



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

Engagement overview

There was one public drop-in open house on Sept. 28, 2016 and related online feedback about 16 Ave NW and Bowness Road (Montgomery) as Main Streets in the 3rd Phase of the Main Street Initiative. The online engagement opportunity for these two Montgomery main streets was available from Sept. 26 – Oct. 6, 2016. There was a total of 49 full and partial responses for the Montgomery Main Streets, including both online and in-person.

What we asked

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

- Comments and feedback on the proposed changes along the main street (changes in density, retail/mixed-use and the area of those changes) and in the residential “transition” zone just off the main street (changes in density and the area of those changes).
- Reflection on the input already received, images of different land-use zones and other Main Street decision factors to provide a thoughtful overview of each participants’ preferences and visions for 16 Ave NW and Bowness Road (Montgomery).
- Prioritize the factors that The City should consider in future evaluation of “large sites” that may be redeveloped (by the land owner, not The City) in the context of growth and vibrancy along the Main Streets.

What we heard

Some of the main themes expressed often by citizens and stakeholders were that more retail was a good idea but would need to consider how this might impact traffic/transportation of all kinds (vehicle parking and congestion and improvements to the pedestrian experience.) Of the 33/39 respondents online and in-person who answered the question (how well does this plan fit your vision of the main street?) overwhelmingly indicated that the current plan “somewhat” or “very much” fit with their vision of these two main streets in Montgomery. However, many stipulated they want to see pedestrian realm or traffic flow improvements along with this. Among all the comments there was relatively equal split of the feeling of the comments being generally supportive of (20) or concerned with (14) at least some aspects of the proposal.

The boundaries suggested for transition area, as well as the main street area, got mixed comments but overall the area was deemed to be appropriate with some specific suggestions made by one or two participants, for example: less development south of 16th Ave; use R-CG everywhere that R-C2 was suggested; not to zone anything for row houses.

The images people preferred generally indicated that it either maintained or improved the streetscape and green spaces and pedestrian realm. They also suggested that some images helped illustrated what some participants thought was an appropriate building height. Images “B”, “G” and “J” had most interest compared



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

to their paired photo. The other image sets had fairly equal preferences or a lack of interest in the particular image set at all.

Retail input from participants' comments on the maps was analyzed by the Main Streets team. The preference was for focusing retail on Bowness Road and 16 Avenue NW, with a connection between the two along 46 Street NW. The preferred concept retains C-COR2 along 16 Avenue NW to allow for redevelopment while providing flexibility for auto-oriented uses, and adds MU1 and 2 along 46 Street and Bowness Road NW to require active retail/restaurant uses between 45 and 46 Streets NW and allow for a mix of uses on the adjacent blocks.

For the Large Redevelopment Sites the most common factors citizens felt The City should consider were: Through site connections (more sidewalks, pathways or bike routes) (24), Requiring Retail (20) and a tie for using green infrastructure and matching the non-main street edge to existing building scale (17). Others suggested that park/green space and seniors' residences should also be maintained or incorporated into any future large redevelopment site.

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

Next steps

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



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

Summary of Input (In-person & Online)

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

	A or B	C or D	E or F	G or H	I or J
Preference count	16 and 23	18 and 21	18 and 21	28 and 10	13 and 24
Number of times 'both' was listed	1	0	1	2	2

From all the comments about the photographs some common themes arose. The majority of comments were, quite obviously, about whether or not the visual appearance (108) was positive or negative but what made the appearance good or bad varied and were sometimes opposed. Typically the main interest was the quality of the green spaces/street scape (19), if it was human-scaled/pedestrian friendly (19) and whether or not it would add a friendly feel or increased community vibrancy (10). Several comments (12) also indicated their photo preferences were due to the building height and set-back being appropriate.

