae.</p>
<p>There are a lot more roadways but the pedestrian access isn't much different from the current layout.</p>
<p>I have lived in Braeside for five years, and frequent the Co-op often during the week. The accessibility to the shopping centre is very good from where I am, and I hope that does not change. I will often ride my bike or walk there with my toddler. I come from the Southland side, and think that there needs to be better access around the carwash for pedestrians (there is currently a staircase that leads to... the carwash).</p>
<p>I believe it has resolved any issues with connectivity and safety.</p>
<p>What is the hourly vehicular capacity of the new north/south connection? Will this support the existing traffic entering the site from the two existing north entrances? As the only entrance to the commercial space, the concern is the potential for traffic congestion to enter and exit the property for users from the north of the development. The pedestrian connection looks good.</p>
<p>probably</p>
<p>It has improved pedestrian connectivity into the community slightly but at a cost of adding two floors to west condo building is not enough of an improvement.</p>
<p>I can't tell as there aren't new visuals to demonstrate.</p>
<p>Pedestrians must walk through parking lots to get to anything useful. All retail and residential should be fronted on 24 st, close to the SWBRT stops. This proposal puts a gas station with car wash closest to the BRT stops - completely unacceptable. If the applicant refuses to reorient the development to a proper street frontage, any existing frontages on Southland drive and 24 st should be activated with store fronts Pedestrians walking around the site encounter 5 different road crossings. This is too many. These are dangerous for pedestrians and severely diminish the pedestrian interface. Ultra long crosswalk along Southland Drive, adjacent to the site, on the SW corner of the site encourages fast car travel through this area which is in Westbound pedestrian's blind spot. This lane is used purely for this turn, cars should have to slow to make a small radius turn. Crosswalks within the development should be raised to give priority to pedestrians and slow car traffic.</p>
<p>No. Foot traffic will increase substantially with the areas pedestrian ways being unable to safely handle the load.</p>
<p>Yes, I feel these changes reflect the connectivity/safety concerns.</p>
<p>the postcard received in the mail this week is the first instance of soliciting community. It has been presented as a done deal and this is catch up. The traffic light will not be enough to handle pedestrian traffic particularly with the day care on the corner. The density of townhouses/condos in the area - down Southland and 24th street is too much to support another high density development.</p>
<p>Have you done a traffic study on the roads in and out of the community? How does all of the new congestion add to that?</p>
<p>I have found online changes and amendments difficult to read and understand. Somewhat confusing.</p>
<p>A significant amount of pedestrian traffic (either directly from the surrounding neighbourhoods or from transit) enters the site from the northeast and northwest. Access to the primary retail and amenity spaces is either through surface parking OR through the gas station. An</p>

<p>enhanced pedestrian access (ie: not just a basic sidewalk, but think of the experience) on the north side of the gas station (with some screening from the gas station lot) and along the east side of the existing coop liquor store (a better one on the west side that connects to the north-south connection would be great too) would made the pedestrian arrival sequence more comfortable, safer, and enjoyable.</p>
<p>I think interface is improved. i think the City still needs to work ion the interface at Oakmoor and 24th</p>
<p>Yes. I actually feel the original design was adequate. If anything, the high-rises should have been made twice as tall, not shorter. The city should stop spending so much attention listening to all the minority of complainers and focus on building great dense neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Would like to see underground parking for residential areas two stalls available for 2 bdrm units Plus 15 walk way access from multi family to Coop Closed private court yard for multi family development Incorporate the empty lot across the street into the development plan. Roof top green house above Coop</p>
<p>Its hard to understand how pedestrian interface is a huge issue in a community that consists of mostly single family homes with easy access to the area. Perhaps it will become a bigger problem as the proposed increase in density of such a project makes it an issue.</p>
<p>Anything that improves walk-ability and pedestrian access is a win. I have no issues with what is proposed.</p>
<p>Yes. I think the critical issue is whether residents will have to pay for their parking spots or not. This deeply impacts everyone's experiences. We have seen this with other density projects in the community. When residents need to pay for parking they tend to park in commercial or on the street. This deeply impacts the vibrance and usability of the site. With the increased retail space we will need all the parking on the surface for commercial use. Many of the residents in our community go to the coop because parking at glenmore landing is a NIGHTMARE. My kids have almost been hit more than once at Glenmore Landing. I will be very disappointed in COOP if the parking lot here becomes like Glenmore landing. It is truly horrible there and many residents actively avoid going there for that reason. It hurts everyone if you don't manage parking properly.</p>
<p>This development has increased in size from 266 to 294 residential units and has concentrated development in the NE corner to a massive and unacceptable degree. Pedestrian interface is small potatoes.</p>
<p>Yes and they hav done it well.</p>
<p>Increased Traffic.--NO 1. increased traffic due to Ring Road access from Southland Drive. The area between 24 St and Oakmore Way should be reclassified as a Zone with speed reduced to a pedestrian crosswalks. Vehicles rarely stop for pedestrians at Oakmoor Way and the bus stop mid way between 24 St and Oakmoor Way. 2. 24 St should be a restricted pedestrian zone from 100 metres south of the intersection to 100 metres north of the intersection of 24 and Southland drive. 3. It would've prudent to consider a pedestrian tunnel at the West side of 24 st and SL Drive due to the projected traffic increase., and afford the accessibility to pedestrians and cyclists envisioned by the applicant and developer. Parking Spaces Allocation--No 1. Average family is projected with 2 vehicles and many also with an RV. 2. Most destination gathering places are at the end of a transportation hub, allowing users an alternative to privately owned vehicles. This is not the case of the proposal, indicating most users will continue to rely on privately owned vehicles requiring parking spaces.</p>

<p>3. The city census indicates that many households in Cedar Brae are empty nesters, widowed/ widower, and senior citizens. These groups are usually do not walk any distance especially if restricted speed limits are not in place to cross busy roadways.</p> <p>City Sponsored Infra Structure--??</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased sewage. Expansion required to current infrastructure ? Treated effluent disposal- Fish Creek ?? 2. Electrical and water. Increases to infrastructure ?? 3. Snow Clearance at pedestrian crossings-- dedicated shoe removal, not just Plowing creating impassible snow banks to mobility, mothers with prams and seniors. 4. Increases to school enrolment, faith accommodation, medical facilities, library services etc. All these above means increased taxes, what is the city projections? 5. Increased Security. More people in the area means more B&E, car prowling, car theft, assaults, trespassing, vehicle accidents, property damage etc. Will CPS establish a permantly 24 hr/ day sub station in the area. Prevention of cut-through driving and " over-flow" parking on residential streets will be a reality. Will the City establish residential parking passes or even as in several Downtown areas install parking meters circumnavigating the COOP " destination and gathering place. 6. Will the city implement bicycle lanes along SL Drive and 24 St or will these two streets continue to be classified as Trails with no cycling allowed. <p>The city's desire to build up instead of continued expansion on the fringes is recognized, and at walking ease to the CTrain is a reasonable proposal, but plonked in the middle of single house community is mind boggling without the increased infra structure and lack of proper traffic control considerations to be authorized and concurrently planned.</p>
good
I'm not sure how pedestrian friendly the access is
A north-south connector will help.
I believe it is moving in a better direction. A safe bike stall area would be great.
With providing additional access points, this will encourage people to walk to the Co-op Centre instead of driving. Both good for the environment and people's health.
The revised concept is considerably improved.
Yes, the pedestrian connectivity appears to be as good or better than what currently exists at the site.
<p>This changes do not address needs of our community at all.</p> <p>First Where is infrastructure for all this new development. . Roads can not handle it what we have now, and nobody wants to see that. The new line is not going to solve any problem at all. Only creating even more.</p> <p>Our sewer system is overloaded as it is, and having hard time to handle existing community needs. That is why we have had a problem before and not just once.</p> <p>Second Nobody really wants high dens community. That is why we live here. And now all of the sudden City hall wants to change that. So why you don't start to put all this high rises in Mount Royal. it is very close to DT and no need for new bus lines etc. Commute is short and much more environmental friendly and sustainable that here.</p>
No. Once again, the city and their partners will do the bare minimum required and plans are certain to change along the way.
No, there is only a roadway
Yes, providing the north-south corridor has provided for this.
I apologize that I am late to the engagement, and haven't been part of the conversation until now. There is a pedestrian desire line from the SE corner of the site (at the gas bar) to make a bee-line to the coop through the parking lot, and not along designated pathways. I'm not

sure how this is being addressed. From the open house boards, it appears that many of the pathways are being maintained in their current state/width, thus not encouraging a different, more comfortable path.
Somewhat
Increase in truck traffic - recycling trucks, garbage trucks, delivery vehicles, visitors to condos... will cause danger, noise, confusion, delays, pollution, graffiti
BIG QUESTION: Is such a large development economically & environmentally sustainable?
Yes
Yes.
Yes from the perspective of someone living in Woodbine.
Unaware of the original or changed pedestrian plan
Yes - more access has been provided and is an improvement over current access.
Yes. The new plan provides a main street style shopping walkway which will improve the pedestrian interface.
I don't know what the community input was on pedestrian connectivity but I will be amazed if the community has asked for almost 300 units to be built in a very confined area. Another 600 or so people crammed into that space with probably a good number working downtown will definitely clog what is already one of the most congested areas of the City.
Yes
Looks great. Hopefully a traffic light will be installed on Southland Drive at the south entrance by the liquor store. With increased traffic on Southland due to the ring road, not only will pedestrians need a safe place to cross, but traffic exiting the development turning left to head east will be improved.
Yes
Pedestrian access is better than satisfactory. Certainly better thought through than the SW express bus concept
I believe the update will be great for the community. However, I am concerned at the additional traffic noise. For those homes in Cedarbrae directly across Southland Drive, and those on the north side of the development in oakridge, the construction noise will be very significant. I live in Cedarbrae, and Southland drive is already incredibly noisy. An increase in traffic delays, increase in construction traffic and a general increase in construction noise will dramatically increase an already noisy area. Most areas n Calgary just off of major thoroughfare roads have privacy and sound barrier walls, but I understand that no such wall is planned for Cedarbrae or Oakridge. I highly recommend that a privacy and sound barrier become part of the plans to reduce noise, but also to give additional privacy for those individuals backing onto Southland Dr. as the proposed apartments will be able to look directly into their back yards. Thank you.
No, one of the things that needs to be done is a left hand turn signal to turn onto Southland Dr from 24th Street. There is a turn light to turn west, but none to turn east. With the additional amount of traffic that this expansion will create, we will never be able to turn east onto Southland Dr
Yes. There appears to be adequate pedestrian access throughout the site.
Yes people will be able to walk/bike to the site more easily. Is there any underground connections, either thru the underground parking or tunnels to the various businesses or residences...we are a winter city and I know at least a dozen senior families that want to move there.

<p>There should be no exit onto Oakmoor Drive from the Coop site, only entrance to the site via Oakmoor Drive. Oakmoor Dr. cannot handle an increased volume of traffic exiting here, the current volume is already (during peak times) too congested and street parking from residents adds to visibility issues for any traffic trying to exit onto Oakmoore Drive. The residential homes along Oakmoor Drive across from the Coop site are going to feel and see the additional burden of this increased traffic (traffic from the proposed new units on the site plus commercial traffic/shoppers). It will absolutely detract from the enjoyment of the homes facing Oakmoor Drive.</p> <p>Vehicles should exit the Coop site onto Southland Drive and 24 street, both of which are designed and able to accomodate greater volumes of vehicles.</p> <p>Pedestrian overpasses crossing 24th street at the intersection of 24 street and Oakmoor would be beneficial to accomplish flow of pedestrian traffic without impeding flow of vehicular traffic on 24 street. Same for a pedestrian overpass across Southland drive, to avoid impeding vehicular traffic along Southland.</p>
<p>It addresses my concerns. I can see clear routes between the different areas, as well as places where "space" has been made for pedestrians.</p>
<p>No. I believe this development will only create more traffic and congestion to an area which is already extremely inconvenient during rush hour. As a home owner in the oakridge community, I'm extremely against this development in our community. This development should not be pursued as all the homeowners I know in oakridge are against it.</p>
<p>Yes, this addresses the concern of connection between the spaces.</p>
<p>Agreed. in addition, the pedestrian crossing at 24th street and oakmoor drive should be changed to traffic lights in order to allow for traffic turning south onto 24th from oakmoor drive east bound to safely make the turn and allow for increased pedestrian traffic to cross while not interfering traffic flow.</p>
<p>To some extent it is difficult to determine due to simultaneous ring road development. I want to be able to walk there for groceries and should be able to do that.</p>
<p>Changes to pedestrian connectivity are acceptable.</p>
<p>Yes - sort of Since we live nearby (to the north along Oakhill Drive), we occasionally walk to the Co-Op store or their mall's businesses (dentist, etc.). This will be facilitated by the north/south connection laneway between the residences. I suspect that the only entrance to the Co-Op grocery store itself will be on the south side. It would be nice to have an entrance on the west side off the laneway and below the apartment tower, which may add to the appeal of the laneway (but probably become a security problem - shoplifting is a significant problem now).</p>
<p>I do not agree that pedestrian issues have been entirely resolved as the north/south connection that has been added in the revised site plan has created a barrier between the CoOp store entrance and the west end of the surface parking lot adjacent to the new commercial building. Those parking in this area will have to cross this connection (main street) in order to access the front door of the CoOp store.</p>
<p>Probably</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>This concept remains auto-oriented and an example of poor design. For the development to be pedestrian oriented the entire concept would need to be abandoned. 24th and Southland could be pedestrian streets and with increased transit service coming the development should be oriented along those edges. A gas station at the corner of 24th and Southland and sea of parking in front of the towers can never be mistaken as ped or transit oriented. I hope CPC and Council agree.</p>
<p>Not an issue to me</p>

No, dividing the site with a road does not improve the pedestrian experience.
Good day, I live on Palistone Road (off 98th Ave and 24th St) and am VERY concerned about the following: Mitigation and control of increased traffic in community roads. Our residential roads are constantly being used by morning commuters to "beat the gridlock" of 90th Ave to get to 14th Street. How can we ensure safe passage for pedestrians along 24th and how do we ensure that we can turn onto our residential roads with ease?
I think this plan is great. I shared these comments on your sign outside the store but unfortunately saw somebody steal my sticky note. Apparently if you have something positive to say that's not appropriate for all the cranky people in Oakridge. So I'll say it here ...this development is great! It's going to bring revitalization to a dated area and we are going to have vibrant spaces to visit in our community.
Yes
Mostly. Could you add a set of steps into the existing green space on the NW corner of the development (to make it more convenient for apartment residents to use the green space.)
Yes, I have lived next to this site for years and it is nice to finally see it being put to the use it should have had twenty years ago. I can finally walk through a retail street in the part of my community that is supposed to be retail - neat!
I'm not sure what the issue was with pedestrian connectivity. I regularly walk to this facility and have never had any issues accessing the site from any side.
Unclear as to what 'a better connection' is. Due to the increase in population density in the area and change of infrastructure (the ring road), it will be difficult to access north bound 24th from east bound Oakmoor Drive. This will result in more traffic through the residential area. Also, south bound traffic from the complex turning onto east bound Southland Drive will be difficult. How is that being addressed? Pedestrian traffic crossing 24th and Southland will also be difficult as there will be more vehicle traffic due to the population change and people accessing the ring road. Pedestrian bridge?
I think it is important to always have community input... pedestrian safety should be a priority. I would be arriving from the west... will I have the longest walk around the building?
Yes.
I think for the most part they have. Though it would appear in one area they cannot make a change, so it may become a problem in front of the store if people park where they are not supposed to (like they currently do, in front of the store), this could be hazardous to pedestrians.
N/A
I like the design and feel it will be a welcome addition to our community.
Yes I feel concerns have been addressed.
This is the least of the concerns
Yes. I am especially pleased to see the addition of the "Main Street".
Yes
Yes
NO - In bold letters. We DO NOT want a combined development permit and land use redesignation (re-zoning) for the site located at 2580 Southland Dr. S.W. (the existing Co-op site). We DO NOT want this

type of development at all, period. We Do NOT want ANY residential units. We DO NOT want buildings above 2 storeys high. We DO NOT want ANY additional commercial units. STOP!
Somewhat but still concerned about parking and feel there must be a left hand turn off 24 St travelling east onto Southland Dr
Yes. Plan provides better access than the site currently provides.
There are some improvements - however, I think there should be more attention paid to the pathway that lies between the A&W and existing gas station - would like to see a boulevard added with some greenery (trees/hedge, eg). Also concerned about crossing at Oakmoor Drive and the new taller building with sight lines, etc.
I like the new structure of the North/South connection!
Yes, appreciate them listening to us and our safety fears.
Wont be walking. Will continue to use private drivable car or truck.
I do not feel that you have addressed our concerns. The City of Calgary has addressed the concern or increased density by lowering the building height and INCREASING the number of units. Why spend taxpayers money on the charade of public engagement if you are ignoring our comments?
I think there could be more improvement like speed bumps since it looks like a through street (or better description of what has specifically changed.
I live on 2300 Oakmoor Dr. Across 24th from the mall. The traffic is Insane coming off my street. Plus too many people that don't care of the pedestrian crosswalk. Need lights badly
Yes. The connection through the middle is a great idea.
While the pedestrian interface has been improved from the initial plan, it is still insufficient. There will be a large increase of people living in the area. The connection to the adjacent park is not easy or welcoming and as a result will probably remain largely unused. Minimal additional green space has been added to compensate for limited access to the adjacent park or even added to the proposal.
Yes. Looking at the Development Concept, there appears to be plenty of pedestrian walkways leading to, and throughout the development.
No. All this does is add more vehicle traffic and not enough on pedestrian and bike exclusive pathways.
This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey.
Partially. The "Main street" is a good idea. Not really sure if it will be an attractive place to gather, as the only apparent features are people's front doors, but that is fine. Positively, as a semi-public space, it appears to appropriately handle the pedestrian traffic from Oakridge that will travel through the intersection of 26th St and Oakmoor Dr. to reach the site; the main street will be their most direct means of reaching the grocery store.
It appears that the connectivity has been improved with the north south access from Oakmoor drive and the access from the condo units on the west side
-Not entirely. Hardly any green space left. Only where condos are. Why not make NE corner part medical (first 2 or 3 floors) and part condo/high rise and not more than 8 stories high. Second floor setbacks not needed on this corner. Just on northwest corner. -Have a pleasant green space where medical centre was with benches and tables. -Condos in NW corner be only 4 stories high. -Tower step-down town needs to lower or moved. There is too much and too many people in the NW corner. This feels like cramming as many people into a small corner like hornets - the hornets become again. This is not a community feel or safe. - Put a pedestrian crosswalk from the north side of Oakmoor Drive across to the area where

there is the car traffic from Southland through to Oakmour Drive. I still question the parking spaces (ground level) for customers.

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 the building on the northeast corner from 11 to 7 storeys and has added second floor setbacks to improve the interface with development to the west.

1. Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input and is the reduction in storeys and setbacks sufficient to address community concerns? Please advise why or why not.

OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM

No way!!

Ok

Ongoing recommendations as; project progresses; yes - shadows addressed & parking concerns

Yes. It seemed a little bit "over the top" to have the huge tower housing all around. I'm sure it would be beautifully designed, but would stick out like a sore thumb.