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

THEME	Number/ Frequency	Examples
Like the idea of more retail (and related suggestions)	7	"I would love to have more local retail." "I would like to see more people supporting shops." "We need services for commercial activity, not more doctors/pharmacies."
Want to see more community vibrancy	6	"I like the idea of increasing vibrancy while keeping the feel of the area." "Meets needs, create community."
Concerns or suggestions about car traffic/parking	6	"slow traffic [down]." "Roads can't handle the vehicle traffic now." "Don't crimp traffic flow." "Angled parking on north side retail strip."
Desire for main street to be a pedestrian friendly area	6	"16 Ave needs a more pedestrian friendly/safe atmosphere." "Pedestrian focus."
General desire for improvement/change	4	"sounds like what we are hoping for improving the neighbourhood." "The area seems tired, old, unsafe and just not a nice place to walk." "'rezone' land use bylaws to allow for more flexibility."
Safety	4	"Very important to make it a calm, safe place to walk." "...a safe, proper pedestrian crossing is required at 45 St and Bowness Rd."



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

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

THEME	Number/ Frequency	Examples
Concerns or suggestions about car traffic/parking	10	“Before anymore development on 16 Ave or Home Road...widening of those throughways.” “won’t be able to handle traffic.” “I would like to see increased transit access...traffic is always a concern.” “Fix up parking lots along Bowness Rd.”
Comments about the transition area (like the current and related suggestions)	6	“I like more density in the area between the streets...” “I am okay with 17 th Ave included in mixed use but feel like this should have been done 10 years ago...” “Bump the RC2 up to RCG everywhere.”
Desire for pedestrian friendly area and related suggestions	5	“[the] walkability/walkable-ness of Bowness Road – right now it’s quite busy, feels unsafe to cross.” “Adding pedestrian overpasses – wide side walks, benches, good lighting could make the 16 Ave corridor more desirable.” “[extend] walkable area into the Shouldice Aquatic Centre area.”
Concern with the approach/ want to see a plan for the whole community	4	“Concern with changes to zoning en masse versus a slower case by case.” “You are 15 years too late.”
Comments about the transition area (dislike the current and related suggestions)	4	“I don’t agree with the development south of 16 th Avenue. That is a unique areas to Montgomery.” “I would hate to see anything but semi-detached infills go in the area!” “No rowhouses or MRUs. Should permit legal/approve secondary suites.”
Safety	4	“stop vagrants in the area.” “those motels and the bottle depot sets the area up for crime.” “critical to make it safe and walkable.”
Concerns about height or suggested a maximum heights	4	“4 story makes sense...not too high.” “my concern is that some houses will lose sunlight due to higher buildings.” “no taller than 2 stories.” “Keep building height to max 3 stories.”



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

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

	Very Much/Completely	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat no	Very little/Not At All
In person	11	19	0	3	3
Online	2	1	0	0	0

QUESTION 5 – Evaluation Factors for Future Large Redevelopment Sites

Line main street with tall buildings for more interesting street view	Require retail	Locate highest buildings where shadows would have the least impact off-site	Through site connections (more sidewalks, pathways or bike routes)	Along the non-main street edge match redevelopment scale to existing building scale	Use green infrastructure (rain water capture, solar power generation)	Other
13	20	16	24	17	17	6*

Other (in no particular order)

Trees/green space (multiple times), seniors’ residences (multiple times), transportation/traffic suggestions or concerns (multiple times) [*please note: there was an additional 1 ‘other’ suggestion but it fit into two of the originally provided categories and was added to the total of those columns]