We recommended in February splitting the development from the NW corner to the NE. A limit of 6 stories S/D imposed. Inadequate Green space - see above still too much density for this community - unless it is properly planned with sense of space between building and capping of density of 500-1000 people for 20 years

No - too much (& too many units) put down at West end - unbalanced. Why is green space only down there. Parking - still not enough for units (with 30 more units added = 60+ people = about 70-90 more cars, reduced parking for other business & public; Reduction to tall tower TOO high. Condo have been increased in height - NOT GOOD

No, the # 2 stories have apparently increased now compared to before

No! This needs to be no more than 3 or 4 stories high all the way around. It's not right you stick these monstrosities in our quiet community

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

Yes, I believe density is important and have no issue with the storeys or setbacks.

I am still not sure why these condos are needed here. We have enough people here already and cars. I am saying this because where are all the condo people's friends and relatives going to park? And along came the not needed BRT to take up parking as well. Concerned about that. The very high tower that is on the corner on 24th looks amazing now, so much better and a way better design, looks new and not so tall.

No! This is too invasive for our small community. Towering over the homes and casting shade over the homes and gardens of local residents. Driving house prices down in a most desirable area. There will not be enough parking spaces when you consider most people have a partner and two vehicles for each apartment at minimum, not including visitor parking. This will be an eyesore, stuck in the middle of our community as with most apartment developments in the city, that are beautiful to begin with and then the upkeep is not maintained. Original occupants move out, others move in, who accept the lower level of maintenance and so this continues. Ugly balconies strewn with bikes, BBQ's, washing and other undesirable sights. Only the landowner wins!

I feel the new development is appropriate for the neighbourhood, and a welcome addition of density to help improve transit and walkability. But the existing proposal still has lots of room for improvement, and should be held to a higher standard than the ad hoc changes in this revised proposal.
We just got a huge tower added on 24th Street that has added way too many residents to the neighborhood. Why do we need more towers and more people? Not a fit for our community at all.
Thank you for reduction. Reducing it by one more floor would be a reasonable compromise.
No See above.
Lower is better and yet the unit numbers increase?
NO. 7 stores is still high for the area. Maximum of four stories is acceptable. A setback will improve the look of the structure, however 7 will still appear out of place.
I like the stepped approach to the buildings. Lowering building 2 looks good.
I looked and it is better and hope the sun does not get blocked out and the birds can still be seen as they hover over the roof tops, as birds do eat up a lot of Mosquito.
I appreciate the reduction in height of the northeast building, but still feel that 7 storeys is quite significant for a stand alone building on the corner of the property. Is a further reduction, even by 1 or 2 storeys, possible? The professional building near the residential to the west seems to have had little changed.
OK
No. That scale and density of development is suited to downtown and possibly Macleod Trail areas and definitely not a suburban low density neighbourhood commercial site or area located on the City periphery. Seven stories will change the entire character of the site. It also does not allow sufficiently safe visibility lines for the Southland 24th intersection. There are no other buildings in the area over two stories and certainly nowhere near seven stories anywhere within miles of this location. Seven stories is nowhere near compatible with the area under any standard of measure. The area has mostly one storey buildings with very few two stories and nothing over two stories.
Absolutely not. Still too high & still too much density. Will not be visually appealing in our neighborhood. No one wants 13 storeys & definitely no one wants 294 units. That was made very clear by everyone at both open houses. Trying to make us feel that we have been listened to is not going to work. We do not want 13 storeys & we do not want 294 units. That is an increase of 28 units. Not acceptable. Lowering the one building to 7 storeys was not the one that had everyone concerned, it was the 13 storey building on the in the middle & the units on the northwest corner.
Yes
Maybe. The NE corner will still stand out due to its location and since there are no other buildings of several storeys directly adjacent/opposite (compared to other proposed building to the west). It will be a focal point so needs to be visually appealing.
No. The development is still way to high for the area, especially the building connected to the co-op. I don't think the city should change the zoning bylaws to allow an increase in building heights for the development. I would prefer a maximum of 4-5 storeys high for all the buidlings, not just the one on the NE corner.
yes this concern seems to have been met
No, once again, way too many extra people Ina full community.
No it hasn't. It should not be built.

No! 7 storeys is still far too high for the site visually, and is a far greater density than the roads and neighbourhood can tolerate.
It still feels crowded and homes nearby will have people looking into their yards from above.
I don't feel the developer realizes how busy that area is and they need to implement a smarter solution for the space. I'm for the revised co-op, but not for the Residences.
I agree with this change to 7 storey height and the second floor setbacks.
The developer has clearly not heard residents concerns about the overall height to be not too high and to fit in with the look of the surrounding area. The overall design has not changed other than the placement of a roadway at location #4. It looks like things have just been shuffled around. The plan hasn't really changed from the original proposal. The input of the community's ideas and concerns obviously hasn't been heard. One of the major concerns I heard during the workshop was that the development be not too tall. The city ONLY asked that ONE of the high rise buildings be reduced in height. Why not both buildings? There is no rationale provided for this. Quote: "The community is concerned that the new development will be ""too much / too big"" for the community. The community wants development that is sensitive to the surrounding existing development." The project has not changed much from the original proposal. It is clear that the developer wants to do it their way no matter what.
The height of the buildings does not affect me, but I am glad that you have taken in consideration of the people living in the adjacent communities. I know that I would hate having property looking at the back of a building - it decreases property values, and ultimately, has no place in a primarily residential area.
Yes.
Just too many units for the already congested area.
The changes has addressed all concerns on Development fit
No. I think lowering the NE building is a mistake. The original plan supports a better community. 1. The shadow effect of the NE building has the least effect on pedestrians and homes, since the shadows fall north on Oakmoor Dr SW and east onto 24th Avenue SW. This is the best location to build a taller structure. 2. Higher structures of the west residential/ commercial buildings is counter-intuitive to creating a community courtyard, meeting place. 3. Higher structures of the west residential. commercial buildings cause longer shadow effects, detracting from the community meeting place concept; AND increases the ice development around the complex and sidewalks. 4. Higher structures of the west residential/commercial buildings will resonate sound more-so than shorter buildings. That means activities / noise in the courtyard will be louder and undesirable for residents. Again, this takes away from the concept of community living for residents in a new complex.
No. The height of the northeast corner building is sufficient, but the entire residential component is now even taller and more dense. The height of the townhomes and the additional storey on the highrise does not fit with the existing community - it is too overwhelming in height and size. The ensuing INCREASE in the size of the residential development i.e. the density of residential causes even more concern with spill-over into the existing community (i.e. traffic, crime). Oakridge is a quiet community - development of the site is fine, but this is now a monolith. Will the increase in the size of underground parking support the residential component or the commercial component of the development?

no, now the apartments on the west side are 5 stories instead of the original 4 and the adjacent tower has not been reduced
No because they have added two floors to the condos on the west side.
I believe this is still too tall for the community. Four stories and an emphasis on walkability and green space would be my recommendation to maintain the feel of the community.
Height and setbacks are fine. Tall buildings should be located further South, closer to the road to eliminate these shadowing and fit concerns and encourage pedestrian activity on Southland drive.
The changes are an improvement but you've missed the point that this development is not wanted in our area by the majority of residents. We live here because it WAS a wonderful predominately single family home neighbourhood. We are a community, actually several communities, and you're proposing to add a big chunk of people who have no ties to our communities and likely never will. Condo ownership is transient at best or turns into rental property thereby increasing crime and reducing property values and quality of life.
Again the density in the area will be greatly increased even with the reduction. There is already quite a bit of higher density housing in the area.
I think the reduced storeys for that particular NE corner is acceptable.
To my knowledge no opportunity to provide feedback . I think there are too many condo and townhouse developments in the area that have not been taken into account - north of the current site are several condos, east on southland and 24th street. There are extensive developments in the three neighbouring communities -- Cedarbrae, Braeside and Oakridge /Palliser. Take a look at the density -- and new bus routes and day cares and schools in the area.
This is appalling. The idea of lowering one building and raising another is sneaky and underhanded. The buildings on the NorthWest side nearest the green space and my home are now two storeys taller. I was not happy before but accepted the 4 storey buildings. I do not accept the change in height and am now enraged.
Absolutely not. With the exception of Glenmore Gardens, one mile to the Northeast, no buildings are higher than three storeys. Five storeys should be the maximum height considered for this primarily residential area.
See "General Application" below.
Stepping the building on the northeast corner of the lot, and decreasing the overall height, is appreciated.
This is really going to add good spaces and housing options to our area. I am excited for the updates, although the corner building could have stayed taller
The buildings are adequate.
Building height restrictions should be respected
No, I don't. I think the maximum height of any building should be 3 stories. Anything taller than that will be jarring.
The height of the buildings should be coordinated with the community. There are no buildings greater than two stories. I would accept 4 stories for the condo and professional buildings. I strongly refuse turning my community into a commercial enterprise. It must remain services to the community NOT the city. There will be a large shopping mall at the corner of 90 Ave. and 37 Street. The facts are we have over built condos. So start thinking about what the community needs instead of what the builder needs to build. Money is not the answer.
4 story buildings should be the maximum height allowed for this development... the community engagement meetings were very clear about not wanting 11 story buildings. People have chosen to live in this area of the city to get away from such high density, it is a

fallacy to believe there is a desire to have this type of development here. Traffic congestion has noticeably risen over the years and this will only increase the traffic congestion.
I was and am ok with the 11 stories. I feel we need to increase density in - what is becoming more and more of an inner city neighborhood.
I was actually ok with the taller building but this is fine as well.
As noted above - too much density in the NW quadrant. The NE Tower should be where the most density is located since it is accessible via 24 st. But density should remain at 266 units and the original concept plan. Density should be capped at the original plan level for this part of Oakridge and no further development should occur on this sit. The original plan is dense enough and it should be improved by spreading out the development on the site and raising the tower to 12 stories-max. Our May group came up with ideas to do this. We recommended that the terraces be 5 stories -max and be integrated on two levels with cafes on the second level. Green elements with nature being central plus well thought out landscaping. The green roof on the coop offers nothing to the community. Traffic congestion on Oakmoor will occur unless the buildings are situated so that access by Southland and 24th can be facilitated. Walkability of the site is not facilitated by concentratin all of the dwellings in the NW corner. The courtyard is swallowed up by the surrounding buildings and is neither accessible nor inviting. Perhaps the roof of the co-op could be converted into an inviting courtyard with some kind of connecting link to the residential units and pedestrians outside.
Yes I do although I never had any problem with the original heights.
No This changes to the makeup of the existing community for no particular reason nor improvement other than the City planners want to experiment with " cluster" insertions, which will likely degrade the single house community planned and constructed in Cedarbrae and lived in for the past 50 years. Change is inevitable but the proposed change additions by the City to the COOP application is not realistic.
yes
Yes
Yes. 7 stories is still higher than anything else in the community but it is a reasonable compromise.
I defer to those directly affected but it sure looks like they are being reasonable to drop four floors.
Yes. It's a compromise that should work. I can't see the location as being an issue as there is really no view from the current apartments on the south side (facing Southland Drive).
Parking has still not been adequately addressed. Although the 754 spaces, may exceed the City requirement of 701, the fact is that according to Google Earth, there are currently 678 available parking spaces on the entire property, including at those at the gas bar and around Boston Pizza. The latest concept adds 76 to that number, but also adds 294 residences, most of which will have one or more cars associated with them. This can only mean a serious net reduction in available parking for shoppers.
Whether or not buildings are "too high" is an extremely subjective measure. But, the changes do seem to have improved the interface.
Development height still not in keeping with the surrounding area. We live on Cedarpark Dr and the high rise will loom over us. not what we expect in this area.
City Hall is just making decisions with out really listening to our concerns. It was same before, with new bus lines. Because people didn't like it, was just simply canceled. I was there and I didn't see any of what was reported by city officials. Not one proof of anything that was said in media. And this is just another one of this campaigns. I am just upset with all that , and I am not the only one.

No. The complex is still too big for the space. Has there been an influx of requests for citizens needing one bedroom apartments in Oakridge? More parking?
No,they increased the height 2 storeys on the west end
Seven storeys is about four storeys too high for that tiny piece of property
Yes the changes fit better with the lower profile of the community.
I apologize that I am late to the engagement, and haven't been part of the conversation until now. I am supportive of higher density, to bring a critical mass to the area and to create a node of activity at this corner of the neighbourhood. I am surprised that the A&W, Liquor Store, and Boston Pizza has not been incorporated into new buildings, creating opportunity for some additional residential along the south side of the site. With Southland being a wider street, I am surprised this isn't where we are seeing some of the higher density being placed, rather than placing it adjacent to residential at the north, where the impact may be higher. Perhaps it is a visibility thing for the Coop.
Yes
I don't want condos in this community because that would bring more poor people, crime and immigrants. Can you build this in another area? This is not a fit for our community
No. I feel very strongly that the buildings are much too high for the community. As a resident of Oakridge that lives only one block away the morning sun will be blocked and I will feel "shut in". I am very unhappy with the height of the apartments.
The changes do nothing to satisfy the concerns of residents to the west of the development. There has been no reduction in height of the main central structure which will decrease the morning sunlight for the west side. An increase in the height of the far western complex is actually counter to the wishes of the residents.
Yes from the perspective of someone living in Woodbine but can appreciate Braeside and Oakridge residents immediately adjacent to the development will feel quite differently.
Height of the building is not a concern. Parking and traffic congestion from residents is a concern
Yes - although the original plan was fine. The current site is inefficient and the new site in all phases has been an improvement in land use.
Yes. I have no concerns about the height of the new structure.
No. Again, congestion is going to be the main issue, not whether some monstrosity is visually appealing. How can the City possibly approve moving around 600 people into an already congested route to downtown?
Yes
That building seems to fit better.
Better, but still too tall for this area
Yes, this sounds reasonable
I am still concerned about the amount of people and traffic that this expansion will create
Yes. I feel that the height could have been left at originally proposed levels. Current proposal is fine.
Look all you are looking at is increased revenue for your over priced supermarket. Your most profitable store is downtown and that's bottom line for you people. It doesn't matter what you do this is all about the coop, I have lived in this area for over 35 years. You have realised that people need affordable housing and this is right up your alley. Not to mention the increased traffic along southland drive to service your over priced supermarket when the ring road is open.

<p>When people cannot travel they will shop the coop . Shame on you over priced [profanity].</p>
<p>This is the first time that I have been aware that this web-site even existed. Until now it was a case of hearing rumours that this development was going to happen. Public communication, in my opinion, has been POOR!!! What is being proposed is nothing more than a corporation (COOP) attempting to profit on a land holding at the expense of destroying the entire character of the existing neighbourhood. In Calgary this is NOT new. We have seen this with golf courses disappearing, just so that land developers could profit...and the City is only too willing to co-operate with these developer pirates! After all - it's increased tax revenue! *Offensive information removed* With ring-road connections opening up at Southland and 90th Ave. the increased traffic, augmented by this development, will destroy completely the character of what was once a relatively peaceful neighbourhood. And what of the destruction of the property values of those who live in proximity to this property that the COOP wants to further develop???</p> <p>I note too that these questions are worded in the usual Calgary bureaucratese bafflegab. In other words, "We really don't want your opinion...,we're going to do it our way." Gentlemen, there is more to living in a city than just the collection of tax revenue!!! NO!!! This should NOT go ahead! But then, this is the City of Calgary - EVERYTHING is written with a \$ sign in front of it!</p>
<p>The pictures look very nice. Does anyone know what the vacant lot across the street may become...? I think that will influence acceptance of the height of the building. Plant lots of trees but give them lots of space and dirt to grow....not pavement ...then the trees die in 5 years and are never replaced.</p>
<p>This is a good start, but not sufficient overall. The proposed residential buildings in the NW corner should not exceed 5-6 stories. They will be an eyesoar in the presence of a surrounding community of single story homes and will detract from the community look & feel. If taller structures are to be erected it should be on the south side of the Coop site, facing Southland drive where there are fewer homes in close proximity to make the relative height difference so obvious.</p>
<p>Still too high but better. All buildings should be a max of 5 stories</p>
<p>Based on the representations provided, the changes make a much smoother transition from the surrounding area. Thank you.</p>
<p>Many people in the community are unaware of the size of this development. A 13 story apartment building is, in my opinion, a case of it being too large for the infrastructure of the area. The subsequent volume of traffic on 24th street will make it unsafe for the residents whose houses front on the street between Southland Drive and 90Th Avenue. The residents and business employees of this proposed development will, in many cases, not be taking the ring road, nor Southland Drive, the express bus on 14th Street but using 24th street.</p>
<p>I am not against increased housing density but consider this proposal to be too much for the area. High rise buildings do not encourage people to be part of a community, therefore not contributing to the ambiance of a great city.</p>
<p>Yes this issue has been addresses. It was too tall for the area but now with setbacks and 7 stories it will suit the area better.</p>
<p>Yes I would agree that since Oakridge is not part of the downtown core, and the community feel is more of a single family, established community feel, that the height of the building should be kept of a minimum to make sure that they residential buildings feel more like condos and not high density high rise living spaces.</p>
<p>Not convinced of the need for any additional changes. Most of the request were to placate immediate neighbors who were in NIMBY mode.</p>

Changes to development plan and reduced height are acceptable. However, could the SE residential tower be combined with the CO-OP shopping centre building in order to reduce site coverage? This may also be cost-effective?
Yes.
I reviewed many of the early comments based on the first site plan and a recurring comment was that "11 stories is too high" for this community. Although the northeast building has been reduced in height, the tallest building adjacent to the CoOp store is still at 11 stories and no height revision in this tower essentially ignores a common concern that 11 stories is excessive.
Yes, 7 stories is better
No, the entire concept is flawed. The development should be oriented toward Southland and 24th where the impacts of the tower development will be negligible. Adding a stepback is lip service and ignores the obvious issues with the concept.
Not an issue to me
No because I think oakridge needs a new feature
No, the condos on west side have been INCREASED in height. They are now 6 stories high and directly adjacent to 1 and 2 storey homes. How is this addressing the concern to reduce storeys? This has made the project much, much worse.
I think this plan is great. I shared these comments on your sign outside the store but unfortunately saw somebody steal my sticky note. Apparently if you have something positive to say that's not appropriate for all the cranky people in Oakridge. So I'll say it here ...this development is great! It's going to bring revitalization to a dated area and we are going to have vibrant spaces to visit in our community.
This is an improvement but I am concerned that 7 storeys is still too tall for the neighbourhood. Using a community like McKenzie Towne as a model would be beneficial, where condos are limited to 4 storeys so as not to ruin the aesthetics of the area
I believe these two changes have significantly improved the application.
I do wish that there could be more frontage and more density, but the plan is very nice regardless. Textbook compromise!
Although I understand the cities desire to increase density (and justify the BRT), it does concern me that one of the buildings is still going to be relatively high. The accelerated is a good solution but could still be a couple of stories shorter. There would then be almost no impact to the surrounding residents.
No issues with fitting into the community. I like this development plan.
I do like the changes... not a concrete jungle anymore... a modernized look.
There was supposed to be a "shade review" done by the City with respect to the amount of shade cast on the houses on Oakmoor Drive - has this been done?
We have also heard that even though there is a reduction in storeys, that the amount of actual apartments has increased by at least 25 (more 1 bedroom apartments - less 2 and 3 bedroom apartments). If this is true, then again we will be back to the issue of parking.
I believe that the existing mall meets our needs. I do not think that we need more housing there as we do not need increased population in this community.
I don't think the concerns have been totally addressed in regards to the height of the buildings. I think 13 stories is still too high and will look out of place in this community. I am glad the reduced the one building down to 7 stories. That is better, though I think it is still going to look out of place.
N/A

<p>It's hard for me to visualize how tall it will actually be while standing outside the building but as long as it isn't too close to exist residential builds so they suddenly don't find themselves in the dark, I think it will work.</p>
<p>I like the proposed change. I think it will make the development more visually appealing.</p>
<p>Addresses height but not occupancy. Too many units and people</p>
<p>No I don't. I still believe the proposed buildings are too high. I like that the developer has reduced the height of the building on the NE Corner, however I feel the other high rise should be reduced as well. Our community, streets (parking) cannot accommodate this increase in density. I would like to see the other building reduced in height to 5 storeys or less. This developer seems to be cramming as much as they can onto a parcel of land in an old established community. Our community roads, intersections and such cannot handle the increase of density that this project will bring.</p>
<p>Yes. Although I was not previously concerned that the buildings would be too high, I think the revised plan would be more visually appealing.</p>
<p>No, while I believe they are making a limited attempt, they have not addressed the fundamental issues of substantial traffic increase that comes with multi-family dwelling (both vehicular and pedestrian), socioeconomic impact (more cheaper housing means more turnover, transient populations (of which there is already adequate balance of housing to single family homes - wasn't that part of the original design and balanced by the architects - why does that somehow suddenly not serve the purpose and need to be changed? (more is not necessarily better), and other impacts such as school, recreation, etc. volumes that will very likely change the face of the Oakridge community and what is already good about it (for example, Southland Rec Centre is already packed and full most of the day, and this would bring beyond capacity numbers to the area, potentially causing residents to move elsewhere, among other things).</p> <p>I have yet to see an impartial traffic impact study (with recommendations for or against development) with real figures as to both access environmental, safety and community impact [which already exist onto Oakmoor Drive WITHOUT any additional housing - so far their response to this request is just putting in traffic lights, (which isn't going to reduce the demand on the area, which increases busyness, potential for accidents, noise, pollution and safety)]. I also have yet to see a traffic study with actual numbers form part of the basis for the APPROVAL of this plan to even go forward, yet it appears it's going to happen regardless of public input. This greatly reduces my trust in the City and the community of Oakridge, which I love, and if it goes forward I will NOT be able to recommend Oakridge as a place to live, particularly when the public's rights to choice have been removed.</p> <p>I also don't see if/what effort has been made towards alternative ideas, with real transparency as to the concern from Co-Op in regards to the way the space is being used now. Did anyone consider approaching Alberta Health Services to rent/buy from Co-op (or whoever is existing owners) to build another urgent care clinic over the entire area, and keep the Co-op if need be? With the new Stoney Trail extension, access to urgent care will be a real draw and bring business to the Co-op [which I suspect is at the heart of this change] (as Rockyview is very busy, and the SW part of Calgary is still one of the fastest growing areas, with South Health Centre in Sundance now going to bear more of the load as the city continues to expand beyond Chapparal. I think opportunity for a health facility, not just private offices, exists and is being greatly missed, without compromising revenues for Co-op. An urgent care clinic with outpatient services would only increase traffic during the day, not at night when residents (in this proposed new complex) would also be contributing to increased volumes to the</p>

community.
The lack of transparency, choice, and willingness to actually change and consider other plans, rather than insisting on re-development proposed, are serious concerns and flaws in the decision making process. Those are some highlights of my concerns as a community member, and I would like to see some engagement regarding this in a full disclosure and truly open process, not just a communicative process of plans already decided.
Yes, much better.
yes ... it will definitely change the landscape of the area adding another high-rise development, but it appears to flow well and allow for connectivity.
NO - In bold letters. We DO NOT want a combined development permit and land use redesignation (re-zoning) for the site located at 2580 Southland Dr. S.W. (the existing Co-op site). We DO NOT want this type of development at all, period. We Do NOT want ANY residential units. We DO NOT want buildings above 2 storeys high. We DO NOT want ANY additional commercial units. STOP!
better than the original, but still have concerns about the amount of extra people in the area
I think the design of the proposed development is far superior to the poorly laid out and under utilised current development. I don't agree with concerns about building heights and believe a mix of different building types is needed in the area.
The change to the corner building to a shorter height is welcomed, but would still like it reduced to no higher than 6 storeys. These buildings will be the tallest structures in the area by far, and unfortunately it will set a poor precedent for future development.
The proposed change is sufficient
Yes. This is better (as someone who lives kitty-corner to where this will be and doesn't like the idea of creepers staring down into my backyard from a balcony - one of the reasons i left downtown) I wish it was capped at 5 but 7 is better than before - thank you.
It is still a tall building for this neighbourhood, & will block the view of the mountains for many people who currently have decks, balconies, patios, to the east of this development. The taller the building & the more units in it, the more parking space is required. In the past, in this area, there is a noticeable reduction in available parking spaces following the building of new developments - in all of the strip malls around, & especially at larger shopping areas like Glenmore Landing.
There should be no alleviation from the existing restrictions on height. This development will stick out like a tumor in the community. If height restrictions in Kensington are sacred so should they be in an suburban development where there are no surrounding development even close to the height of this proposal.
You have not requested comment about the number of units because contrary to public concern you have INCREASED the number. Then you modify this item by leaving out the question to avoid comment on it!
Yes, reducing the floors and making second floor setbacks seems a good improvement.
No. I still feel these towers are too tall for this area and they will stick out like sore thumbs.
I still would like this re-thought out as my concern is the volume of parking on the east side - people wanting to use A&W and the new building, along with the new east entrance to Co-op. It seems to me that the parking area will be overloaded and those of us who use A&W will potentially find it challenging to park conveniently, especially in the mornings. It is often hard to find parking with what is there now.
Yes. Seems more in-line with the condo developments on either side of the proposed development.

<p>The initial drawings are not visually appealing. The second ones are better but still not appealing. Just because they are an improvement from the initial proposal, does not mean they are good enough. The reduced building height is better but they could be reduced further. Five storeys is the maximum height that would best fit the community. There is a lot of higher density housing in the area consisting of townhouses. These fit in quite well in this community.</p>
<p>Yes. The standalone building in the northeast corner would look like a giant at 11 storeys. Seven storeys is not imposing.</p>
<p>No. The building is out of scale with the rest of the community and thus is not esthetically pleasing as well it will block the sun for many and cast a large shadow for others.</p>
<p>This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey.</p>
<p>I understand that density and transition is always a volatile topic and complaints are often emotionally formed. I have no issues myself but perhaps the following suggestion may help.</p> <p>Amendment 3 to Building A is commendable but I am concerned about the nature of the space between it and the adjacent residences after the business day. Few people would be in the space or professional building while the vegetative barrier eliminates dialogue with the residences to the west, leaving it potentially vacant and without passive surveillance. People still have apparent concerns about the height of Building E.</p> <p>I feel these issues may both be resolved by shifting the professional uses to a new building in the parking lot immediately East of the liquor store where height is less of an issue. Some residential units of Building E may be moved to building site A, perhaps with a professional/retail interface with the parking lot at grade. Building E may then be built lower without reducing site-wide units. The residential use in Building A can make a more residential/residential back-yard interface with the existing neighbours and remain visually continuous with amendment 5.</p> <p>The new building will consume some parking stalls but better enclose the parking area quadrangle and support the below suggested connection to Cedarbrae and the #80 bus stops.</p>
<p>The concerns seem to be density for the size of plot of land along with the height of the higher building. The fact that Coop and the developer made changes based on suggestions seems very favourable.</p>
<p>It looks like you have decreased the height of the corner tower but increased the height of the condo units to the west. Number of units has increased from 266 to 294. Interesting that there was no detail in your presentation as to how this increase in units will be achieved. How many parking places are allotted for condo residents? What is the breakdown of 1 - 3 bedroom units?</p>
<p>No. I would like the City of Calgary Planners and the Developer AND the citizens to make final decisions -NOT CITY COUNCIL. They themselves should be at these meetings to get a feel of what the community is like and the wants needs. They have NO idea!</p>
<p>Too much traffic is still planned for Oakmour Drive.</p>
<p>Question 3: Vibrant gathering spaces Community Idea / Concern: Community feels there is a lack of local, small-scaled businesses and vibrant places to gather.</p> <p>Applicant's proposed change: The applicant has added a commercial main street, a place for the community to meet and gather, in addition to a publically accessible courtyard.</p>

Do you feel the changes to the plan have addressed the community input about gathering places and creates a vibrant place to gather? Please advise why or why not
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
Absolutely not!!
Ok
Yes with an open mind to continue with ongoing recommends
Yes. It will be nice to see some vibrant and exiting new shops. Time will tell about how greenspace at Co-op gets used
No. The businesses should incorporate the courtyard where people gather to improve the business environment and the people enviro. The courtyard should incorporate excellent landscaping to be a restful serene place.
NO - increased small businesses good if clients can afford to pay rent & it is what the community wants & needs. Not in a VIBRANT location & no "meeting places"; No community feel to this plan at all - Just feels like greed by developer and city
No, I think instead of a vibrant place, it will be more invasive and less private
These big apartments don't belong in our quiet, safe, peaceful area!!
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
No. See note above. The public space feels hidden meant for the residential building.
I believe it does as there isn't very much green space to be had as it is so the courtyard and Main Street is great. Now it won't feel like it is all for the condos and not the public.
That will depend on how much valuable space the landowner is prepared to give up to something he does not want, tat will not generate revenue. Location will be key and key space will not be used for non rev use.
The commercial main street and the publicly accessible courtyard do not address a vibrant place to gather. Both are shaded, and in the case of the main street, reserved for vehicle traffic and will be used as major entryway for vehicles into the site. There is still far too much asphalt, and not enough pedestrian friendly spaces. While it may be more expensive in the short term, the idea of having underground parking has not been explored enough on this site. The trade off of underground parking for additional "public/amenity/pedestrian" space above ground will give a lot more flexibility for a better plan.
No, it will be a place to sell drugs and for criminals to gather - the plan is too business park like and not neighbor friendly.
The Gathering space seems like an after-thought and looks hidden amongst the residential towers. No one will see that from the road. As an example we have a green space hidden in the middle of our condo complex and because it's out of site, it's out of mind and poorly used. Increasing the area by making the north south connection (section 4) completely pedestrianized may increase the value and desirability of the gathering space. A place for concerts would be great.
No See above.
I think these spaces will benefit the residents only and not the community at large. The neighbouring communities have gathering places currently and this 'enhancement' really changes nothing for existing residents.
This is a nice addition. Traffic flow needs to be addressed possibly and parking will still be an issue in the area in general. The number of stalls is to be the same as what is currently in the

mall. However, several businesses and residences are being added and I believe parking is going to be an issue.
It looks like a good start. Is the roof of the Coop going to be a green roof? If it is, could this be a gather in space as well? Or will the residents be looking out on an expanse of dull roof?
Yes, and make the colours pleasant to the eyes and not out of place.
The courtyard is tucked away amongst the condo development and I don't feel it would be used by the community at large, but may be used by those living in this development. It is unclear from the drawings whether there would be retail on street level in the area of the courtyard, but retail might increase community use of the space. The community street seems to mainly provide car access to the other side of the development. Again, if there is street level retail with room for patio spaces this might increase community use.
I have no idea what the word "vibrant" means. Will there be a lot of vibration? Would that damage nearby buildings?
No. There is insufficient area and insufficient convenient parking and access to accommodate such uses.
And what do we do with it in the winter? Where do the cubs & scouts sell their trees? They need space, they need electricity for their lights & trailer. Again, where is the map to show what it will look like. We do not want grass on top of Co-op.
Yes
I like the proposals but couldn't see seating areas around COOP building for people waiting for taxis/pickup or to hang out (especially elderly and mothers with pushchairs). Also no children's play area in courtyard.
Sounds good, can't really tell from the picture or the description to make an informed decision on whether the change addressing concerns
yes this concern seems to have been met
No, it is another mall, just what we need.
No it hasn't. It should not be built.
No! The whole development is far too large for the area.
No. The courtyard will never feel like public space, it belongs to the people living there... The street area may work for "festival" type events but how will the parking for the apartments be affected during these events?
with a new co-op and better store options, it will be great for better foot traffic and community amenities.
I am in agreement with this change as well.
The revised area designated as location #6b is likely to be under the control of the condo corporation managing the space. How can this be a public area? Other than this, there isn't any other new community space.
Unless there is a fabulous playground in the courtyard, I don't really think I will be "gathering" in the new space. I also think that "local" is the key. No Starbucks etc. They aren't local.
Yes but there needs to be more thought into who is operating business there....please do not fill it with fast food (ie Tim Hortons, subway, Wendy's etc) but think more local and independent catering some of the businesses to the high senior population in the area (ie - salons, bakeries like the patisserie in Woodbine, chiropractor, massage, yoga studio, small arts and artisan centre, high end pubs, lawyers, small H&R office etc). Don't have tight spaces that are difficult to move around and make accessibility easy for them! Make signage very visible and easy to read. Create handrails along walking paths and entrances etc...An often heard comment about Calgary is how "senior UNFRIENDLY" it is so this would be a great opportunity to create an area that thinks about them for a change.

I believe it has enhanced the vibrant gathering spaces. We do not need more small scaled businesses outside of this site as most of the current strip malls are rundown and do not add to the community well being.
Extensive meeting places are not needed in this plan because of proximity to N Glenmore Park, Fish Creek Park and the walk/cycleway west and Southland Leisure Centre to the east. Allowance for retail spaces (ie coffee shops, specialty food outlets) to have outdoor seating, and tables in the courtyard invites people to stay.
The commercial main street idea is interesting, but there is a concern about congesting the north/south connection to the Co-Op with parking and pedestrians.
Not sure if the new courtyard will attract anyone from outside of the residential development. I would feel as if I was playing in someone else's backyard if I went there. This space seems like it is more for the people who would live in this development rather than for the rest of the community. Also, building a green space is nice for the residents who live on this property, but no one will go there if it's just a big lawn with trees that doesn't have a path that provides access to anything.
It is hard to tell without more detailed drawings of the size and design of the main street.
I'm unclear on what the main street entails, but this doesn't seem to address the issue of local, small-scaled businesses, only the vibrant places to gather. Will need more details.
Impossible to see the integration to the North with the single rendering provided.
Great. A place for the thugs to gather.
Absolutely not. These are high density residences. The so called gathering areas are not sufficient and there is no space to create more.
I think the proposed changes are a big improvement and are welcomed!
There does appear to be anything to address gathering or vibrancy -- nothing has changed as far I see on the plan.
No comment
No I do not. More restaurants, more places to gather would be ideal for the community. Residents DO NOT WANT more apartment buildings and a smaller Co-Op.
I would like to see some cross sections of the gathering places / north-south connection to illustrate the scale of the spaces. The north-south connection and opening the courtyard to this area is a significant improvement in the scheme - adds value for the community / residents as well as for the potential retail tenants.
I would like to see a connection from the courtyard through the mixed-use / residential complex to the park on the northwest side of the property - I know there is a significant grade change here, but an opening in this location could create a "covered" extension of the courtyard space and could be a catalyst for updating the adjacent park to better access/connection on that side (wide steps, etc.).
It was fine before - honestly our neighbourhood needs to do a better job of supporting local business - it isnt Co-ops fault we dont have many. Their changes though will add more space which is good.
It is adequate.
Private green space for multi family ... Roof top green house above Coop
Does not appear to offer a "vibrant place to gather" from what the new plan shows.
Small scale businesses would be great - however many in the neighborhood have struggled to stay a float in the past. It would be great to see some of them flourish.

Its will depend on what we get in those leased spaces and whether small business can afford to be there. This is a tough balance for the developer as it would be worse to have unleased space vacant all the time.
No. Please see comments above.
This is one of the better ideas that have come along. It addresses density well.
As above
Concern remains as these types of things tend to get cut in the final phase of development by developers (and are allowed to do so by the city\$
This is still very general. I want to see a commitment to maintain the 40+ year tradition of Scouts Canada and Girl Guides of Canada selling Christmas trees from this location for the month of December.
No- I think a sun roof park with benches and paths on top of coop grocery store with lots of green(the architect even coloured the roof green in the drawings to indicate need for green space) This would be a wonderful progressive addition if also kept simple and low maintenance. What about a small covered playground for winter ? I believe all parking should be underground for the residence units if not the whole parking allotment. The cost could be offset by more availability for street vendors, food trucks and local weekly markets renting of a beautiful residential park like space
Having more small (family) businesses is a great asset for the community.
The revised concept is considerably improved. However, no commitment has been made to provide space for local Scouts and Girl Guides for their annual Christmas tree lot. This is a very important revenue source to these organizations, which do such excellent work with young people and deserve to be supported. It is also good for Co-op's public image.
No, the latest concept doesn't look ANYTHING like the original one, with a 'village square' idea that looked very promising. I loved the idea of patios, kids play area and coffee shops/restaurants etc.
The amount of gathering spaces create enough vibrant places given the size of the lot.
There are more than few areas like that and are more than capable to serve our community as well as small business needs. We do have beautiful places like Glenmore reservoir, Fish creek park... very well accessible and good gathering places where vibrant community can meet.
Would like to know more about these 'gathering places', who they are intended for, who will actually use them, and who will maintain and keep them secure.
No, besides the public park access there is no gathering area
The community meeting place looks lame but it's better than none at all. It will become a messy weedy place.
Yes the addition of the "main street" has provided for this.
I apologize that I am late to the engagement, and haven't been part of the conversation until now. The publicly accessible courtyard may not be publicly used since it will appear to be "owned" by the residential space. Unless it is prominent, and physically put out there for the public, it won't be used by the public. The applicant has "satisfied" the concern through a token designed space that won't really have any impact.
Yes, but this space should be located behind the Boston Pizza at the West end of the complex. NO Please consider moving the(medical/shops??) building that you wish to build at the west end. It backs on The Oakwood Lane Condo Complex, & sadly, any building at this end destroys property owners' quality of life - noise, views destroyed, congestion, loss of privacy... Why is it necessary to build along this fence line & lilac hedge at all?