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

Verbatim Comments

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

	A or B	C or D	E or F	G or H	I or J
Preference count	16 and 23	18 and 21	18 and 21	28 and 10	13 and 24
Number of times when 'both' was listed	1	0	1	2	2
Verbatim comments A or B	<p>A - [drawing of retail with setback from street & seating]</p> <p>A - brighter, easier to see, more inviting / stop</p> <p>A - but where appropriate have seating where it makes sense for the commercial use. Off set, like in B is nice though for shade, bike racks. I don't like benches alone for loitering but I like it as a gathering space.</p> <p>A - I like the individual inset doors.</p> <p>A - looks like a welcoming places like the benches in "B" for resting your feet</p> <p>A - Looks small town, old established town</p> <p>A - More pleasing to the eye. Each store has an individual appeal</p> <p>A - More specific business presence with the business logo right out. Individual door more pleasing to the eye. What I like about "B" is the benches prospect.</p> <p>A - More to human scale</p> <p>A - More visibility of store fronts, more modern feel, design appeal.</p> <p>A - more visible & obvious what is going on</p> <p>A - seems more approachable, friendly and warm.</p> <p>A - signage better</p> <p>A or B ? - I like the look of A but I like the seating offered in B.</p> <p>B - (marginally) - I would like to see the canopy large enough to walk under for weather protection & perhaps patios.</p> <p>B - a bit of shelter along wall. Friendly.</p> <p>B - allows for seating for people to gather and relax while out shopping.</p> <p>B - big windows to see more interesting stuff benches to sit and rest and talk</p> <p>B - canopy encourages pedestrian walking - weather - benches are very good encourages community</p> <p>B - Canopy preferred. Shelter. Flower boxes, shrubs sheltered. Place to rest. Place to congregate. Place to get out of elements.</p> <p>B - canopy sunken look</p> <p>B - I like street side seating.</p> <p>B - I like the overhang.</p> <p>B - Inset doors allow visualize wider sidewalk</p> <p>B - Like style - eye appeal more timeless look</p> <p>B - More pedestrian friendly</p>				



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

	<p>B - Patio, more people friendly</p> <p>B - safe and sidewalks</p> <p>B - See the sidewalk, benches, space between cars and building, subtle business signs.</p> <p>B - seems to allow for bigger sidewalks more inviting</p> <p>B - Setbacks create façade interest & architectural opportunities</p> <p>B - wider sidewalk & benches, stone work</p> <p>B - wider sidewalks for pedestrians & dogs to pass easily.</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments C or D</p>	<p>C - Brick - yec! Eliminate those archways. Prefer some setbacks; adds variety. Also top floors set back over lower allows for decks etc.</p> <p>C - D is not visually appealing. Too many styles in one building.</p> <p>C - Fits more into Montgomery with the trees</p> <p>C - greenery</p> <p>C - I like the use of brick and but not the design.</p> <p>C - It's a little more inviting and not so much shading on sidewalks.</p> <p>C - less industrial looking.</p> <p>C - looks better when colour scheme is similar.</p> <p>C - Looks more modern, simple, streamlined. To me, D looks outdated/cluttered.</p> <p>C - Looks more organized. D looks messy and unfinished.</p> <p>C - more inviting</p> <p>C - sleek, more city-like, better use of space</p> <p>D - "D" allows to use the bottom level for business enterprise. Design could be interpreted to be in sections as opposed to just a flat design such as "C". The only appealing thing about "C" is having trees around.</p> <p>D - Brick façade looks fake, does not fit in.</p> <p>D - cleaner look</p> <p>D - façade variation & stepping back upper level</p> <p>D - Flat feels too commercial</p> <p>D - I like the colour difference and set back between commercial and residential. Makes it seem like two separate uses.</p> <p>D - I like the contrast</p> <p>D - is less imposing</p> <p>D - Less mass</p> <p>D - Like the building design but not the brick - detracts from the architecture.</p> <p>D - more bricks stucco</p> <p>D - More facade features.</p> <p>D - more interesting doesn't look as tall</p> <p>D - more interesting to look at.</p> <p>D - More texture. Balconies separate but together with street.</p> <p>D - Retail space better delineated. Less height at sidewalk (like set-back)</p>