Isn't enough to have the condos over the COOP & the medical building on 24th Street? Why overdo this development project by constructing so many new buildings on the site?
Yes
Yes
No. Lacks imagination.
Local, small scale businesses and nice gathering places is important to me. I am unaware of the local businesses and meeting places that are planned
Yes - this is the exact change to improve local businesses. Hopefully, the community will support the businesses as, for example, they are supported at Glenmore Landing.
Yes. The main street style shopping walkway will add a much needed interest point to our neighbourhood.
No. The community apparently is asking for small scale businesses not a commercial main street.
Yes
Great! Looking forward to riding bikes for coffee and/or ice cream.
Depends on which businesses fill the spaces
I like it! This is a great use of space and allows more people to live and work locally
Yes. I like the idea of a plaza, park and more street-fronting businesses.
If I was living in the residence with the courtyard, I don't think I would like to share it with everyone who comes into the CoOp...I would want something more private as a homeowner or renter. Could not the city park on the northwest corner be made more inviting with a ramp or stairs for accessibility, benches, music, lighting...pop up stores like East Villageadd some color and make it a fun place to be. Make this area a destination!
Yes. Some beautification of the Coop site with the addition of a courtyard and walkable pedestrian paths with trees/landscaping will improve the look & feel of the site.
Can't tell where this is on map but sounds good
I like a lot of things about these changes. I don't see seating in either the court yard or nor along the boulevard. Is it feasible to add benches? When I think of areas like Marda Loop, Mission etc, benches seem integral.
Yes this suggestion has now been addressed. Hopefully a new restaurant or starbucks could bring more people .
Agreed. There should be the implementation of a few restaurants/pubs since the only walkable ones available now to oakridge residents are the point and feather and boston pizza which while desirable, lack the updated model restaurant appeal.
Changes fine. We have to start growing into our size as a city. People gather in restaurants or shopping malls. It should be attractive rather than merely utilitarian. That has to be done anyway to attract tenants to the residential units.
Changes to improve user space are acceptable.
I have often thought that the relatively unused NW corner of the existing site could have been used to house some small scale businesses. I think that the sides of the laneway could be used in similar fashion - small spaces for compatible businesses such as a coffee shop, restaurant, boutique shop (fashion clothing, specialty foods, etc.), bank, maybe even the Wildrose Registry.
See above comments re the north/south "main street". It is somewhat unclear is the main street between the buildings and adjacent to the courtyard will be pedestrian only or also for vehicular traffic. If this street is pedestrian that would be acceptable, but not acceptable if vehicles can use the street for reasons stated above.

Love it. Make sure it is fully accessible and does not become a hang out for individuals who have no where to go and intimidate shoppers
Calling this a main street is laughable. How many main streets are single sided with the second edge a parking lot? This is a joke. It is a suburban auto-oriented concept and calling it a Main Street doesn't make it one.
Not an issue to me
I think this is good for the community
No, by increasing the number of residential units, the plan adds more demand to the limited parking in the area. There is no parking on 3 sides of this project, and Oakmoor Drive, on the 4th side is at capacity. Cars in the area already park in the Coop lot in the evening because there is no parking on Oakmoor Drive. If the development goes in, the Coop lot by Oakmoor will be removed - further straining the parking resources of the area.
I think this plan is great. I shared these comments on your sign outside the store but unfortunately saw somebody steal my sticky note. Apparently if you have something positive to say that's not appropriate for all the cranky people in Oakridge. So I'll say it here ...this development is great! It's going to bring revitalization to a dated area and we are going to have vibrant spaces to visit in our community.
Yes
I am concerned that the green roof space will not receive much use. I spent several decades working downtown in different office buildings with views onto various green roof spaces, and in my opinion none of them received much use, not even on summer weekends. Is the developer being over-optimistic about the value this green roof will add? I don't envisage nearby community residents using this space. Perhaps if there was a direct (second floor) access from the adjacent apartment building onto the roof, the apartment residents would use it more.
I would like to see a stage.
Please please have a place to gather for a fine coffee .not in a cafeteria setting. Oakridge is a nice community and needs a place for people to meet and stay in the community. We currently get in our car to go to Marda Loop, 4th street etc.
I think this will provide the gathering spaces that are lacking in the area, and provide a space for small business opportunities.
Community is important... newer communities have these vibrant gathering places that already exist. It would be great if you could create that here!
It looks fine - I hope it works.
I was initially very excited about the prospect of a new Co-op, new medical building, new shops and restaurants. I actually didn't mind the thought of condos and apartments - as long as they were done properly, did not take away from our property value and addressed parking and traffic problems - not sure this part has been accomplished.
I did enjoy when the Coop had a cafeteria, but we do not need more places to gather.
I think this has been adequately addressed, but wonder how it will be maintained? Who is accountable for looking after the park?
N/A
I love the idea of a courtyard as currently i often find myself outside Co-op or around the building standing around catching around with friends chatting
As there are not currently any gathering spaces, I am in favour of this change.
Last place I would want to gather
Yes.

<p>This change would reduce and limit the existing community places (as they'd be overrun) and doesn't provide even enough green space and business to handle the mass numbers of new residents in multi-family dwelling.</p>
<p>Partially. I'm not sure small local businesses are being accommodated</p>
<p>I am uncertain that the people who live in the building will want the public gathering on their front doorsteps.</p>
<p>NO - In bold letters. We DO NOT want a combined development permit and land use redesignation (re-zoning) for the site located at 2580 Southland Dr. S.W. (the existing Co-op site). We DO NOT want this type of development at all, period. We Do NOT want ANY residential units. We DO NOT want buildings above 2 storeys high. We DO NOT want ANY additional commercial units. STOP!</p>
<p>not bad still more could be done</p>
<p>I think there are sufficient green spaces in the community already. Providing a public space in what is better set as a private space for those living in the residential buildings does not appeal to me. However additional meeting spaces in the form of businesses with patios or rentable community rooms seems like a good idea.</p>
<p>I would like to see some sort of connection between the courtyard and the existing green space on the west end of the development - a "portico" or other connection through the building.</p>
<p>Love the idea of the courtyard! This provides the people with a sense of community.</p>
<p>Great news!</p>
<p>Will only use the development to shop. If it is too congested I will shop elsewhere. I avoid bikecalgary geeks and artisans.</p>
<p>I think making the courtyard accessible to public could be strange for residents in those buildings.</p>
<p>No. The proposed Main Street is located between the residential buildings and has access to Oakmoor Drive. This will create increased traffic to a street that already had to have traffic calming measures put in place. The street could be a walkable gathering place with no vehicle access. This would make it more inviting as well as to limit vehicle access to Oakmoor Drive which will have a lot of difficulty handling the increased traffic.</p>
<p>This wording is not clear. Is the "commercial main street" outside, or is that a fancy name for an indoor mall? Is the courtyard inside or outside? I hope that it is not referring to the courtyard in the northwest corner which should be for residence only.</p>
<p>More emphasis on outdoor green spaces gathering is required. More benches, tables, trees , required. Boccie ball or horseshoe areas would also be pleasant. Community gardens would be excellent. Outdoor art required. A decorative water fountain to sit near by would be excellent. Funds to the existing Oakridge community centre to enhance and provide additional user experience is a must especially for fall and winter. Additional funds will be required for the Southland Leisure Centre.</p>
<p>This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey.</p>
<p>In general, I tend to be critical of the reliability of the terms 'vibrant' and 'gathering places'. I have a few suggestions below that tangentially regard the capacity of the park to the NW to serve these ends in concert with the courtyard and main street.</p>
<p>They addressed the concerns because changes to the design were made.</p>
<p>Not sure. The "6 gathering space just looks like the parking lot. I don't think you can afford to sacrifice this parking space to create a "gathering space"</p>
<p>The publically accessible courtyard has the feel of being just for the condo residents and is too cut off from the rest of the gathering places. I question its seclusion and safety, especially during the night hours.</p>

I saw very little gathering spaces where there is a commercial main street planned and for people to gather. I would like to see it facing south and not on the side of the buildings where there is traffic planned to go from Southland to Oakmoor Drive. The area at the west end of Co-Op now is a very busy route. Having stores along that area would just cause more congestions. If the medical centre was moved to the NE corner then put the commercial main street along the south side west of Co-Op and where the medical centre was supposed to go with a lovely green area with tables, chairs etc.

Question 4: 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

No they haven't

Parking?

?

Yes. Parking is a big deal here. Just keep in mind about construction vehicles access, and that would be a concern regarding Oakmoor Drive

No. The developer have not listened and "heard" what citizens wanted in Feb. Instead they made harmful tweaks without creating the sense of space and good environmental design that is needed.

NO - didn't listen - increase (too much) in residential development; Didn't listen to traffic problem on Oakmoor (has nothing to do with ring road); Didn't listen for parking concerns - underground parking for condos will NOT solve the problem!; DO agree with South roadway from Southland into shopping area & out to Oakmoor Drive

No - not with the number of increased units, and the locations of the apt. buildings

Absolutely not. I have talked to over 75 people about his and nobody was aware of it. We only just found out now because of the signs on 24 st. These needs to back up.

COMMUNITY SOUNDING BOARD

14 stories was just fine as long as more parking was added

I think creative use of space - providing good living especially for older people is great

Needs more cow bell!!

[heart symbol]

Can't wait for this development! This community needs it!

Love the plan go for it, I have lived here over 20 years you have my support

This parking lot is a ghost town most days

I have never had an issue finding parking here. Calm down people.

ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

Yes, except for the item below about Oakmoor Drive access to 24th Street.

By the way, my wife and I are quite interested in this development, and will be taking a serious look at the various apartments offered for our inevitable "down-sizing & simplifying move". We like the Oakridge community and, depending upon our situation at the time, may well buy an apartment.

Yes and No - see above comments.

I think so

No. I feel the number of parking spaces still is not adequate when compared with the current site and the related businesses; especially during peak visit times.

It is not clear how many of the existing non Co-op businesses will continue on the site, but many of them have been the primary reason I visit the site.
No, the design to keep the gas bar, the A&W and the Boston Pizza are preventing a true TOD and pedestrian first concept. This is simply an attempt by Coop to have their cake and eat it too.
What are the rental requirements, will these units be used as full rental? Or will they be subsidized or low rental units?
Parking is a concern to me, Please see my comments and questions in the box below
No
No, the plan seems much worse. Increasing the number of residences, increasing the height of the west side condos and dividing the site with a road has made it much much worse. It would seem that the developers are tone deaf to the existing community.
I think this plan is great. I shared these comments on your sign outside the store but unfortunately saw somebody steal my sticky note. Apparently if you have something positive to say that's not appropriate for all the cranky people in Oakridge. So I'll say it here ...this development is great! It's going to bring revitalization to a dated area and we are going to have vibrant spaces to visit in our community.
Partially. I would like to see more focus on small independent business. I will gladly spend my money at these over chain stores. More diversity in the area would be appreciated too
I feel the changes the developer have made are an improvement BUT I still have outstanding concerns regarding target tenants and parking.
As a whole, yes these changes generally reflect the concerns that I heard at the workshop.
Yes. You listened and tried to do what we asked for.
I can't answer this question as I was completely unaware of this proposed development.
Yes... i like the engagement process and the community input
No, I still think that parking and traffic is a major concern that I do not think has been addressed. I am wondering where visitors, maintenance vehicles, etc. to the apartments are going to be parking? Is there assigned "Visitor Parking"? As someone that lives on Oaklawn Place S.W., I just think it is turning into a nightmare as far as parking goes. I am sure that people will be using Oakmoor Drive, 25th Street and Oaklawn Place for extra parking. If you were to drive down Oakmoor Drive on a week-end, you would see that there is no excess parking to be had.
The City does not listen to resident feedback as illustrated in the development of 14Street S.W. We do not need bus lanes on 14Street.
I think they have though still a concern with access to 24th street from Oakmoor Dr. I am concerned that another light will have to be installed to manage traffic in this area. Will there be a pedestrian crossing located there even if they don't install traffic lights?
After briefly skimming, I believe so.
From all the concerns I have heard I think the concerns appear to have been heard by the developer
Yes, I feel that changes have been made to address community ideas and concerns.
No I feel that it's all for show that the City is 'listening' but really you just want to provide the approval and get it done. It has the same stink as the BRT.
No. There has been little if any move to address the parking issues that will arise from such a high density plan. For the residents in the direct area - there is not enough street parking, with such an increase in density, street parking will be a nightmare. Has the developer allowed for more parking? The current plan allows for the minimum required or just a slight

increase above that. With the amount of people utilizing the new development there is not nearly enough parking!
Yes.
No, see previous answers.
Somewhat but not completely. Stiff concerned about vehicle traffic onsite and surrounding Streets.
Yes
NO - In bold letters. We DO NOT want a combined development permit and land use redesignation (re-zoning) for the site located at 2580 Southland Dr. S.W. (the existing Co-op site). We DO NOT want this type of development at all, period. We Do NOT want ANY residential units. We DO NOT want buildings above 2 storeys high. We DO NOT want ANY additional commercial units. STOP!
somewhat
I feel that the changes have tried to meet the concerns expressed by those who have provided input. However I see that most of the input is mostly negative and based on not having any changes or advances to the community.
Some of the concerns have been addressed, but some have only been half-addressed (heights of buildings, etc.)
I love how the publics voice is being heard!
I feel they listened to us and compromised. I appreciate this.
This is a very long process. Having construction going on in this area PLUS road work for the SW Ring Road, extending Southland Dr. for a very long time, will turn our neighbourhood into a very undesirable place to be. I will not be shopping at Co-op during construction. There is nothing appealing about dust, & noise going on, having to find convenient parking & so on. After 40 years, I will be shopping elsewhere for the most part. In addition, there is this idiotic proposal to build a S BRT which will affect this entire area & beyond. It is just too much!! (with any luck, this latter project won't be happening).
No. There is a predetermined outcome in this application. Connections between the developer communicatons staff and the outgoing councillor staff fail values and ethics in any decision making.
Parking spaces are only 7.5% over the minimum by law, this seems low. Think of Glenmore Landing where it is nearly impossible to get a parking spot mid day.
The concerns have been addressed in part but the solutions are still insufficient. As noted in previous responses, the concerns surrounding green spaces, traffic flow, etc. still remain and need to be addressed further. An opportunity exists to add a vibrant area to a community that is very walkable and has great green spaces. What is being proposed however does not compliment this but detracts from it. If I had to pick only one change to be made to the proposal, a pedestrian Main Street would be it!
yes, dependant upon the details of the "vibrant gathering spaces."
It's a start but more changes are required.
This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey.
People will almost always lament a lack of parking, even on sites only ever full on holiday shopping rushes. As someone who used to work at this Co-Op location and a recent graduate of planning, I offer my commendations and sympathies to the team and the applicant for enduring this.
Changes made seemed to address most of the community ideas and concerns. For some the planned development with residential, commercial and social space is a welcomed plan for the community and surrounding area. The key for city planning is to

support the plan with ongoing assessment and planning for key infrastructure to meet the anticipated needs of increased population.(ie impact on the SW Leisure Centre, on South Glenmore Park)
I still have a concern re possible street parking but I guess the impact of that will only become apparent once the complex is built and fully inhabited. What are the criteria under which a system of parking permits would be required for street parking along Oakmoor Drive?
I would like to see the Co-Op Grocery Store enlarged especially if 400+ people are to be added to this area. This store is not big enough now and is not able to bring in quality produce and items and have a first class selection of items (See the Co-Op on Macleod Trail ****
No. This community DOES NOT WANT A LOT OF PEOPLE AND CARS CRAMMED INTO THIS AREA!
If this decision comes down to just what City Council wants I will not be surprised but I will be extremely disappointed!!
Getting close.
Yes but I am not convinced that the residents are on board with the condos.
No. It is too tall for this community, as stated in the first question box.
They have done the minimum necessary to indicate they listened to feedback from the City and community. There has not been a strong vision for making this a much better space for the next 50 years - which is where all planning should be aiming for.
No - too dense, too big, too many people, will change the vibe of the area in a negative way.
Some of them. It's closer but we still need to be moving towards a more pedestrian friendly site.
No See above.
I see the number of residential units has increased from the original plan. This increases concerns about traffic and parking.
There is no mention of the commercial buildings at the west end of the lot. These buildings will impact the townhouses situated directly to the west of them.
It's hard to tell from the pictures if there is a clear sidewalk / pathway from 24 street and Southland drive. The bus stops by this corner and right now the pedestrian access isn't great and generally is a meander through the parking lot. Will the parking near building 2 (7 stories) adequately serve that building? Right now it is a single story and the parking area in front fills up.
Yes they seem to care and listen, which is quite new with developers and will add vibrancy to the area.
I feel that the city did a great job summarizing the communities concerns and making recommendations. The developer has responded with some improvements in the design, however, I think there is a long way to go to making this development a valuable addition to the community.
OK
No. The proposed density of development is way out of scope with all communities within miles of the area. The site cover and FAR are many many times greater than the average site cover in the area. The proposal is nowhere near compatible with the area. It is way out of place.

Absolutely not. The parking. The main concerns have not been addressed at all. The aesthetics do not fit in with our neighborhood. A residence in our neighborhood was torn down & a new one built. It blends with the style of our neighborhood. This will not.
Yes
Yes.
No, although it has improved there is still alot of concerns (see above). I do think where the buildings are all situated is the best that can be done and should stay the way they have suggested but just not be as tall. I don't think anyone wants to look out there window and just see a massively tall building as their view instead of the nice open blue sky view that we had when we bought our places. I am extremely concern about the noise level and traffic levels on southland drive .
No, see my previous comments
Improvements to parking have not been addressed.
No it hasn't. It should not be built. It will bring more traffic to the area that already has alot. There is no need to change this area in anyway.
No. Visually it does not fit the neighbourhood and will put too much stress on the roads, which are already too busy and which will only get worse with the BRT
Partially, still too high, not enough thought to traffic/parking
Don't think it's thought out very well.
I feel the community concerns have been addressed and now you should get on with the construction.
See comments above. Frankly, the developer has the opportunity to have a clean sheet of paper to start with but it is not using that opportunity.
I have to be honest, upon receiving this request for thoughts, I had only heard rumours about the re-development. I don't recall a time otherwise when this was brought to us for public input.
No No No to the issue of traffic congestion! Thank s will still be a huge problem! Especially at Southland and 24th street. Putting in m Re lights does not help. To put this kind of development in would require a change to the traffic infrastructure and flow. There should be traffic flow with hour lights that allows for continuous flow....think lanes that are dedicated for complex entrance only or d dictated merge lanes or over passes and unfortunately th cost to do this would be extraordinary. I like the concept of th d velopmnt but unfortunately th congestion will make it a nightmare and deter ant for going there.
Also the parking issues have not been adequately addressed.
Yes I feel all issues have been address and the application should go ahead as soon as possible.
The plan is a good one, incorporating existing services, expanding residential space with appropriate residential parking.
I think this plan needs fine tuning to size it appropriately to the existing community. Again, reducing the height of the commercial tower is great, but the residential development is now taller with more units. It's too big for this community.
no, now the number of units has increased which also means an increase in parking requirements and traffic.
No
I think it's a good start, but it doesn't go far enough toward addressing the issues raised by the community. With more dialogue and revisions I'm sure we can arrive at a good fit for both developer and greater community. I love the green roof and unique gathering space ideas

and hope we can see more details about these. It would be great to have some kind of indoor exercise or fitness space in there too!
Pedestrian connectivity improved, pedestrian interface is still absolutely terrible. This is a development for cars - the gas station closest to the BRT stops makes that very clear. Parking lots are closest to any pedestrian access points which is a terrible interface.
Traffic and parking are major concerns so the solution was to add more residents? Doesn't address concerns in the least. All pie in the sky answers and pats on the head by arrogant know it alls.
No they have not. Thanks reasons have been addressed in the previous sections.
I think the changes have addressed the community concerns within the context of building height and interfacing with existing nearby residential.
Same as below - there needs to be a pedestrian bridge at the new light. There have been serious accidents there with children crossing to Louis Riel and the Oakridge community center.
Too tall. Too much congestion. Where are these families sending their kids to school? The designated schools are full now! Too much too many. Greed is driving this proposal! The traffic is going to be a nightmare. If you actually want to work with the concerns of the public in this community the way to fix this is LESS! Less new housing, less congestion. The reason people are I. These communities are for less congestion. If we wanted what you are proposing we would move to new communities. We are in these older areas for a reason! Do not let development turn ruin the different communities in Calgary.
Not sure
No I do not. More restaurants, more stores and places to gather would be ideal for the community. Local residents DO NOT WANT more apartment buildings and a smaller Co-Op. This doesn't address the communities needs.
Even the reduction in storeys opens the area to all large multi storied construction in the future. The Glenmore Gardens apartment was grandfathered from an existing permit from the 1960's. On what basis are our building permits in the Pump Hill, Palliser, Bayview, Oakridge, Cedarbrae, Braeside, Woodbine, etc. areas being changed? Is this a step in developing the high-rise low-rental plan for the Glenmore Landing/Pumphill area ? How can we protect our neighbourhoods from being down-graded by these building permit changes?
Some significant improvements - thank you.
I think this is a good plan that will add value to our aging community. I fully support it and what it will bring to us.
The land across the street from Coop which has been vacant for years should be added into the development plan
This development will result in increased activity, density and traffic to a quiet corner of the city. I am not in favor of the development but if it must be done, no building should be taller than 3 stories and new apartments should be reduced by at least half.
The city has been on a mission of increasing density at the expense of changing the original purpose people chose to live in a given community. More stores and high rise buildings do not improve a community, more parks, community centers, and places to gather do. As we are truly be forced to accept a major development to this site, I believe it should focus on maintaining lower density, and having areas where people would like to gather. Keeping

all building height at a maximum of 4 stories and not just trying to see how many people we can jam in a small area is key to having something that fits in with the current community.
I had no real concerns with the original proposal. It would be really nice to see that site re-developed.
The north south corridor is interesting...I cuts up the residential area and makes that courtyard/public space more accessible for the community. I wonder what the residents of the building will feel about that. I like that it provides more street parking as I suspect we will need it. For visitors and the public.
No. The changes have increased the density of the development and have concentrated it in one corner of the site. It is not a welcoming development at present and offers little to the community as it stands. A redesign is in order with more attention paid to size or footprint of the development, its spatial arrangement and the green and social amenities provided. It could be a benefit to the community if done right and to the proper scale.
Yes
As above
yes
I don't believe there will be enough surface parking. Some surface stalls will be taken up by visitors to the residential areas cutting down on the stalls for businesses. These business will be the ones to suffer as people will go elsewhere
Somewhat. Height is still a concern
Getting closer. The three maon concerns that I heard at the public open houses were: Traffic - not addressed here but inevitable to increase if this centre is to remain viable. I would rather deal with increased traffic than lose the only grocery store within walking/cycling distance. Height of building - 7 story height for the NE tower building seems reasonable. Parking - not addresses here. Is there any additional information that can be shared?
I think the changes are appreciated and moving in the right direction. Cooperatives are the way of the future- Coop should be excited to build something completely progressive and funky and totally green and cycle foot friendly! This project could be incredible with underground parking and street level used for beautiful shops, Main Street Markets and park like setting
I think the plan has been well thought out. You'll never get a 100% from anyone as generally, the general population does not like "change". I'm looking forward to watching it grow!
The changes are an improvement, but have not removed the feeling that while this may be a profitable move for Co-op, it will negatively impact existing Oakridge residents, who form a big part of the Co-op's customer base.
The population density increase has not dramatically improved in the latest plan. 7 floors instead of 11 is not enough of a difference, especially since the other 12 storey building hasn't changed at all. Why not move that tall residential building to the vacant lot just North of the present medical building?
Yes, the proposed changes show that the developer has been very responsive to community concerns.
This is City idea and is being pushed in to our neighborhood, I would like to know the real story behind. This are not changes that we wont. Why? Because if this is what I wont ,I would be living in place that already got all of that what City promotes. But great majority of us do not wont that. And that is why we are here and not somewhere else.

No. Once again, the city and its partners pretend to listen to the citizens to make us feel important or that we actually have some say in the matter while truly the plans are already in process.
No, if the site was a totally new build it would not be developed this way
Yes to a limited degree
I apologize that I am late to the engagement, and haven't been part of the conversation until now. I am surprised little attention is being given to the south boundary of the site. This would seem like an opportune location to address and enhance. Bus routes go along here, and Southland is a busier street than Oakmoor, and I would think that attention would have been given to this side of the site.
NO Development should take place on Southland Drive and 24th Streets which are major thoroughfares, not on the Oakmoor Way SW side of the COOP property.
No
To a great extent yes.
I don't feel that the existing online information sufficiently addresses parking and congestion concerns. The city should wait and share more information about the traffic studies before approving the development
Yes - this is a great example of densification that works for the community.
My only concern was with parking. I spoke with the city folks at the Braeside 50th anniversary celebration and they put my concerns to rest.
I think the application should be scrapped for the reasons I have given above.
Yes
Yes, the city seems to have filtered through the comments from previous consultations and gotten to the important issues and implemented changes. I am pleased with the engagement.
Some of them. Still an issue with access in and out of the development. All the residents in the towers will need to arrive and leave along Oakmoor Drive for best access, which will hugely impact traffic on Oakmoor Drive, as it is already impossible to turn north on 24th Street from there during rush hour. Residents choosing to head east along Southland Drive will all have to drive through the entire property to exit between the Boston Pizza and Liquor Store on the south side of the development, as that is the only exit where a lefthand turn can be made. Seems like a huge bottleneck opportunity, especially with increased traffic coming along Southland Drive when the new ring road expansion is completed along Southland Drive. Traffic lights or another exit/entrance are in order.
Yes. There is clear response to suggestions to concerns such as parking, walking, and height of the development.
I think the coop has made an effort and offered a viable alternative. Has the role of the BRT been publicly discussed in this development? How about community garden space...
No. The proposed residential structures are still too tall. It will simply add too many units to the already congested area, further fristrate the already poor street parking situation and detract from existing adjacent resident's daily commute and general enjoyment of their home and immediate surroundings.
Definitely an improvement but room to do better. Building placement is good, still concern with increased numbers of people/traffic and height of buildings
Yes, thank you.
Yes, the concerns were listened to and the developer amended the plan.

Felt that most of the concerns were NIMBY and general resistance to change.
Yes, so far.
Question 5: Do you have any outstanding concerns about the application that you feel have been missed?
OPEN HOUSE – COMMENT FORM
More noisy unnecessary traffic!
Parking; Now 700 parking spaces, future 700 parking spaces, spaces which includes residents & increased visitors
Parking spots have been added but so has residential occupancy. We live close to Glenmore landing where parking is an issue. Do not want to see this site/development have that congestion.
Not well enough informed
What will this do to the value of the surrounding properties? Up, down, stay the same?!
It is not an attractive plan - integrating living and commercial space with the surrounding community
When doing survey of traffic flow please do all area from Glenmore Trail, West to Tsuu' Tina, East to Elbow, South to south part of Fish Creek Park; Do this survey at all times of day; Get a better restaurant on site! & a good coffee shop
See above - three items; the height of the apt. bldgs; the increased densification around co-op (yes I know they want to); and the lack of green space for the new apt. dwellers
Yes. Height; crowding of area, impact on environment & surrounding parks, traffic, too many traffic lights along 24th (stop & go all the way), safety, value of homes
OPEN HOUSE – ENGAGEMENT BOARDS
Traffic coming out of NE corner. No idea how to reduce congestion. It's already bad now getting to 24th
Still feeling parking is inadequate based on all additional commercial space. There should be solutions i.e. staff parking underground
Parking is still an issue. Accomodation for 2 indoor spaces at affordable rates!
Beautify the City or Enmax utility building to fit the nice look of everything else
Don't turn this into high density low class housing project
Has the applicant addressed additional load on sewage infrastructure?
no parking from Co-op onto 26th St & Oakmoor for units on N. side of Co-op
Is the BRT to support this project? It certainly isn't needed for current use
What is the logic and rational for the green space on top of the Co-op. Make a better use of the design that was bought up in the design sessions
Original plan is better with larger building on north east corner and lower on northwest corner
Will there be a charge for parking? Or will parking continue to be free?
2 open houses noone wanted green space on roof of Co-op Apt. are appropriate
Everyone at the 2 open houses were absolutely against 266 unit. Now its 294. Not acceptable
Put crosswalks across Oakmoor Drive to the pedestrian access to the centre
Don't allow a 300 m cell tower to be built to detract from the development
The crosswalk access should be at Oak Tree Close, into the Co-op complex. More access for more people.

Too much density at N.W corner need to spread out development and CAP density More space between buildings
Maintain some sort of architectural status[?]
The ratio of residential parking stalls to condos does not seem high enough for the current car ownership trends in Calgary
Local transit does not support a development like this. Busses ran every 40 mins if they come at all. After 7pm you can't get a bus from the train station
New enmax building is ugly very poorly thought of, design & color looks like a jail
Apt. building too high for community
No one could answer whether apartments would have "assigned" parking spots - this is a vital issue to whether there are sufficient parking spots for Coop, medical etc. Why ask for input when you have not addressed this issue?
A lot of people back out of homes onto Oakmoore Dr. It's an issue now, will get worse in time. There is no alley there
It seemed there was a near unanimous concern about the high number of residential units. Now there are more in this plan. How did this occur?
Need a turning light going east on Southland out of Co-op
24th St & Oakmoor Dr already needs traffic signals - this become imperative w/ increased density; pedestrian safety on Southland Drive given that with SWRR traffic will increase
More info on the Co-op doors so people are aware
Don't put a light at Oakmoore and 24th. It will cause more traffic on Oakmoore where people back out of their driveways
Concerned about population growth as old people move on and their kids/families move in
Based on 2.1 cars per household, there will not be enough parking for residents and shoppers
The height is still to high for a residential neighbourhood
With lower income comes crime. Low cost housing will increase crime
No 12 stories in my area!
The 13 story structure seems too high, especially when the Co-op roof is unused real estate. Seems to be a missed opportunity
It looks great - I'd like lots of small stores & pedestrian friendly spaces
If I purchase a unit in the West buildings will I have to go outside to shop at Co-op?
If possible, could you ensure that large garbage bins are within the developed area, so residentss to the West are protected from the noise of them being emptied? Thanks!
Traffic model rationale needs to be clearly articulated, particularly for West developments
Consider an indoor gathering space given Calgary's weather
Great concept. Would prefer greater small scale businesses
I'm glad to see that residential space will be included, especially to accomode the elderly
increase in traffic, adding lights at southland & 24th could be a problem
Could use more small independent business space and green space - maybe Co-op could open something on the roof!
700 parking stalls now - in future with added development it will still the same no. require more spots
Open up park in NW corner more to community access (courtyard area in the center of the condos). If this area is too closed off then it will be wasted space; I like the step backed feature on the central bldg. If that could be incorporated into the building on the NW corner I believe it would be nice

Community garden access on top of the Co-op would be nice; Full walking street (no cars) for the access from Oakmoor West of Co-op could make a nicer place where people want to visit; Talk to the city about opening up the park off the site to the NW. Regrading. please.
I would not reduce height in the NE corner. It is the least intrusive area.
Not enough parking for the Co-op store. Especially for aging customers
For any senior focused housing, ensure there is enclosed or underground access to Co-op
Community garden spaces above the co-op; it might be nice for people to have access to their own plot if they are living in condos; Millenials garden
Parking won't allow for current events like food trucks, stampede breakfasts etc.
Trees in parking lot should be eliminated - safety & sightline issue
Glenmore landing example: if there is no parking I just leave
Put underground parking also under the Co-op
Great for my parents. I will buy them a unit to retire them in the community!
Establish connectivity to existing bike path. Make bike parking easily accessible
Traffic will be bad on Southland. Very dangerous at Bradbury. There should be a light there to ensure safety
Parking in this design is adequate. But guest parking could become an issue.
Not clear if we'll get traffic lights from Oakmoor to 24th. Turning left is already a challenge
Grocery store - surface parking; decrease trees for more parking spots; allow room for large vehicle/trailer combos some where on lot (truck & travel trailer N40')
Aesthetics of residential buildings - still could be made to look more appealing eg: London tower (Hub Ave & Macleod) or towers on 90th Ave look better
Do not like underground parking
Concern: traffic onto 24th and Southland. Needs to be a light at exit onto Southland and at 24th
All underground parking for residential complexes should be provided
Density has increased for townhouses. Would prefer less units for townhouses
The "public park" may not translate into public use. Try to encourage public use in this park ie. Through attractive business/entrance
During development, could you ensure that work occurs 9am - 9pm vs. the allowable 7am - 10pm? Thanks!
Traffic on Oakmoor drive without signals at 24th; Being able to turn East on Southland from Boston Pizza entrance/exit
Re: Oakmoor drive side: suggest additional traffic calming to prevent cut through traffic
Traffic plan needed lights to allow floor at traffic onto road, south end on 24 St instead of Oakmoor (left & right direction)
Sufficient parking for commercial taking into account Southland travels from Deerfoot to new Stony. More parking add 2 level parkade
Oakmoor Dr is already full of cars in the evening plus cars park in the Coop lot (to be removed) With only 1 parking stage per unit, parking will be a problem
Ample bicycle parking needed!
Great design however there needs to be a stop light at the exit onto Southland & also one at Oakmoor & 24
I'm concerned about slow sales in the neighbourhood. I worry we'll have a bunch of vacant property driving down values given the current economic climate.

This construction concurrent to Ring Road - related developments will create traffic & noise tension to residents w/ the high potential to impact property values
Traffic may be congested on busy days but should be ok most of the time. Same comment on parking; Really looking forward to it; Should rejuvenate the community; really excit
COMMUNITY SOUNDING BOARD
traffic light at 24 St SW & Oakmoor Dr? due to to increased traffic
Privacy concerns from West 6 story building cut down to 2 or 3 at max
Co-op will town all residual parking vehicles in their lot.
What about a pool? That way you'll have more customers and then more money and that way u can create more wonderess things
Low income & seniors affordable housing must be part of the solution?
Already loosing off leash, Don't need more apartments
Eyesore!!!
Esthetically wrong. Nor for our neighbourhood
Not enough parking!!!
Build new pubs & restaurants!
Take perfectly sound buildings demolish - built new super idea \$\$\$
Will do nothing except cause problems for the people in this area
Will not draw new businesses will cost too much. You will have lost old ones
Proposed changes address ideas & concerns
What about housing for Seniors? This could have be a good opportunity for seniors needing partial care living
754 parking stalls 294 units (assume 1X per unit) 460 left with much more retail plus visitors etc. ???
The green/open space won't get much sun. No room for the scouts/ [West?] get the trailer in, they need electricity
Six stories on the West side w/ balconies?? Invasion of home owners privacy
266 units Now 294 not acceptable!!
Too many units
No higher than 4 floors. Too much density
Design does not address future high density development at site just North on 24th st. (Old Royal Bould)
4 story for seniors - yes; not making area roads bigger to take the volume. Doesn't make me happy. I'll sell!
13 story highrise; Does not fit into this community! 3-4 story max!
The high structure doesn't seem to blend w/ the surroundings. Why not spread out instead of up?
We are not a high rise community, will make it noisy
Cubs/scouts need space w/ electricity B.P. has been paying
Parking today, lot 18 full at 80% Monday afternoon Aug 28th - not enough parking!!
We've had no definitive information about how are 250 cars per day going to get in and out of a parkade that empties onto a half block long section at Oakmoor drive, How are existing residents going to get onto 24 street?
parking!!!

There is no parking, the lot by the condos will be filled with visitors - even though there is parking below the condos
privacy privacy privacy, 6 stories - no
This is an awful idea
Not sure this economy can support this number of new dwellings. This could lower my dwelling's value
Will like to see the details of the transportation analysis released for viewing. Appropriate infrastructure will be required
agreed, too tall
Have you considered a U shaped design instead for better flow; 3+ residential, level 1+2 retail
Too tall! 5-6 storeys is better
Answer complaints! Silence demonstrates poor leadership
too tall, too big, too much traffic
Why not end the SWBRT here? Woodbine has good bus service & doesn't want more costly unused buses
Parking is already busy. Where will people park? Think about Glenmore Landing parking issues
Too high. 4 to 5 stories max, looks too downtownish
More green space needed, too much density
Lack of privacy for neighbouring yards is not fair as 6 and 13 story buildings will have view from the upper stories
Traffic chaos will only increase with more limited access and increase density. We do not need 292 residential units!!
Parking is a definite concern for Co-op and services in light of the additional residential places. Street parking is not an option as it is currently fully used
Looks like there will be less parking for shoppers... we will shop elsewhere
1.) horrible will add to much traffic to community 2.) leaves no parking for the Co-op mall, will shop elsewhere; Impacts of proposed multi-family dev. on traffic? Proposed projections? From X3 concerned citizens!
Cover every inch with pavement & bldgs, tall ones. Seage sunce[?] environment heck with it; leeway did not have this
Money should be spent elsewhere!
elsewhere? Lol wut?
Also will be a traffic nightmare before/after work. This is where the BRT last stop should be not in the communities
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
What about parking? This looks like a potential nightmare for trying to find a place to park. This centre already sees quite a lot of traffic, especially around holidays. The additional customers for the professional building, combined with visitors for the condos (assuming resident parking is underground), could make it frustrating for long-term residents in the community to just peacefully shop for groceries. I already refuse to go to Glenmore Landing for this reason; this proposed plan, if I understand it correctly (looks like no additional parking), looks like a disaster for convenient parking. Maybe we'll be shopping in Woodbine.
Why do you feel we all need and want the condos?
No.