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

	<p>D - The third floor setback provides more privacy and natural noise reduction for tenants. It could include shrubs and flower boxes.</p> <p>Don't like either. C too plain. D looks like a railway station in Europe.</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments E or F</p>	<p>E - aesthetically more pleasing</p> <p>E - cleaner lines, less boxy, seems lower and less (indecipherable).</p> <p>E - for office space. F - for apartments - balconies a must.</p> <p>E - I like the sleekness and clean lines, especially if there are multiple buildings in a row.</p> <p>E - Less busy</p> <p>E - look shorter</p> <p>E - more brick stucco</p> <p>E - More façade features</p> <p>E - more sleek, uniform, more inviting, belongs on a main street vs the residential which could be on a back street. I think if you put a business at ground floor of F would look weird.</p> <p>E - Once again utilizing the space at the main level of the building is sort of a mandatory layout for sure. I do enjoy the structure of the "F" building.</p> <p>E - People sized. Depends on shade restrictions.</p> <p>E - Top floor setback makes the building seem lower. With no top setback the street feel canyon like and closed in.</p> <p>E or F is good. E looks like shops could exist better.</p> <p>F - again more dynamic.</p> <p>F - better façade articulation</p> <p>F - Brick & stone keeps within the age of the area and its more inviting</p> <p>F - does not look industrial</p> <p>F - lends itself to more interaction between 'owern' and pedestrian - 'front porch' scenario</p> <p>F - Less boxy.</p> <p>F - Like the design, but as a comparison, one seems to be an office building - one a condo.</p> <p>F - Looks less commercial</p> <p>F - modern look.</p> <p>F - More character, looks charming, not cold.</p> <p>F - more residential</p> <p>F - Not valid comparison. Office vs condos</p> <p>F - Presents better than a box design.</p> <p>F - Same as above, flat just feels too commercial</p> <p>F - Use setbacks. Use variety of materials. Canopy on main level.</p> <p>F - visually more appealing</p> <p>F (E is very blocky)</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments G or H</p>	<p>G - Again keeps with the age of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>G - Better curb appeal</p> <p>G - has a better landscape appeal</p>



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

	<p>G - Has more eye appeal & character. Except white top windows would look better in same colour as whole building.</p> <p>G - I like variety in exteriors and think it makes it a much more interesting place to walk through.</p> <p>G - less institutional looking</p> <p>G - Looks more "house"-like</p> <p>G - more character.</p> <p>G - more residential</p> <p>G - more residential feel</p> <p>G - more varied, entertains the eye. Would need to be varied town houses like in Currie Barracks (ie like the pic)</p> <p>G - more variety more character</p> <p>G - Much more appealing architecture.</p> <p>G - pitched roof gives a more residential look</p> <p>G - pitched roof, looks inviting, green space, no streetlights</p> <p>G - Prefer pitched roofs - easier to maintain. Change façade and materials. Change materials unit to unit. Less likely to look like "ticky tacky little boxes"</p> <p>G - Sloped roof with overhangs lead to less building envelope issues.</p> <p>G - The design has more character.</p> <p>G - Varied façade</p> <p>G - Variety & character.</p> <p>G or H - Has more wood that has warm feel. I don't mind the high density in H.</p> <p>G, H - I have no particular preference in the design of either one of those structures.</p> <p>H - Better geometry and articulation (G looks like a fake version of an outdated style)</p> <p>H - Do it with character from G. Set 3rd floor back if sun required.</p> <p>H - fit some of the style in the community.</p> <p>H - For residential, I like the commercial feel. Completely opposite my above comments.</p> <p>H - I like modern architecture</p> <p>H - modern look</p> <p>H - More modern, pedestrian friendly entrances.</p>
<p>Verbatim Comments I or J</p>	<p>I - A tie, really, but if I had to choose then I.</p> <p>I - flat doesn't feel as tall</p> <p>I - good place for office coffee shop bar</p> <p>I - has more notable access if disabled</p> <p>I - Interesting form at pedestrian level</p> <p>I - Modern, not as bland.</p> <p>I - More appealing for retail/ commercial</p> <p>I - Most definitely i. The design is more appealing to the eye mix-match of window shapes and detailed architecture - while J falls short on detail pitched roof is the only appealing thing the structure itself lacks character of the area.</p> <p>I - street level businesses J - hitched roofs are more interesting</p>