Lack of underground parking and public spaces. The pedestrian pathway plan seems to be tacked on without much thought to how it will be used on a daily basis, especially in winter months.
see above.
The intersection at Oakmoor Drive and 24th NEEDS to be controlled better, especially if the parkade is at the back of the complex off Oakmoor. Let's get this right, before we have a fatality.
Lack of adequate parking to address changes to currently available surface parking and proposed decreased stalls. Currently at times the parking lot has limited spaces open. In the new design, especially with the location of the professional building, it will create problems for parking for both tenants and clients attending the complex due to decreased spaces and location of the structures. The tenants for the professional building and their staff will undoubtedly park in front of the professional building, which will take a large majority of the proposed parking stalls in the design, leaving limited stalls for clientele.
Yes See above.
Traffic traffic traffic. Southland Dr and 24 Street are too congested already. And all that traffic pours onto 14 Street. And contrary to one councillors belief the BRT is not the solution. Also parking for appointments there. I suspect this will mean changing physicians, etc again as I had to from Glenmore Landing once it became impossible to park there. I hate what is happening to our city.
Parking in the lot and surrounding area.
The greenspace to have people linger is nice, but more detail about services would be appreciated. Why would they linger? Who would it attract. Will the park space have a playground?
I think the city has presented most of my concerns, but the developer could go further to address them. One concern that has not been addressed in this current presentation is the impact of traffic on oakmoor drive. It appears from the diagrams that the parkades will both exit onto oakmoor drive. This street currently has light traffic, but it can be difficult to turn left onto 24th. Will a traffic light be installed? Or can the developer change the parkade to exit onto Southland dr which may be better able to handle increased volume?
Nope
The ease of access onto and off the site with the added traffic, as well as access ways within the site itself, the amount of parking and width of parking stalls. Also see questions below.
Parking, density, crime. It seems that all of the concerns that were brought forward at the 2 previous open houses have been ignored.
No, I live in cedarbrae and use the current businesses there and I am excited for the redevelopment. I hope it creates jobs in the community.
Bike users. I and others use bikes to cycle from communities to retail area - any plans to have cycle path provision or bike racks? Crosswalk across Southland Drive - I frequently cross here (from Cedarbrae) and am always concerned about cars not stopping/slowng down. This is going to become busier and more complicated to cross safely. Please can flashing lights be installed.
1. I think traffic lights will need to be added at Oakmoor and 24th Street for all the residents to be able to get out, if there isn't lights added those people will go out the exit on the other side of the development onto southland drive, greatly affecting the traffic flow and noise level for the residents of Cedarbrae. 2. I think a sound wall needs to be put up along the south side of southland drive across from the complex. Alot of thought and consideration has been put into keeping the multi unit / lower

cost housing residents on Oakmoor Dr happy but no consideration seems to be taken for the residence living in single family homes with back yards facing this development. No matter what it said, there is NO WAY this development and the ring round won't increase traffic and noise on southland drive and ruin the peace and quiet and property value of the residence that live on Cedarpark Drive. I would like to be able to enjoy my nice big backyard and carry on a conversation without having to yell over the traffic noise. I bought my house for the yard and it isn't going to be usable if a sound wall isn't put up (noise studies will show that we would qualify for one through the city, we almost qualifies for one years ago and the noise level is way higher now and will only get worse for more development)
300 residential units will bring about 600 new cars to the area (based on the Calgary average of around 2 cars per residence). Where will these 600 cars park?
No it don't. Just that this project is a waste of tax dollars for no reason. It is to small an area to do this project in.
None of my concerns have been adequately addressed.
The existing parking space, especially in the main lot to the south of the existing grocery store, is often full and congested. With the potential for additional and dispersed commercial, professional and especially residential (plus their visitors), has there been proportionally increased parking space provided over the current space?
No
No concerns.
There has not been any information from the city about what it thinks about the overall development. The "participatory" workshops were not impartial.
No
No
Not at this time.
don't understand the desire to increase the density to such a degree in this quiet area of the city. think it should be a lower number and height of buildings to fit in with the neighbourhood
The height of the buildings and lack of (that I can see) concession for small, local businesses within the mall space. The parking lot is still a giant block of pavement, hoping we can make this look better and overall make the development and area walkable, safe, and attractive.
There has clearly been no thought put into connectivity with the BRT stations. Residential towers are placed furthest away from this point. The gas station is a 150m walk from the BRT stations while the residential towers are 4 times this distance away.
There is no accommodation for cycling visible in this rendering. Bike racks must be provided - suggest to have some in front of every business, gathering space and residential tower.
Yes. In my opinion no concerns have been satisfactorily addressed but I don't expect much from the City anymore. They just pretend to engage citizens so they can tick the box.
The roads in the area are already congested this will make it worse.
I am pro this development, however, these changes now show additional condo apartments to be built on top of the townhomes at the west end of the site. Not sure is this will encroach on the townhome residents i.e. privacy, traffic, noise.
I have not seen any evidence of the concerns being addressed or changes made. It seems to be a token effort to say - we asked but the asking is after the plans are done and have been communicated. I first heard of this last year - and now the city is saying what do you think.
INSTALLATION OF SOUND BARRIERS: I am concerned about increased traffic on Southland Drive due to the increase in residential units and traffic. A concrete sound barrier should be installed along the current fence lines along Southland Drive from Oakridge

<p>Crossing east to 19th Street to help mitigate increased traffic noise in the neighbourhoods adjacent to the development.</p>
<p>I am quite sure that the public who attends engagement sessions voice concern over issues the don't agree with and they do not expect a change to something they initially thought was ok. This is going to get as ugly as the BRT situation. Is the city still going to just do whatever the developer wants?</p>
<p>My outstanding concerns is road accessibility. Currently 24th feeds many areas from the outlying areas located in the southwest outskirts, to Woodlands, Woodbine, Evergreen areas, Braeside, Cedarbrae. The majority feed into 24th Street to 90th Avenue and access 14th. The City has not made any attempt to widen 14th Street thus the overflow onto 24th in the hope of averting some traffic between Anderson Road and Southland Drive. There is always a bottleneck in that area. 14th Street will carry a "proposed bus route" which appears to go no where. The completed ring road will not alleviate traffic going to the downtown, Chinook and industrial areas east of Chinook.</p>
<p>I am concerned with the impact to local traffic. 90th ave gets backed up with any small traffic issue and this will certainly add a significant amount of traffic.</p>
<p>The street interfaces - 24th and southland - could be addressed more completely. Ideally, it would be helpful for this to be done with the City of Calgary's "vision" for these corridors (ie: changes / enhancements to bring these spaces in line with their Complete Streets policy).</p>
<p>No. I do think the City workshops were a waste of time because they didnt seem to reflect what could actually be done with the site.</p>
<p>The focus should be on reducing the input complainers can have on developers building economic dense projects. If we want to create a great city and eliminate all the disgusting urban sprawl in Calgary, we need to realise that high-rise real estate development is a business and needs the best opportunity to generate a good return on capital. Developers should be out building buildings instead of dealing with all this useless red tape and complaint-based nonsense.</p>
<p>As above Plus, would like more info on residential development...</p>
<p>Yes, I think the concern about increased population and density has not been adequately addressed.</p>
<p>Many table groups made it clear that this could be an opportunity to have better housing opportunities for seniors with possible assisted living for those seniors as well. This does not seem to have been addressed.</p>
<p>None that come to mind. Restaurant space would be nice.</p>
<p>Please encourage the developers to not charge the residents monthly parking fees but rather have it included in the condo fees that they all pay. It is the number one thing that will drive parking issues and 311 complaints in the area. We have seen this at glenmore gardens. It is truly awful.</p>
<p>Medical often needs more space as physicians run behind and those that are ill or elderly need close parking. Please consider that in your planning. As much access and parking as possible will be required for the medical building. Typical physicians see 15- 20 people a day and run 30 to 1 hour behind. With multiple doctors in a clinic it adds up fast. Working in healthcare, I have seen and know first hand that the city fo calgary minimum parking requirements are not even close to what is required. I would encourage the developers to do the math and plan accordingly.</p>
<p>I believe that before this application for development proceeds any further an Area Redevelopment Plan for Oakridge should be undertaken so that developers and other people</p>

have clear guidelines for density and design both now and in the future. We need clarity and reasonable limits on density in residential areas.
No
As above, both the application and what should be concurrent planning by the city concerning infrastructure.
no no
Will the parking be sufficient for the development? Traffic and access are also concerns
See above regarding parking.
When can we expect a decision about a commitment to retain a space for the Scouts Canada Christmas Tree lot? Trees will have to be ordered from the supplier soon.
Underground parking
I do not have any concerns at this time.
No.
Infrastructure is one of them. And I have been talking about that earlier . And what about pollution. How will that be addressed. That new bus line, the City is promoting / building is not a solution. How are you going to bring all that traffic over Glenmore reservoir? Add new line and a bridge? Creating problem with contaminating city drinking water?
It's unfortunate when you buy in an established neighbour for the exact reasons that the city is intent on destroying. With the addition of the Southland Connector and more high density housing, it'll be interesting to see watch the crime rate and who it affects (and who the perps are).
Properly addressing traffic concerns
It is not clear where the underground parking stalls will all be located. Particularly, the NE tower, is there an underground parkade? It is not depicted or described.
I apologize that I am late to the engagement, and haven't been part of the conversation until now. I would like to know why the south side of the property isn't really being touched.
Yes, I absolutely object to the development plans that back on to the Oakwood Lane Condo property - 10030 Oakmoor Way SW.
Why can't development be limited to the COOP and the medical / shops building facing on Oakmoor Drive & 24th Street? Why disrupt & tear up the entire area, thus causing stress & headaches for the neighbourhood.
Yes. There is not enough parking provided for the number of apartments. I have witnessed in other areas a shortage of parking spaces in similar developments.
Parking and traffic concerns not adequately addressed yet
Not really. Hopefully, the site is a prime retail space for interesting, quality food and coffee spaces beyond the Co-op.
No.
The community doesn't want a development on this scale.
No
No.just
I still feel that the parking issues have not been addressed. From the development concept images, it would appear that there are only about 50-60 parking spaces for use by staff and clients of all the businesses currently housed in the mall, that will be occupying the new two-

storey medical/office building. The staff parking needs alone for these businesses are close to 100 spots. Is there underground parking that is not shown on the drawings for staff, so that the surface parking will be available for patrons of the businesses? Otherwise, I cannot see how all the staff and patrons will be able to fit into that small surface parking area. Since several of the businesses in there will cater to elderly and infirm people, it seems a real oversight not to have more readily accessible parking available. And where do all the staff that work in the independent buildings park now? There are still Coop staff, liquor store staff, A&W staff, Boston Pizza staff, and staff for the new little businesses that will require parking. Not everyone (in fact practically no one) is going to be arriving for work via the bus. As an employee of a business in this mall for over 14 years, I know how difficult parking can be, especially in the winter when the piles of snow that get plowed up are left covering dozens of spots, making them unavailable until the spring thaw.

I believe the update will be great for the community. However, I am concerned at the additional traffic noise. For those homes in Cedarbrae directly across Southland Drive, and those on the north side of the development in Oakridge, the construction noise will be very significant. I live in Cedarbrae, and Southland Drive is already incredibly noisy. An increase in traffic delays, increase in construction traffic and a general increase in construction noise will dramatically increase an already noisy area. Most areas in Calgary just off of major thoroughfare roads have privacy and sound barrier walls, but I understand that no such wall is planned for Cedarbrae or Oakridge. I highly recommend that a privacy and sound barrier become part of the plans to reduce noise, but also to give additional privacy for those individuals backing onto Southland Dr. as the proposed apartments will be able to look directly into their back yards. Thank you.

I wonder about public transit accessibility and integration within this project and connections to the SW BRT in particular.

Also, not sure if there is a provision for bicycle parking and how many units of bikes.

It doesn't seem that the developers & City have taken into consideration the total proposed cumulative impact to the Oakmoor Drive/24 Street/Southland Drive traffic volume issues of this Coop redevelopment, the BRT line and the Ring Road project. Adding just one of these projects is frustrating to regular commuters of these 3 roads, but all 3 are a formula for total chaos and heavy congestion.

Need a sound wall on Southland if this is finally plan because of increased traffic, increased noise and decreased privacy in backyard. A lot of nice family home along Southland across from development whose backyards face the development. Will people in high rises be able to look down into our backyards from the suites??? Need privacy and sound wall!!! Not to mention the ring round connection that's coming too!

I continue to be concerned about the ability of vehicles to turn left off eastbound Oakmoor Drive onto northbound 24th Street - particularly during the morning rush hour. I believe that a number of folks who live along Oakmoor Drive drive instead down 26th Street and Oakhill Drive to access 24 Street at Palliser Drive (although I have not tried to gather evidence of this). Unfortunately some of them choose to drive Oakhill Drive's curve and corner, with limited sight-lines, at 50 kph or higher.

The future residents will have the same problem, and may choose to drive down Oakhill Drive as well. However they will have access to the laneway, which will allow a left turn onto eastbound Southland Drive, which may be less busy during the morning rush hour.

The revised proposal has changes to the surface parking orientation to an east/west row design whereas the original proposal had north/south rows similar to the current configuration. The east/west setup, although it does not affect the number of available parking slots to any extent, does create an awkward set of barriers for getting grocery carts

across any raised dividers with trees or planters whereas the north/south orientation does not have this issue. The site plan shows a large number of treed planters and my concern is that although the ascetics may be more pleasing, it has to be borne in mind that this is a parking lot and not a park. Furthermore, the more raised areas, the more difficult it makes snow removal in winter (more comment on snow removal below).

Will there be enough parking for tenants, their visitors, and shoppers?

I live in the Braeside Estates area and use the bus system to Southland Station. The residents of this development could significantly increase the bus ridership and increase bus crowding at peak times.

What about the additional traffic concerns that will be created by adding higher density? Southland drive, 14th Street, Macleod trail are already over capacity and cannot handle the traffic volumes. Will Southland Be expanded?

PARKING ISSUE – Proposed CO-OP Development

Parking seems to be an issue regarding the proposed development at the Oakridge CO-OP. At the Open House on August 14th, my observations were there were two camps regarding parking:

- Members of the public stating there is not enough parking.
- City employees and CO-OP Staff stating that they have listened to the public at previous meetings and have increased the number of parking spots which they think is adequate.

Currently my view is that the proposed parking space is inadequate. However, my view could change if it can be demonstrated that city/CO-OP conclusions are substantiated upon. More specifically, I would like responses to the following questions in order for me to consider re-evaluating my view.

- (1) What are the number of parking spots at the CO-OP now?
 - a. On average how many of those spots are empty at peak busy periods?
- (2) Will the new parking spots be the same size or smaller than the current ones?
- (3) Is there a business plan that illustrates anticipated growth at this CO-OP branch? e.g. will there be more shoppers at the store and if so, how much would this impact parking?
- (4) How many new proposed stores are planned to be built?
 - a. How much newly induced customer visits will likely occur in response to this proposed complex?
 - b. Will there be a need to have more parking spots to address additional customers who will be going to the new stores?
 - c. Will there be a need for parking by staff members of these proposed stores?
- (5) Do parking projections take into account that cars are normally parked along both sides of Oakmoor Drive?
 - a. Do you know if local residents currently use the CO-OP parking lot on a fulltime or part-time basis?
- (6) What criteria, justification and factors have been used in determining the number of parking spot requirements for the residents of the proposed complex?
 - a. How many resident dwellings will be built onsite?
 - b. How many people are likely to live in each dwelling unit? (e.g. average no.)

c. Who are the dwellings being targeted to? e.g. seniors, family, singles, mixed?
(7) Do parking spot requirements take into account extra parking requirements at peak holiday periods such as Christmas when some residents may have visitors?
(8) Is the proposed road that will be created onsite (presumably passes the front entrance of the CO-OP store) be two or four lanes and will it have stopping and/or parking provisions?
No
Parking was mentioned time after time in the first round. It was not addressed in the "improved" plan. Why did the city not include parking as one of the points to be addressed by the developer?
Will these residential buildings have enough parking (be it underground) to accommodate their residents so that they do not park on the street?
I think this plan is great. I shared these comments on your sign outside the store but unfortunately saw somebody steal my sticky note. Apparently if you have something positive to say that's not appropriate for all the cranky people in Oakridge. So I'll say it here ...this development is great! It's going to bring revitalization to a dated area and we are going to have vibrant spaces to visit in our community.
Yes - I have outstanding concerns. I do not believe that enough information has been shared about the target tenants of the apartments / condos. I would be very concerned if these are going to be "low income" apartments / condos.
I am also extremely concerned about the lack of parking at the development. I do not believe parking concerns have been adequately addressed. The developer is building only 8% additional parking spots over the minimum (754/701). If the tenants are targeted to be retirees, that would suggest that many of the parking stalls will be utilized very frequently (retirees would not be expected to be driving as much). Why can't a larger parkade be added for the residential tenants?
Traffic on Southland Drive west of 24th Street will increase once the SW Ring Road opens. The south perimeter of the property will receive more "eyeballs". It would be nice to enhance the proposed south perimeter landscaping to be more of a feature. By far the nicest commercial "green area" in the neighbourhood is the south perimeter of Glenmore Landing, but this area is proposed for redevelopment and as I understand it most of this green area will be lost. It would be great if the new Co-op development could add something of what we will lose at Glenmore Landing.
No, lets get constructing.
Just don't forget about local business... these large retail chains crowd out the small businesses
No.
Only concern I have is will the condo's be rental units or purchased? Do studies indicate these types of residences will be occupied in this area?
I just want the Scouts Tree selling not to be interrupted or continued this winter. It is an important part of supporting the Scouts and Guides in the community and is an important source of funds for the groups. Plus the community supports the tree lot and relies on this area for a close tree pick up.
Christmas tree lot
My only remaining concern is whether or not the Scouts will continue to be able to have a tree lot at this location. The tree lot has been there for many years and is a part of our community's seasonal traditions.

In addition, the local Scout troops and the Girl Guide units in the area rely HEAVILY on the tree lot as a fundraiser. Since parents pay a minimal fee to enroll children in these programs, most of the funding comes from fundraising. If the tree lot is abolished, these groups will have to find other means of fundraising, which will place a big hardship on them. I am one of the leaders for the 49th Guide unit and I can tell you from personal experience that we will have to severely cut back our program if the tree lot cannot be set up.
Parking - increased traffic, controlled intersections?
No. I am really looking forward to seeing this development completed. I feel it will be a big improvement to our neighbourhood.
Yes, see previous answers.
Overall size of project and resulting traffic volume for area.
<p>1. The feedback board that was supposed to be at the Oakridge Co-op from Aug. 23 - 30 seems to have been removed early -- it was definitely not there at 12:15 - 1pm Aug. 30 (I checked all entrances) , and I think it was not there on the late afternoon of Sat. Aug 26. On Aug 30, the Customer Service desk at the Co-op had no information about why the sounding board had been removed early.</p> <p>2. I often can't get onto the Northbound LRT at Southland Station during morning rush hour because of overcrowding -- adding more density will make the problem worse.</p> <p>3. It often takes me 5 minutes to turn left onto westbound Southland Drive from Brookpark Blvd. Adding more traffic will make this problem worse.</p>
I am concerned about the amount of parking available. I did attend the comment session at Braeside and I was surprise by the City representative's comments that the City had not yet approved the amount of parking. In addition, I could not get a straight answer as to whether parking spaces would be sold or "assigned" to the residential units. The City representative simply stated that if you go to the space now "there are lots of parking spots available" which obviously does not address the situation if the development goes forward.
YES!! As an integral part of the community, I feel compelled to strongly recommend that there be space allocated to continue the Annual Christmas Tree sales to remain on site. Guiding and Scouting are vibrant and ongoing in the communities surrounding the Oakridge Co-op. As we, the people of the area and I myself as a Guide Leader support Calgary Co-Op and the many other businesses in the area, we want to make sure that this fund-raising and community building activity is also supported by the developers. We meet and connect with many in the community during the Xmas tree sales. It is not only a fund-raiser, but an awesome confidence building activity foe the kids...LOVED by the parents who join their kids in it, and SO well received by the people who but their trees. We all laugh together, eat cookies, sing, cut trees, and generally share in the joy of the season together as a community. THIS IS A VERY HIGH PRIORITY TO ME AND ALL OF THE SOUTING & GUIDING FAMILIES FOR SO MANY REASONS!
NO - In bold letters. We DO NOT want a combined development permit and land use redesignation (re-zoning) for the site located at 2580 Southland Dr. S.W. (the existing Co-op site). We DO NOT want this type of development at all, period. We Do NOT want ANY residential units. We DO NOT want buildings above 2 storeys high. We DO NOT want ANY additional commercial units. STOP! driving/parking loss of small business
I would like to see the proposed development proceed. I think it will revitalize the area, allowing new home type options and bring new businesses into an underutilized area.

I, as a Girl Guide leader, would love the opportunity to allow the girls to still be able to sell Christmas trees in a designated location. This allows the girls so many opportunities and helps them communicate with fellow Calgarians. This is vital to the longevity of Girl Guides. Please consider this in your plans.
Looking at the new plan, I do think parking will be tough.
I think the tall buildings are still too tall, & they do not fit in with the neighbourhood. It is not very attractive overall, & is much too much density.
Should the height restrictions be approved I will take my business elsewhere and would not support any business in the development.
Landscaping specifics would be helpful.
Seriously think of how much traffic. This is a quiet area and great for my kids
Yes. There are significant traffic issues around these intersections that need to be addressed before or at the same time as the development. Even presently, it's a very dangerous intersection (24th and Southland) with people exiting and entering the property on the Southland and 24th St sides weaving in and out with cars trying to turn from southbound 24th St to westbound Southland Dr. The present situation needs to be addressed before adding to the traffic in and out of the property.
Traffic concerns have not been sufficiently addressed. The ring road will bring many changes to this area and the impact on local and through traffic is still unknown. Until the ring road has been built and in use for a period of time and its impacts assessed and dealt with, if needed, a development such as this should be put on hold.
With the ring road coming on line additional traffic control is required. As it is now Oakmore Drive has traffic control measures in place. Oakmore Drive should be turned into a pedestrian way similar to Stephen Avenue.
Can the existing water and sewer system handle the increase? Maybe upgrades are required as well as fluid controls and flood mitigation.
Additional underground parking for these buildings are required for users and visitors. Proposed surface parking is inadequate for the increase in population density.
This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey.
It is a good thing that the City is facilitating this dialogue between applicant and community. However I feel the ability of the project is seriously limited by City's self-limitation to this facilitation role. This creates implications for several aspects. The City of Calgary is responsible for the park to the northwest and every road skirting the site. Practical pedestrian connection to the surrounding neighbourhoods is as much the responsibility of these features as the applicant's responsibilities on-site. Calgary Transit, though not fully a formal department of the City, is capable of influencing the quality of transit service to the site, largely through bus stop placement. Nowhere are changes to any of these features apparently on the table. In-fact, the report on feature 5 refers to the grade-change of the park as an immovable reality. It is not a mountain. The following comments relate to this critique.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The pedestrian connection (amendment 5) is a good idea but could be a great idea with a few changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The grade difference of the park to the existing parking lot is currently a wooden retaining wall topped with vegetation to screen the park activity from the loading docks. With the new development, this incompatibility of shipping/recreation uses will change to residential/recreation. Maintaining the same interface of walls will make both the path and the backyard experience of the units rather uncomfortably enclosed and bland. I strongly recommend that the City work with the applicant to open and connect across this interface.

The park could benefit from more use and visibility, while the west-facing units of building C receive a functional connection with the park. This depends entirely upon the City coming forward with a willingness to modify the park in integration with the Co-Op site; the existing stand-off nature of the interface would fail to benefit both. The connection could do with or without vehicular traffic and I imagine is contingent on future resident's tolerance of vehicular shortcutting.

- o The approach from the parking lot, an enclosure (between buildings A and C) followed by an immediate wall and right-angle turn are an uncomfortable experience, a perceptual dead-end. Please consider opening up this space up so it may read as a safe semi-public circulation route.

- o The courtyard and interface with the park are both good ideas on their own. I believe they can be made better as a whole with a semi-private connection through the Building C, contingent on the above point about the City's ability to reshape the surrounding public infrastructure in integration with the proposal.

2. The intersections of the site with Southland drive, and the pedestrian crossings are critical to making the shops and services of the site as well as transit convenient for the residents of NE Cedarbrae. Understandably, articulating such connection across an arterial such as Southland drive is tricky, but here is where the City of Calgary roads department, Calgary Transit, and the applicant can coordinate a reconsideration of the road geometry, crossings, and bus stop placement in response to the pedestrian path on the Cedarbrae side, the amenities on the Co-Op site.

- o The geometry of the more western intersection appears to be designed to carry articulated freight trailers. With the elimination of the western loading docks, I presume this demand will become vestigial. With consideration for the walkability of such geometry and the amenability for motorists from Southland drive to approach a turn into the development at higher speeds, please consider contracting this geometry to encourage slower operating speeds and support shorter pedestrian crossings (crossing Southland Drive's 5 lanes and median is currently shorter than the curb-to-curb distance of this access).

- o Currently the pedestrian access to NE Cedarbrae emerges on Southland Drive far from any formal crossing. This adds up to 200m to a walk to the front door of the future grocery store and makes jaywalking a compelling option. The current proposal already features a direct connection from the grocery store to the WB #80 bus stop. Please consider placing a pedestrian crossing near this alignment to improve legitimate connection between the site and Cedarbrae.

- o The current EB #80 bus stop lies near the intersection in the first point and is otherwise quite distant from any access to Cedarbrae or anything besides Boston Pizza. Please also consider moving this closer to the aforementioned crossing.

Not missed...just important to recognize that infrastructure changes... the SW Ring Road and the SW BRT are being implemented along with the Coop planned development. The plan as it stands will continue to need to attend to parking concerns both surface and underground as well as the height and position of the larger tower.

See the above. No one has addressed the a community area that could be used for meetings, functions for 50+people, a daycare and library.

No

Not at this time.

Question 6: 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
When do you all plan to get rid of all condos??
No except issue in 5
Rentals vs. owning of highrises; where will small businesses in mall go?
Can you please ensure the bus routes are not affected by the development process?!
Don't overload a beautiful friendly happy community to people in condos & highrises - This does not have the community feel
Yes, why not put units on top of the co-op bldg
OPEN HOUSE – ENGAGEMENT BOARDS
Condo units may house families - what is possible impact on local schools/class size?
Will there really be enough parking?
Please put the liquor bar in the Co-op store!!
Will there be parking time restrictions due to additional car & BRT traffic?
Will it be owner condos or rental apartments?
Why build apt buildings in an single family areas?
Why was parking not addressed in round 2?
Need lights at 24 St & Oakmoor. It is almost impossible to get into 24th during rush hours
I agree with the whole concept
Why not add additional units on top of the Co-op store to offset the height of the apt. bldgs?
We need to look ahead/forward to this kind of opportunity/development; your engagement has been sensible & constructive
Larger issues impact this development 1. Ward 11 election outcome 2. Concurrent development of BRT - SW & Ring Road
What was the original parking count?
Will Southland become 4 lanes all the way up to the ring road? If so, when?
Re: size of parking; please ensure the spots are big enough to fit those big tracks everyone seems to love. They so often take up 2 spaces!! (don't make them smaller to increase the count)
Oakmoor Drive and 24 st needs lights or traffic circle!
Remember parking - reasonable for holiday travellers with motor homes & vans
What impact will BRT have on development traffic & parking?
Will there be adequate signs around for non-access to residential private property at new development?
Is there a requirement for public art? If so, is a procurement plan in place?
Why not additional stories on top of Co-op to reduce height of apt bldg?
Is there sufficient water and sewer capacity?
Why have 6 story building (#5) beside residential?
COMMUNITY SOUNDING BOARD
How many are 13 story & how many 7 story? Way too high.
Is the mall's roof actually a green roof?
When will property be available for purchase?
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

<p>What could you have done in place of the condos?</p> <p>More people would shop there from other neighborhoods if there was more retail thus not needing the condos.</p>
<p>Why are building allowed to be so high in a flat residential area so close to other homes? What enforcements are in place to ensure the upkeep of the building forever! To encourage good tenants to stay in the units? WHAT CLADDING WILL BE USED ON THE BUILDING? What can residential home owners do about excess noise from tenants and traffic and inadequate parking. With the addition of so many apartments becomes a rise of drug use within the community and the possibility of pushers /sellers on the property, what will be done to prevent this? How many extra handicap parking spaces will there be, it is already hard to get a spot.</p>
<p>Please provide information on the environmental impact of the development. Has carbon footprint been assessed? How is waste, sewer, water to be managed? How is this development moving us away from being automobile-centric?</p>
<p>See above.</p>
<p>No additional questions as the answers provided are just sales pitches and don't address the concerns. Just trust us. It will be perfect they say. And yet it keeps getting worse. These so called consultations are a waste of time. It's all a done deal as with previous developments and projects. Citizens concerns are ignored and this will hopefully be rectified in the next election.</p>
<p>Will there be further engagement sessions?</p>
<p>I have not been able to attend the meetings, but I am on the e-mail list and have been monitoring developments. My wife and I have been residents of Braeside for 24 years, and we love the area. But, we are torn if we have to sell our house and move elsewhere as we get older and downsize. We would love to have the opportunity to still live in the neighborhood so we are looking forward to being able to look at the residential properties being developed. Please keep folks like us in mind that might want to migrate 'internally' within the neighborhood. There are not a lot of newer high-quality / low maintenance properties between the Glenmore and Fish Creek. So, a lot of people are not thinking like this, over 20+ year change in demographics, a lot of people may just like things the way they are....until they don't. This is a great chance to rejuvenate a mid-city neighborhood in a great city. steve simon 403-589-1101</p>
<p>How is it that people purchased their houses based on the existing density and zoning in the area and must continuously conform to those designated land uses, but then one owner can change it's zoning, land use, and density so as to completely change the current land use designation and alter the entire character and desirability of the area from a low density neighbourhood commercial site to a high density development typically found in downtown areas?</p> <p>Will the added value of the site, caused by the increased density, be shared with residents in the area?</p> <p>Will municipal tax in the area drop because of the added value to this site?</p> <p>Will local businesses be charged a lower rental rate in the new development?</p> <p>Will local residents get a discount for buying units in the proposed building?</p>

Are there going to be any age or other restrictions in the condo?
Will condo bylaws restrict use of and access to commercial areas?
Will commercial units be available for purchase? If so will local residents get any discounts?
Will local residents get any preferred parking privileges?
Will there be any compensation for any value losses in the area?
The applicant proposes to change an existing conforming business property into a commercial development site. What controls are in place to stop that?
What studies have been conducted to prove this is a viable venture that residents will not be stuck living with an obsolete white elephant in the area forever?
No matter what the traffic people say, there will be more traffic & more parking problems.
Address: Parking, crime, density is not acceptable, aesthetics, 13 storeys are not acceptable 266 unit grows to 294 units is not acceptable.
i, as well as many others, feel that it was basically a waste of our time to participate in this process.
Why were maps not provided with this "engagement". We shouldn't have had to go to another site to see the revised plans. Should have been connected with each question.
Please listen to us.
No
Still concerned about parking. Site is busy at present and with extra residents will it be adequate?
I cannot find any change to the number of residential parking spaces per residence. Calgary averages about 2 cars per residence. This development does not seem to have 2 spaces per residence. There is no parking on 3 of the 4 sides of this development. On the 4th side is Oakmoor Dr., please see the video of the number of cars parked on Oakmoor Dr. (https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-g1DzcmWgPLRThiQk50d0VCTTQ/view?usp=sharing)
There are two apartment developments close to the Coop. The one on Oakmoor Way (Oakwood Lane) has 2 or 4 parking spaces per residence. There are no cars parked in-front of this development. The other is on Oakmoor Dr. (Oaktree). It has 1 parking space per unit. There are about 100 cars parked on the street and in the Coop lot in-front of it (see video).
Based on the two existing models in the area and the average number of cars per residence in Calgary, this new development will put about 300 new cars on the streets around it.
Can the number of parking spaces per unit be increased to 2?
No
Do you have any idea on the traffic level of of Oakmoor Drive, adding in more residences would be a disaster. Please think this though. I'm all for development, however adding in more Residences isn't the solution.
No questions.

If the developer is not wanting to consider the feedback of the residents why bother with this whole exercise?
What type of housing (yes, apartments but...) are you creating? Expensive ones? Or low-income? With the economy as it is, how do you propose to get people to buy apartments/condos, in such an isolated location?
I am a Realtor and am very concerned with the population density of the projects, traffic patterns and already bad access in and out of Coop. Traffic will be a nightmare. I am not in approval of this.
No
My question would be regarding the traffic capacity of the new north/south connector - does it support the existing traffic capacity for users who currently enter the property from the two north entrances?
Does the change in parking from above ground to underground support the residential component of this plan or the commercial component of this plan?
What type of residential units are planned? Is this for families, singles, couples - one bedroom, two bedroom, three bedroom? Knowing the number of residential units does not indicate the true number of people who are estimated to live in this development.
Is this high-end housing, moderately priced housing, or affordable housing? Who is the target audience for this residential development?
How will you address increasing the walkability, safety, and attractiveness of the development for pedestrians?
What planning was done to accommodate the BRT?
There is no point asking questions as real answers aren't given, only platitudes.
Does the project team actually heed the comments?
I have a suggestion for the Co-op store development team. I think the addition of a central sit-up bar in the store that can serve wine would be well received. This is a concept that has been successful in Whole Food stores which has delayed store openings in Alberta. The combination of allowing prepared foods/snacks purchased from the store to be consumed at the sit-up bar could be an added feature. This would provide an opportune 'up market' attraction for the Co-op store in Oakridge and other similar neighborhoods.
Where is the parking for the residential units? Are there plans to improve Southland Drive, 24th Street and 90 Avenue?
Question: Considering our local grocery store is forced to fit in a smaller square footage space and other small business will be closed, what is the project team giving back to the community? Note: The community does NOT want more apartment buildings.
I would like to hear how the project team anticipates development the rest of the site as the current leases expire? ie: is there an overall master plan?
No
Would like to purchase a condo at this location and I need to know who to contact
It is obvious that this development is not related to the vacant property just north on 24 st. However it should also be taken into consideration what will be occurring at this site and who owns it. I can easily see how this property owner will want to also put in a similar high rise to what is suggested at the coop site which will significantly increase the number of residential units in the particular area. The city needs to address this and make others aware of the bigger picture of what could possibly happen there and not just say "we don't know." They may not know yet what is

planned, but they do know what could be planned, particularly when a new 11 story building sits across the street.
Where are the existing vendors going? CIBC, Wildrose, the hair place, photographer etc.
Parking - Parking - parking. It will be difference between success and failure of this project. Look to Glenmore Landing as a good example of what NOT to do. Many of us refuse to go there and use the businesses there because of it. COOP has been a beloved part of our community. I hope it will stay that way while still meeting e density needs of the city.
Are provisions being made to provide vehicle access to this site primarily via Southland Drive and 24th street ?
no yes
Traffic access Parking Height of structure
When can we expect a decision about maintaining the Scouts Canada Christmas tree lot for the month of December?
Phase work is going to have residents in a construction zone and patrons in a construction zone for years. I think they should just do it and get it done in two phases maximum
Not at this time.
Will the residential units be RENTALS or OWNERSHIP based?
No.
Always thought Co-op was a grocery store not a land developer.
Will this project team be long term or will there be staff changes throughout interrupting the continuity of the project? Are community concerns more important than capital budgets? And, will there be a piece of public art attached to this project or will you let the community decide what to do with the 1 percent?
No
None at this time
Why can't development be limited to the COOP and the medical / shops building facing on Oakmoor Drive & 24th Street? Why disrupt & tear up the entire area, thus causing stress & headaches for the neighbourhood.
see above- more info on plans for traffic and parking
None.
I think the community's concerns have been down-played in this questionnaire and their opinions should be made public on-line.
No
Where will traffic lights and pedestrian crossing be implemented at the entrance and exit points?
See above concerns about parking. This area has a large population of seniors who come here for their banking, dental, chiropractic, medical needs, as well as shopping, and they are going to be unable to park close to the new 2-storey building for their appointments. Not enough surface parking has been allowed for this, and the overflow from all the new condo/apartment residents who own more than one car is also going to impact the surface parking. Parking controls/towing will have to be ongoing to prevent surface spaces being used by residents. The idea that 1, 2 or 3 bedroom units will house people with no cars, or only 1 car, is very optimistic. I can't think of any families or couples that have only one car

between them. Most have at least two, not counting any recreational/seasonal vehicles. The biggest frustration with this whole concept is going to be the parking.
I would like the SW brt and other public transit integration to be addressed.
How many total net new residents have provided feedback from each of the four adjacent communities, with a breakdown by community?
Question, not a complaint- do plans for the pedestrian flow integrate with BRT planning for the area?
When will this project be finished?
Will there be increased public transit options available to meet the added demand?
1. Could the SE residential tower be combined with the CO-OP shopping centre building in order to reduce site coverage? This may also be more cost-effective? 2. Don't give up in finding improved design solutions to ultimately make an outstanding development!
I know you have a FAQ on the above - I would be interested in the results of the traffic study.
A few additional comments. Nowhere is it clearly stated where the underground public parking is located except for a very faint note on the north side of the CoOp store indicating "Parkade Entrance /Exit" which implies that this parking is under the CoOp store. I suggest that future site plan maps should use larger boldface fonts to highlight this feature. One other comment is that the issue of the surface parking area in winter. Currently snow is moved off the parking stalls and piled up in two or more corners of the lot, thereby removing three or more stalls per pile of snow. In the new proposal, if the same procedure is followed there may be a considerable loss of parking stalls which will not sit well with CoOp customers. The argument that in this circumstance the customer can use the underground parkade is not acceptable for those who are only shopping for a few items to be carried out to their vehicles. Consideration must be given to not storing the snow in piles on the lot, but removing the snow entirely from the property to avoid unnecessary loss of surface parking stalls.
Not at this time
See previous box for list of questions.
Yes
Why did the project team not know the parking requirements for the development? I asked several members of the team at the open house and none knew how many parking sites are required for this development or the general city requirements.
Will there be lights put up at the intersection of 24th and 98th? And would I still be able to turn left onto my street (Palistone Rd) from 24th? Or will there be a no turning sign now?
I think this plan is great. I shared these comments on your sign outside the store but unfortunately saw somebody steal my sticky note. Apparently if you have something positive to say that's not appropriate for all the cranky people in Oakridge. So I'll say it here ...this development is great! It's going to bring revitalization to a dated area and we are going to have vibrant spaces to visit in our community.
Yes - I have outstanding concerns. I do not believe that enough information has been shared about the target tenants. I would be very concerned if these are going to be low income apartments / condos.
1. Will there be "Visitor Parking" for the apartment/condo buildings? If not, why not?
I am not in favor of the development so more questions do not need to be asked.
Will this potential improvement project increase our property taxes in Oakridge?
Just hoping the Scouts tree lot will continue this winter and so forth.
I do hope that the complex will still have room to home the annual Scout Christmas tree lots as I feel the lost of that would be very sad. I have lived in the neighbourhood for almost 40

years and couldn't imagine the tree lot not there and would be a loss for a community that has enjoyed the lot for many years
When will we have more details about the residential units? In particular, I want to know how many will be for sale and how many will be available for rent.
Why are we not being given a choice in whether this goes forward, or not? It makes me wonder how much the developer really cares about the community, to be honest.
1. Why was the sounding board at Oakridge Co-op removed early?
It is not a question, it is AN ORDER: STOP THIS DEVELOPMENT. Leave things the way they are. WE DO NOT WANT ANY FURTHER DEVELOPMENT, residential, commercial or anything else - IS THAT CLEAR?
When will the development be given approval, if all conditions have been met? When will construction begin, theoretically?
No - thank you.
Will there be a flashing pedestrian crossing on Southland Drive on the west end of this development?
I may have missed it, but my greatest concern is access onto 24th street from Oakmoor Drive - both on the west and east side of Oakmoor Drive to enter 24th either going north or south. Since significantly more people will want to use that intersection, will there be traffic lights put in, so that both vehicles and pedestrians can use this intersection safely and in a timely way?
The scouts tree lot must stay. Needed for the area. Also a better mix of retailers. I do what I can there shop grocery, licence, dentist, gas. But a few others would be great
What traffic controls are anticipated to be put in place. The information session did not provide much detail and remained vague.
What level of LEEDS certification will these structures achieve?
This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey.
Not questions about the plan directly. But a concern that transit planning should make sure there are stops strategically placed near the development.