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

	<p>I or J - neutral, good things about both</p> <p>I would not want to see 4 or 6 storey buildings. I would like Montgomery to retain a small town appearance with small business opportunities. My experience with the present developers in Montgomery has been a very distasteful and stressful; I've been bullied and it has cost me thousands of dollars. [General Comment]</p> <p>I, J - actually would like to see a mix of these. Perhaps different from block to block.</p> <p>J - brownstones</p> <p>J - Cleaner look</p> <p>J - Gives the neighbourhood more character.</p> <p>J - I think having multiple entrances promotes walking, people sitting on the front step and makes it more approachable than a locked lobby.</p> <p>J - Interest provided by peaked roofs. Change of materials adds interest.</p> <p>J - looks more residential, pitched roof, more space between building and road</p> <p>J - more accessible to street. Better use of space.</p> <p>J - more residential</p> <p>J - more variety more character more pedestrian friendly</p> <p>J - Much more pleasing to the eye.</p> <p>J - no real reason just look nicer.</p> <p>J - Pitched roof</p> <p>J - Prefer pitched roof design.</p> <p>J - Seems more house like</p> <p>J - setback</p> <p>J - variety</p> <p>No preference</p>
--	--

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

Re: 6: Not 16 Ave 6 lanes of traffic. Re: 7: Disagree. Re: 8: Disagree. Higher density will lead to the loss of a community ie Beltline
Far too much medical use has squeezed out opportunities for retail/commercial and local service business. We need services for commercial activity, not more doctors /pharmacies. They contribute nothing to the neighbourhood.
Use the ARP. It was written specifically for this purpose.
Speaks to the desire of the residents that they live in a 'walkable' community.
I would like to see more people to support shops
Window shopping on a stroll is interesting and draws you into more businesses to investigate further.
I like the idea of increasing vibrancy while keeping the "feel" of the area.
Makes Montgomery more appealing and hopefully slow traffic.



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

I would love to have more local retail. Montgomery is a fantastic neighbourhood but increasing retail/food/restaurant density would be great. I know this needs people to support.
Wonderful pathway system by the river where I do stroll. For goodness sake don't crimp traffic flow. Major roadways.
Again density - our roads cannot handle the vehicle traffic now - what are you proposing to do to make road traffic not so congested.
Safe & vibrant can include a variety of businesses. Prospect for businesses to not just be relying on the community, but on others is good. Ie ppl from Parkdale & Point MacKay. To have the support of the ARP I simpt. Also goes along w/ imagineCalgary goals. Impt to "rezone" land use bylaws to allow for more flexibility.
I did not know about the city targets and this is important to keep in mind in our decision. Maybe it is better to do a few 6 storey rather than more spread out 4 and 2 storey to improve density.
We talked with a rep - MRU - sounds like what we are hoping for improving the neighbourhood.
16th Ave needs a more pedestrian friendly / safe atmosphere. It would be great if it were a destination area, rather than just a street you pass by to get somewhere else. The area seems tired, old, unsafe and just not a nice place to walk (especially after dark.)
I believe that Bowness Rd & 16th Ave are two main streets of primary highway in which resources have not been utilized to its full capacity. It would be for the better of the community to have those areas developed to engage the community for usage of such a place.
Re: "Outcomes" - Very important to make it a calm safe place to walk, stop for a snack or coffee - maintain a community space. Re: "Market outlook" - Should encourage \$\$ for shops & services
Safe & vibrant streets - would encourage population to use the neighbourhood businesses etc. Local planning - same as above. Rezoning - make sure new buildings are not too high, & spoil the present views, etc. (eg new Marda Loop building I feel was too high/large & didn't fit the neighbourhood)
Meet needs, create community; Pedestrian focus; not sure what the targets are the MDP so couldn't address some of them I don't understand
Can the City stimulate growth in a particular area or does it wait and restrict? Do businesses/developers see a direction for the area? Amenities? Road use planning needs to be done. Don't build a business where no one can stop.
There is huge potential to make Bowness Road between 45 St and 47 St a great pedestrian corridor. But first a safe and proper pedestrian crossing is required at 45 St and Bowness Road and angled parking on the north side retail strip of Bowness Road needs to happen
The parking on the retail side of Bowness Road needs to be improved as it is extremely hazardous. Angled parking like in Bowness would work well. Improved pedestrian crossing at 45 st and Bowness Rd is a priority as well.