Open house engagement boards

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	45
Development Fit Concern that the new development will not be visually appealing and will be too high for the existing community.	44	31
Traffic Community is concerned about the effect of additional density on traffic and road safety.	25	47

Pedestrian Connectivity and Safety The community desires an improved journey to and through the site.	36	23
Vibrant Gathering Spaces Community feels there is a lack of local, small-scale businesses and vibrant places to gather.	29	15

Public engagement evaluation

Question 7. 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	96	35	12	11	19
I received enough information to provide meaningful input	69	45	15	15	28
I understand how my input will be used	72	35	20	18	22
The format was an effective way for the City to collect input	83	37	20	7	24
Question 8: What worked for you about the feedback opportunities provided to you? Is there anything we could do differently to make it better?					
Get rid of all condos					
plenty of stuff around					
It would be nice to have an actual model of the development for display at future community meetings					
More Co-op folks vs. city					
I loved the insert in the mail. Please provide later times in P.M. for people who work later					
A group of citizens from the surrounding communities needs to be selected for meeting with the developer and the city to come up with a better plan. These meeting are not sophisticated enough to result in beneficial improvement					
Did not find more discussion that gave me understanding whether changers were done or not. Listen to community No just the developer!!!					
This seems like a bit of a given, no matter what input is rec'd					
I only just heard about this. I think we need to back this whole process up so more people are informed. I think we need to re-think putting these disgraceful tall buildings in our area.					

I saw the road signs for the Oakridge Coop - give your feedback, but had no idea what it was about so didn't look into it until just recently. Couldn't there have been signage IN the Coop about what the proposal entails? Who knows how many people didn't/don't look because there is too little information up front?
This is perfect for me and I thank you all for the opportunity. Can't wait until you begin construction.
The card in the mail box two days ago was the first time I heard about this building project. I have missed all info sessions and the process so far. Local residents should be given a card in the mail at the application stage to be involved in their community fully. THIS AFFECTS US ALL!
I was able to look at what changes the developer made. Maybe include photos of the revised site plan on the same webpage as I'm currently typing.
No, because it's all very patronizing considering that this is only an exercise in public relations. The decision has already been made so why bother pretending our input has given any consideration or will make any difference what so ever. What a waste of time and resources (taxpayers money). Why not be honest and just tell us what you going to do and leave it at that. This way you save time, money, resources and end up with the same result you have already planned for. Banana Republic, here we come.
Engage earlier in the process. Engage with surrounding communities earlier. We are all stakeholders. Actually listen to citizen concerns. There is no point in consulting if you don't listen and act.
I like getting the postcard letting me know that I could provide input and learn about the project. I had heard about it from an acquaintance who lives in Oakridge and was interested in hearing more. I liked the idea of the development. This process clearly shows that community members can influence a project.
Yes increase the awareness to Southwood and Haysboro.
I had previously attended an open house. It was valuable to speak to city staff, but time was limited with the staff and the presentation boards due to the large volume of people who attended. Looking at the information online was convenient, but did not allow for real time questions. Is there a way to incorporate access to city staff for those viewing the information online?
Have more public meetings in larger venues as we could not get into the Church for the session at Braeside
Show the maps with the proposed changes with each question. Listen to us when we say that we don't want 13 storeys, we don't want 266 units never mind 294 units, we are very concerned about traffic & the fact that there can be no residual parking on Oakmoor Drive, we don't want that many residents living in a 2 block area, crime whether you admit it or not will escalate, aesthetically it will not blend with our neighborhood, prove that our home values will not go down, 4 real estate agents say that they will, the homes & condos on the west side will loose their privacy, their sun & the enjoyment of their life.
None of the real issues have been addressed.
No
Open houses and online methods were well publicized locally and I received a mailing too. Perhaps display boards left in centre of current mall too would be useful.
This is going to happen no matter what the community input is. You cannot fight city hall and what they decide to do. They are changing the entire community, with his development, the BRT and the access to the SW ring road. This will not be the same community, it used to be. Great job shoving this through city hall.

Getting questions about things such as parking, answered by the developer.
Yes, you could actually listen and not ignore.
I found it on Facebook. I live in haysboro but use this facility all the time so it's development will affect me directly. I would have appreciated having some communication come to me firsthand.
Like to be heard as a residence and tax payer. Would like to be contacted on this matter. Please look into this matter carefully. This development is too much for this site plan and will not provide the antequate practicality of the neighborhood. Stop putting more residences in a already high populated and congested neighbourhood! it's a developed neighborhood for a reason, it's developed! No need to stack more. It makes no sense. Thank you
I think the community has been given ample opportunity for input.
The good: workshops to provide input The bad: The workshop was being directed by the developer with a vested interest and was not impartial. We were led to believe during the workshop with the table top exercise that there was an opportunity to provide suggestions to the layout, in fact we were encouraged to come up with a new layout but that looks like it was a waste of time.
I think the site is user friendly and easy to maneuver. The information was easy to understand and give feedback on.
I was hoping to see a 3D map of the proposed site.
This area is already heavily congested and traffic in and out of Coop is not adequate.
Having the city people s well as the Co-op team was great; allowed to cover off all my questions and concerns
Having the applicant (COOP) with the developer (Quarry Park) and the City working together in the same venue was valuable.
The information provided requires alot of study and invetigation back and forth between the original concept and the changes to the concept. It would be easier to understand the changes with a comparison matrix. Also, the information provided does not accurately reflect the changes to the plan. It highlights the desired change (i.e. reducing the size of the commercial tower), but does not highlight what may be construed as undesired changes (i.e. increasing the height of the townhomes, increasing the density of the residential units). The optics is that there is something to hide.
It's great that there is oppotunity for dialogue around this and we appreciate having input. On the other hand, I think the materials provided to the community to review online didn't allow us to visualize the changes to the development plan from the initial proposal, and I'm unclear on how my input specifically will be addressed. Having revised visuals make a big difference, otherwise it doesn't bode well for the feeling we're being listened too. I look forward to continuing the conversation!
I am making all comments based on a single rendering of the site provided on the engage site under the "development concept" tab. All other renderings/plans/maps are either unavailable or too difficult to find. What does the site look like on the North side? Overall map does not show context of the development well (BRT stations should be marked, proximity to schools and southland leisure centre should be marked).
Listen!
Listen to the community. We have to live with these decisions.
I attended the workshop in Cedarbrae and a person at my table was concerned about shadowing from the proposed 13 storey tower. I spoke to a representative from Quarry Bay

and he stated that because of the design of the building, any shadow would fall in the immediate area and therefore not affect nearby residents. I think this information would have proved useful at the workshop.
Send out email updates so people are notified about changes
I'm somewhat concerned that this project has gone as far as it has without a completed traffic impact assessment.
This survey should be done with all information disclosed
I replied in response to a small (4" x 6") information card I received which included a website. I am a Palliser resident.
The workshop didnt make sense. We arent designers as the public and werent made aware of site constraints
Streamline the process. Reduce the time for consultation by 90%.
Would like to speak directly to developers
I like the opportunity to provide input online as well as at meetings. I think you have done a good job with providing information and feedback opportunities. I just don't like the project and am disappointed that it seems it is going to proceed.
The city ran out of papers to write my concerns at the community meeting.
The format was not effective. Board games that told people that they now had to put a given number of pieces on the table does not give choice to what could or should happen to this property. This "Board Game" and meetings had already pre supposed that a major development with higher density would be a given..... now the community could be given the false sense that they actually chose such a development. The only game being played here is the one the city is playing with the community.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. The city and the developer have done a great job with this one - so far anyway.
Have a small forum where the city, the developer and concerned citizens can dialogue with each other about the project across a table. I would limit it to 12 people or less. This would result in better projects with less controversy and would save time and money in the end. These 12 people would then report back to the community at large for final feedback.
The SW Ring Road will change numbers of vehicles and types of vehicles using South Land Drive, 90 Ave, Anderson Road and quite likely 24 st, 14 st and Elbow Drive, Crossing SL Drive which is now risky will become even more so. Yet this point has been ignored by city proposals as has the extra buses using 24 St and SL Drive on the proposed BRZ route, which assumes people will walk or cycle? To BRZ stops when history has proven bus users are proven overflow Parking on residential streets. The highly restricted scenarios and question parameters at City/ Residents meetings all pointed to the city scenarios and adjudicators would only consider points or questions within the parameter of the City proposal. Ie put the cart before the horse. " theirs opposable"
no
Nice to be able to do it online
Too bad you did not treat us in the same way as this project regarding the SWBRT!
The information provided was easy to understand.
There were many more than three concerns. Making all groups narrow the list down to just their top three concerns seemed to be just a manipulative way to reduce the number of concerns that needed to be addressed.

I missed the info sessions in May, since I had no idea what they were about. I thought it was all to do with the Coop itself, not a whole project around it and a redevelopment.
Start to listen to community and not just make some sort of desision and present to us as something what we wont. Start doing your job for change.
Listen to the residents of the community. How does it affect those that live here and not those in the outlying areas or those developers looking to make more money off the backs of taxpayers.
Feedback? Braeside birthday event, Saturday the 19th: Event starts at noon, I arrive 12:35. Looked for information about the Oakridge Co-op development, found the community event bus. Had no idea if I was supposed to look on the bus for more info as no one around. Stepped into bus. Obviously I scared your staff member who immediately told me "You can't!... We don't!... We won't be set up until 1:00". Great. Thanks for the warm welcome by the way. Improvements? Just set up a model of what you've decided this development will look like, put it somewhere public so we can all see it on our own time, and none of us have to disturb your staff.
on the PDF from this link (http://www.calgary.ca/_layouts/cocis/DirectDownload.aspx?target=http%3a%2f%2fwww.calgary.ca%2fengage%2fDocuments%2fCo-op%2fOakridgeCoOp_OpenHouseBoards_Aug2017.pdf&noredirect=1&sf=1) There were sections at the end for concerns about parking and traffic, but they were not addressed on this page.
I like online opportunities for feedback. I can do it on my own time, and not have to schedule time for me to attend an event.
The Saturday morning workshop at the Braeside Community Centre was well-organized and fair. No one has explained why the COOP is building so many new buildings on its site. The condo development above the COOP and a new medical/shops building should suffice. Why build a third, temporary medical/shops building so close to a residential property, Oakwood Lane, 10030 Oakmoor Way SW? No one has justified this construction. DO BETTER: Definite answers to questions would provide clarity and be appreciated. Take a clear stand against some construction on the Coop site.
I appreciate it very much if the city would consider re designing the height of the apartments and the lack of parking provided. Thank you
Mostly appreciate the opportunity to give feedback.
A Support/Oppose radio button style question would be constructive. (I'd click support). I have no connection to the developer and no connection to Coop beyond being a customer and long term member.
As I suggested; publish the concerns and viewpoint on-line and let's see how the public really feels about having their lives impacted.
I thought the entire engagement process was done well and am very satisfied how the city and the developer handled it. I am 100% in support of this project as a 20 year home owner in the Cedarbrae community.
A realistic response to the parking questions that have been posed would be helpful. Simply responding that surface parking by residents MAY result in action being taken IF it occurs is

not realistic. It's not a matter of IF, it's guaranteed to happen. This development may say that they have followed City recommendations and regulations for parking requirements, but those requirements are obviously outdated and unrealistic.
Liked that "sharing thoughts" card was given out at Co-op.
Everytime that there have been "adjustments" over the past 30 years of living in this area, the City HAS NEVER CONSIDERED the opinions of the people. I am not sure that this will be any different.
Not sure.
Yes do not go ahead sigh this
Do the citizens living in the area, trust you, the city staff, to present the people's wishes.....
I do feel that all residents in the community should be able to provide input on a major development such as this that will impact their community. However, many of the most vocal community members that I have observed through this community engagement process were either brand new to the neighbourhood, non-owners (ie they are renters) and/or they live more than a few blocks from the actual Coop Site and several do not drive, but are pedestrians. The community members who appear to be most concerned are the ones who do drive and already feel the congestion on this route around the Coop site, and who do live around the perimeter of the site and therefore will be impacted most by the construction phase, resulting optics of the buildings in their direct line of site.
I appreciate the flexibility of the different options provided. I would have preferred to attend a session, but could not make the scheduling work.
Listen to the community of homeowners be honest with feedback given! I was at the open meeting when this plan was presented to the community and after speaking with over 100 home openers they were all against this development, but you obviously didn't care or listen the overwhelming opinions that this development is extremely bad for the established neighborhood.
No, there were signs everywhere on how to engage and I could easily fill out an application online.
Up until about 3 weeks ago, i was not really aware that this project was going ahead or had been applied for. A little more heads up and opportunity to meet would have been appreciated. Even door to door polling or notice would be nice.
This application procedure was very informative, due to good/effective communication.
Build a mock up of development
Just happened to see the survey through a facebook link. Great way to circulate the need for this info
Just refuse the application and save everyone's time
Open house was useful to convey the project.
I hop we can get it done
Having the online survey open on time. Having people at the open house that know the city parking requirements.
If you could do something to control the jerks that stole my positive comments off the sign.
Online is easy access for me, and I appreciate the visuals. Any questions I had were answered well in the FAQs.
Overall it has been a good process. You can't "please all the people all the time" but this process has given multiple opportunities for people to engage - before the final decisions were made. I believe my "voice" has been heard. (Compared to SWBRT for which many residents believe the consultation took place after the primary decisions were made.)

<p>Until I saw the signs posted on 24th Street recently, I wasn't even aware of the proposed development. I'm not sure where the communication about this was but it certainly was never at the Co-op Centre itself. I read the Herald daily, always read our community newsletter, am on the mailing list for the Palliser/Bayview/Pumphill community but never saw a thing about this development. I walk almost daily from my home in Palliser to Glenmore Landing and around the reservoir to 37th street and then through Oakridge back to my home and have never seen a sign. I walk to the Centre (I live 3 blocks away) several times a week but again saw no signs.</p>
<p>Only heard about this community engagement opportunity recently... I will give my email address to get updates.</p>
<p>I originally thought this was a very secretive project - not a lot known about it other than rumours. I do think the City has provided much needed opportunities to actually see/hear what it going on.</p>
<p>Why could there not have been a plebiscite?</p>
<p>Though I have been unable to attend open houses, there certainly were many opportunities to do so. Greatly appreciate the heads up and advanced notice. I am happy to be able to provide feedback in this format.</p>
<p>It was very accessible and I appreciate this opportunity!</p>
<p>I can't think of any way you could improve feedback opportunities.</p>
<p>Actually listen and act</p>
<p>The open houses and workshops you held were not very informative. There wasn't anyone who wanted to answer any questions. They wanted the residents to add our input - however the input doesn't seem to be of any concern to the City. It appears to me, the developer will be allowed to rezone the property, and continue on with minor changes made to the original design - despite the feedback from the community & its residents.</p>
<p>I liked that I am able to receive updates by email so I know how the project is progressing. Thank you</p>
<p>Yes, see above regarding choices in the decision to move forward with the project, and repeated requests for traffic studies, with actual numbers from a perspective of 'when would it NOT be a good idea to go forward with this project' has not happened. That is a disappointment.</p>
<p>Good effort but we will see what the final decisions are. Thank you</p>
<p>Do NOT remove the sounding board early. It would have helped if a handout about the proposed project had been available at Co-op.</p> <p>The only 2 days for feedback where a real person would have been present were Aug. 14 and 19 -- both the same week, (during summer holidays). I was away this week so was unable to speak to a live person. Spreading out the feedback (at least making the dates more than a week apart) would seem to be only fair, especially as this is summer holidays, and many families are away.</p>
<p>Prior to staging input sessions the "revised plan" should have been understood by the City representatives who were there. It is not helpful to be told that the Revised Plan was just received so the City has not yet had time to consider whether it meets bylaw requirements. The City appears to set up the feedback sessions so that it can "check the box" that feedback was received, all the while having already made the decisions about approval.</p>
<p>I HAVE BEEN ACCESSING THE INFORMATION ONLINE BECAUSE I WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND IN PERSON. I HAVE ALSO SPOKEN WITH OTHERS IN THE COMMUNITY WHO DID ATTEND LIVE DISCUSSIONS. I REALLY APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO</p>

PROVIDE MY INPUT.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH!
The City of Calgary DOES NOT LISTEN, so all input provided was a waste of time. The City designed a process that is clearly biased towards the development and brainwashes community members, specially taking advantage of seniors. CO-OP is quite poorly administrated (each board person has a pitiful resume, emphasizing personal aspects rather than what they have achieved professionally) and the CO-OP board does not care about members opinion/wishes. Many neighboring communities were not invited/ not included by the City of Calgary. It is clear that the officers involved from City of Calgary already made their mind even before consulting anyone from the community and this process is just to "make it official", but without REAL support from all members of the neighboring communities.
it would have been nice to receive even an "auto" reply to let us know that someone somewhere in the city has even read our comments
Providing an online option with detailed materials (as was done) was beneficial to those who were not available to attend in person consultations.
While the developer says there was engagement before the city's efforts, that is not correct - we live in the immediate area, and did not know anything about this development until the city's first engagement session.
I liked the in person brainstorming and that i can see how feedback was taken and considered.
You could have chosen a time, other than August, when so many people are away on vacation, having visitors, spending time with children & grandchildren, dealing with the heat. How about Sept.-Oct. when everyone is back in more normal routines? I think you waited much too long to reveal anything at all about this proposed development - it was presented, on a very limited basis, as a done deal, instead of a proposal, with the opportunity to make changes.
Bogus consultation where local community concerns are marginalized. The urbanists working in city hall and the potential profits of the developer and increased tax revenue for the city outweigh any local resident concerns. I hope this development turns into a failure and the developer is forced into bankruptcy. Go buold a skyscraper in Marda Loop or Kensington next to *personal information removed*
You could try being honest and not ignoring the answers that you don't like
More detailed information on the revisions.
I think that I have never recovered from the sense of being ambushed by the COOP and developers. I heard about this from a neighbor in Oakmoor 2300 and looked it up. It was shocking to read that they claimed they had been working with the community for over a year - I think the term used was "as you know". I read the community newsletters and am in Coop at least once a week and never saw anything about this new plan. Since I live in Oakmoor 2300 which is opposite the intersection that will be probably be used extensively and is already challenging to get onto 24th street now, it makes me concerned that the extra volume of traffic may not be addressed.
This is the first time I have been involved in this sort of process and I welcomed the opportunity to provide input. I realize mine is not the only opinion but I hope it will be considered.
More detail for the applicant's proposed changes would be helpful, especially the "vibrant gathering spaces."
Traffic and pedestrian/ bike planning not well explained.

This is a test to see if I can submit multiple responses to this survey. If I can, then this is definitely something that needs to be fixed. Surveys can be anonymous but also limited so no more than one response per person.

As someone who no longer lives in the area, I attempted early on in the year to contact a planner associated with the project. Correspondence was poor and my own workload, completing my own master's degree in Planning, has deferred my feedback to this point. I take responsibility for my role in this eleventh-hour submission, but am disappointed with the frustration of earlier communications.

If the team would like to reach me regarding the content of this feedback, I can be reached at
personal information removed

Thank you for your time.

I appreciated the forum held in Aug 2017 at the Braeside Community Centre with reps from all stakeholders.

I appreciated the open houses with graphic info made available. This process seemed to improve as the plans progressed. Initially, info from the Co-op/developer to the surrounding neighbourhoods was very inadequate.

Better meeting area where people could talk to more planners.

Better organized sessions.