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

QUESTION 3 – First Impressions of the Main Street Map

I feel that it is a little late to promote higher development with all the new 4 and duplex's that have been allowed in the past 10 years.
You're too late. Too much new infill development has happened. This will hurt those who recently invested here.
I live in the area that the city would redeveloped. I feel I am being forced out of my home. I like Montgomery the way 'It' was. Small town Alberta!!
You are 15 years too late. The area you are asking to review has already been thru massive residential redevelopment. Your question on preferred façade are a red herring. Development board does not comment on architectural design.
I would like to see what they have in Inglewood or Mount Royal but not Bankview
Makes the concept very clear.
I like the more density in the area between the streets, along with other used or the ground level.
I'm ok with it.
Before anymore development on 16 Ave or Home Road be really proactive and plan ahead for significant growth & widening of those throughways 16 Avenue is still #1 Highway
Concerns with changes to zoning en masse versus a slower case by case.
Make sure some Green Space is left not all high density - also impact of 10,000 cars coming out onto 16th ave - & won't be able to handle traffic.
I think this plan makes sense, I think it would be desirable to live in a single family/residential low rise with the new retail so close. Consideration re walkability/walkable-ness of Bowness Road - right now it's quite busy, feels unsafe to cross.
I am okay with 17th Ave included in mixed use but feel like this should have been done 10 years ago before so many residential got sandwiched in. I worry about the residential south of 16th Ave being isolated from the rest of the walking/residential community.
I like the plan that is proposed (especially the lego version). This would provide for a more vibrant atmosphere in the community and give residents better access to businesses and amenities.
Getting informed is great.
Acceptable. What is being done to reduce traffic on Bowness Road? Traffic lights? Traffic circle?
I'm excited about it, I would love to see it develop sooner rather than later. I think it would be ideal to have it remodeled and change for the overall benefit of the community.
The residential areas north of Bowness Road should be maintained as only residential no taller than 2 stories.
Encroaches into some of the area which should stay residential.



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

There is so much info, it's challenging to process. More plain language. Where are references to environmental sustainability e.g. low impact development. How is this view impacted by current infrastructure? Will there be additional upgrade required to water, wastewater, stormwater upgrade. What about the city sewer? How is waste recycling, green cart considered?

It is very important to renew the zone due to the great location it has.

Residential areas are next to undefined "future comprehensive plan". Don't plan big residential redevelopment without knowing who the neighbours will be.

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

	Very Much/Completely	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat no	Very little/Not At All
In person	11	19	0	3	3
Online	2	1	0	0	0

The yellow area south of 16 Ave has been redeveloped for single and duplex all ready.

It's inevitable.

This area is already redeveloped. Follow the ARP.

I would agree with the development on 19th Ave NW. I don't agree with the development south of 16th Avenue. That is a unique areas to Montgomery. Existing character should be maintained.

Bump the RC2 up to RCG everywhere.

I live on 19 Ave NW. I would hate to see anything but semi-detached infills go in the area!! Bowness Rd and South is where I envision apartments, row houses, and town houses or West of Home Rd.

I think that this is a good location for this type of growth, as it is similar to what is happening already, and Montgomery seems to have less heritage consideration which make this type of growth more complex / less desirable.

Excellent

Excellent area

I think this is very appropriate. I would like to see increased transit access as community grows as traffic is always a concern.

4 story makes sense. The 4 story unit along Bowness by 46 st NW is not 'to' high.

Roads can't handle traffic now - how will you improve by high density more cars - only one Crowchild Trail - to go south - congested - fix that first

Any plan needs to allow for parking both for customers & employees. Only then will it be a profitable neighbourhood.

I like the blend and closeness to the mixed use.

It's about time. Garrison Woods is a great model to follow.



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

Having a garden in our yard for many years with south facing light has been great to provide knowledge for my child. My concern is that some houses will lose sunlight due to higher buildings.

What is being done about the vagrants in the area? What is being done to stop Bowness Road being used as a short cut for commuters?

The redevelopment of 16 Ave needs to encourage interesting businesses - the current motels excluding Centro & Days Inn need to leave the area - the combination of those motels & the bottle depot set the area up for crime. Adding pedestrian overpasses - wide side walks, benches good lighting could make the 16 Ave corridor more desirable.

The yellow areas should be maintained as low density.

Re: 4(c)- Only the area south of 16 Avenue.

Change / fix up parking lots along Bowness Rd across from Notable. \$ flowers, walkways, etc.

Keep sight lines pleasant - keep building height to max 3 stories. Consider parking needs. Critical to make it safe and walkable.

Makes sense because it is inner city and there is infrastructure already in place. The neighbourhood is close to University and hospitals.

See previous page. 4d needs to be defined before adjacent areas.

No rowhouses or MRUs. Should permit legal/approved secondary suites.

I would like to see this growth encouraged BUT The City needs to install a proper pedestrian crossing system at 45 St and Bowness Rd and introduce angle parking for the retail side similar to parking on Bowness Rd in Bowness.

Great location!

Please consider an extension of the "main street" area, or at least walkable area into the Shouldice Aquatic Center area. I love the idea of cafes in parks, and the city does not seem to use it much.



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

11 October 2016

QUESTION 5 – Evaluation Factors for Future Large Redevelopment Sites

Line main street with tall buildings for more interesting street view	Require retail	Locate highest buildings where shadows would have the least impact off-site	Through site connections (more sidewalks, pathways or bike routes)	Along the non-main street edge match redevelopment scale to existing building scale	Use green infrastructure (rain water capture, solar power generation)	Other
13	20	16	23	17	17	7

Other (suggestions)

Re: Other - Fix existing traffic issues with the interchange of Shag., Bowness Rd, + Transcanada Highway.

Better public transit.

Keep it as a seniors residence

Make sure to plant lots of trees! As that's what makes Montgomery / Edworthy special.

This would be a perfect site for higher height because few residential would be shadowed. Ensure still walkability and connectedness. Improve crossings.

Silvern location only. This should remain residential for seniors. No commercial unless the new building is used to house seniors. Other 4(d) areas - retail/commercial as it is today.

Include park / green space

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

Bowness Rd - work towards an Inglewood feel - coffee shops, cafes.

Safeway is a very important business in the community (or another large scale food outlet).

Re: 4d(a) - Only in left. Re: 4d(b) - Only in the one on the left. Re: 4(d)(e) - For one on top.

Ranked 4d choices: 1: locating highest... ; 2: Along the non-main street edge...; 3: Use green infrastructure...

"4D I School, sr citizens complex, park". "4D II Retail & commercial (more parking)". "4D III Widen roads, redesign, leave for future transportation needs."

Put high rise across from Safeway give us some park land back by the Bow River

Re: 4a - No to 4-6 storey.

Do not allow tall buildings on this site. That would not enhance the neighborhood. No commercial development should be allowed. No housing taller than 2 story. Create a walking path.

4D 1 - This is in the middle of residential & next to a school - should stay wholly residential. Children & adults use playground before & after school for sports etc. So sunlight should not be affected by tall buildings. Green space is a must!



Main Streets –16 Ave & Bowness Rd

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard
11 October 2016

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

Retail is a good fit:

Bowness Rd between 45 and 47 St
N/A
Most beneficial would be to line Bowness Road with walkable retail/commercial. Good elsewhere too.

Retail should not go:

N/A
All should be able to be retail/commercial.